THE POWER OF PATRIARCHY: ITS MANIFESTATION IN RAPE

Carla Ackerman

Thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts at the University of Stellenbosch

Handed in: June 1995

Supervisor: Dr. Amanda Gouws
Department of Political Science
University of Stellenbosch 1995
DECLARATION

I the undersigned hereby declare that the work contained in this thesis is my own original work and has not previously in its entirety or in part been submitted at any university for a degree.

Signature:  Date:
Abstract

This study investigates wimmin's perceptions of social power, as illustrated by their experiences of rape. In the first chapter the principles of subjective feminist research are analyzed against the background of feminist critique on so-called objective science. This introduction also discusses the feminist research methodology used in the study.

This is followed by an examination of mainstream political science's conception of "power". How mainstream political scientists conceptualise "power", how they define "the exercise of power". Analyses of the feminist critique against the mainstream conception of "power" are discussed.

The account of Foucault's ideas on "power" is, to some degree, a link between mainstream political science's views and feminists views.

An examination of patriarchy, the three main dichotomies present in our society that determine female/male relations and gendered sexuality follows.

It is against the aforementioned background that the literature study moves into a practical research stage. The next chapter analyses wimmin's conceptions and experiences of "power" relations by looking at the feminist theory of rape. This is followed by an analysis of the research data and a discussion of the popular rape myths in our society.

A herstorical overview and analysis of the current rape law is then given, while the last chapter examines a feminist alternative conception of "power" relations by re-visiting "power" and by providing a feminist vision of womyn-power.
Hierdie studie ondersoek vrouens se persepsies van sosiale mag soos geïllustreer deur hulle ervarings van verkragting. In die eerste hoofstuk word die beginsels van subjektyiewe feministiese navorsing geanalyseren teen die agtergrond van die feministiese kritiek teen sogenaamde objektiewe wetenskap. Dit verskaf 'n bespreking van die feministiese navorsingsmetodologie wat in die studie gebruik is.

In die daaropvolgende hoofstuk word hoofstroom politieke wetenskap se konsepsie van "mag" ondersoek deur te kyk na hoe hoofstroom politieke wetenskap "mag" konseptualiseer, hoe dit "die uitoefening van mag" definieer en deur die analise van feministiese kritiek teen hoofstroom politieke wetenskap se konsepsie van "mag".

Die opsomming van Foucault s. idees oor "mag" is in sommige opsigte 'n skakel tussen hoofstroom politieke wetenskap se sieninge en dié van feministe. 'n Onderzoek na patriargie, die drie belangrikste tweeledighede ("dichotomies") in ons samelewing wat die verhoudings tussen vrouens en mans bepaal en geslagtelike seksualiteit ("gendered sexuality") volg.

Dit is teen die agtergrond van die voorafgaande dat die literatuurstudie gevolg word deur 'n praktiese navorsingsfase. Daar volg 'n analise van vrouens se konsepsies en ondervindings van "magsverhoudinge" deur eerstens na die feministiese teorie van verkragting te kyk. Hierna volg 'n analise van die navorsingsdata en 'n bespreking van populêre verkragtingsmites in ons samelewing.

In aansluiting by bogenoemde volg 'n historiese oorsig en analise van die huidige verkragtingswet en vrouens se ervarings daarvan. Laastens volg 'n feministiese alternatiewe konsepsie van "magsverhoudinge" deur 'n her-analise van "mag" voor te stel en deur 'n feministiese visie van vroue-mag ("womyn-power") te verskaf.
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"bad girl"  "A bad girl" does not abide by the rules of patriarchal society. She disregards the "rules" of personal behaviour and appearance. Her behaviour and appearance falls outside the accepted rules for wimmin as prescribed by patriarchal society. Bad girls include: prostitutes, "single and free" wimmin, wimmin who dress provocatively, flirtatious wimmin, every womyn who challenges and rejects the rules forced upon them by patriarchal society.

Dichotomies: Part of the system of patriarchy is to create a world divided into right and wrong, good and bad, male and female. It is represented by, amongst other, the male/female, nature/culture, public/private dichotomies.

Domination: The ability of one group of people (men) to determine/control the behaviour and appearance of another group of people (wimmin). Domination implies coercion and force by the one group (men) and subordination by the other group (wimmin).

Femininity: "It is a gentle, tender quality found in a woman's appearance, manner and action. It is a sort of softness, submissiveness, and dependency upon men for their masculine care and protection. More than anything else, it is a lack of masculine ability - a lack of male aggressiveness, competency, efficiency, fearlessness, strength, and 'the ability to kill your own snake'" (Andelin, 1975:261).

Feminism The term refers broadly to all the different lines of feminist thought. It also refers to feminism as a movement and as a frame of mind or belief system. Feminism is "... the commitment to the praxis of liberation for women from all that oppresses us. (But)... neither does it promote privilege for women over men. It is about a different consciousness, a
"good girl"

The "good girl" is exactly the opposite of the "bad girl". She lives within the rules and regulations for womynhood as prescribed by patriarchal society, and will not question male authority over her. "Good girls" are associated with being unspoiled, virginal, innocent, child-like, under the (legal) protection of a male, and therefore untouchable by any other man. "Good girls" are mothers, virgins and sexually inexperienced wimmin, young girls etc.

Herstory:

History which includes the perceptions, experiences, influences and activities of wimmin.

Patriarchy:

The male societal system which results in male domination (power over) and female subordination (powerlessness). "... the power of the fathers: a familial-societal, ideological, political system in which men ... determine what part women shall or shall not play, and in which the female is everywhere subsumed under the male..." (Rich, 1976). It is a historic system of male domination, a system committed to the maintenance and reinforcement of male hegemony in all aspects of life - personal and private privilege and power, as well as public privilege and power. Its institutions direct and protect the distribution of power and privilege to those who are male, according to societal and economic class and roles (Bleier, 1984:162).

Police persons:
Policemen (sic) and policewimmin

Politics:

The more traditional view, held by mainstream political science, sees politics as an activity which is a conscious, deliberate participation in the process by which resources are allocated amongst people. It is the activities associated with the male public domain, i.e. the political
processes of a country like elections, foreign affairs, the state and the economy etc., from which wimmin, associated with the private sphere, are excluded.

The feminist view equates politics with the articulation, or working out of relationships within an already given "power structure". Radical feminists reject the definition of politics as an activity (Randall, 1982:7-8). Politics is "power-structured relationships, arrangements whereby one group of persons is controlled by another" (Millett, 1972:23). Politics is no longer identical with going to the polls, electing one's candidate to a parliament and hoping that he (sic) will change things in the name of the electorate. Feminists have tried to move from a concept of "politics by delegation", to a concept of "politics in the first person" (Mies, 1986:28), and accordingly speak of inter alia "personal politics", "sexual politics" and "the politics of housework".

Private domain:  
The very places (home, body), relations (sexual), activities (intercourse and reproduction) and feelings (intimacy and selfhood) that feminism finds central to wimmin's subjection, form the core of the privacy Coctrine (MacKinnon, 1983:657). It is concerned with the home, with the individual, the children and the domestic concerns of the husband.

Public domain:  
The public domain is the domain of men. It is concerned with activities outside the home, risks, freedom, movement, action, conquests. The public domain constitutes everything that wimmin are excluded from, that wimmin are not supposed to be part of. It is best described as action, while wimmin embody all that is passive, not involved, not active.

Rape:  
Any sexual intimacy forced (against the will; without consent) on one person by another. "Politically, I call it rape whenever a woman has sex and feels violated. Part of the culture of sexual inequality ... is that the
definition of rape is not based on our (wimmin's) sense of our violation" (MacKinnon, 1987:82).

Sex/gender system: "Sex" refers to the biological differences between male and female: the visible difference in genitalia and the related difference in procreative function. "Gender" however, is a matter of culture: it refers to the social stratification into "masculine" and "feminine". You are born with a specific "sex" but you are socialized into a specific "gender" group - "masculine" or "feminine" (Oakley, 1972:16 & Gailey, 1987:33-34).

Wimmin = women
Womyn = woman
INTRODUCTION

Background to the study

Violence committed against wimmin, especially rape, is a familiar and ever-increasing occurrence in today's world. South Africa, as a country, has plunged into a general state of political and criminal violence which provides the backdrop for violence committed specifically against wimmin. Ironically, it is for this same reason that violence against wimmin does not receive the attention it deserves. As a nation, we are preoccupied with the process of trying to solve the "political violence" in our country and tend to forget the political nature of violence against wimmin. We are confronted with violent "political" situations every day, but fail to see the politics of interpersonal violence. The reason for this apparent contradiction is that violence against wimmin is perceived as a domestic, private problem. Thus, by extension, it does not deserve the attention of outsiders, much less to be the subject of study from a feminist political science perspective.

I believe that violence is one of the many manifestations or consequences of a much larger phenomena, namely the unequal distribution of power between men and wimmin. For this reason, I have conducted a study of social power and it is from this perspective that I comment on violence against wimmin. As this is a very diversified field, I have only concentrated on one form of violence against wimmin, namely rape. Violence against wimmin and the power structures within society are closely related. I therefore propose to show how rape, as a violent act against an individual womyn, is closely related to patriarchal society's ascribing power to men and subordination to wimmin. This results in men being able to abuse their position of power, by acting violently against wimmin.
An analysis of the power relations within our society is important because its structure determines both the dynamics of men's power, and how wimmin experience it.

Society is founded on the power relations between different parties, whether it is between businesses, government or individuals. An important reason for analysing womyn/man power relations is that changing existing power relations means changing society as a whole, including wommin's position as "victims" of violence. A change in womyn/man power relations is impossible without a clear understanding of what it is and how it operates. Analysing social power relations will enable us to determine what constitutes men's power and how wimmin experience it. This will then allow us to decide (from a feminist point of view) whether or not these forms of power are acceptable and, if not, what radical changes would be appropriate.

Research on rape

Historically, research on "rape" has been conducted mainly in the form of clinical studies. These studies have categorized rapists into typologies based on motivation, treatment classification or clinical classes (in turn based on sexual and aggressive impulses), as well as descriptive features of the rape itself. These studies have treated rape as an isolated act by a deviant individual, and have viewed it as symptomatic of an individual pathology or character disorder (Williams & Holmes, 1981:6).

It was only as recently as 1971 that the first major sociological work on rape was conducted by Amir. The origin of the feminist anti-rape campaign is attributed to the publication of an article by Susan Griffin, "Rape: The all American crime" in 1971, in which she described rape as a violent form of social control, which effectively serves to keep wimmin in their "place". Much feminist literature has been aimed at survival and self-defence techniques, self-help, consciousness-raising, encouraging wimmin
to report rapes and have rapists prosecuted and at providing support and guidelines for establishing service-delivery programs for rape victims. Other papers have been written primarily to destroy the commonly held myths that surrounded rape and to examine the institutional systems (i.e. the police, district surgeons and rape law) that survivors encounter when they decide to report a rape. One of the most important books of this period was Susan Brownmiller's *Against our will: Men, women and rape* (1975) which provides a historical chronology of rape as a tactic of war, a consequence of mob violence and a weapon of racial oppression *(Williams & Holmes, 1981:8-9)*.

The first attempts to identify and delineate survivor responses to rape was made by Sutherland & Scherl in 1970. Subsequently a number of important studies on womyn as the "victim" of rape emerged *(Williams & Holmes, 1981:14-16)*.

The relationship between rape and power is frequently mentioned in these and other studies, and will be dealt with more fully later on. Most, if not all, feminist work on rape accepts the importance of power relations in rape and, according to Smith & Bennett (1985), the feminist theory of rape has become the dominant social science explanation for rape.

South African studies of rape are relatively few in number, for example: Faul & Muller did a study in 1990 consisting of 24 rape survivors. Verwey & Louw's (1989/'90) study consists of 60 white rapists (no rape survivors), and Vogelman's ¹ (1990) study is based on interviews with rapists. Collings (1987) used 54 rape survivors and Levett & Kuhn ² (1991) studied 183 white (male and female) students' attitudes toward rape and rapists.


The use of rape in this study

Rape, in this study, is used as an example of the way in which wimmin experience the imbalances of social power relations.

The problem

Mainstream political science does not include wimmin in its analysis of "power" (as discussed in chapter two). It replicates the existing societal dichotomies (see chapter four) into a public/private, male/female divide. According to this division politics is viewed as part of the public domain, from which wimmin are excluded (see the "Glossary of terms" for a definition of "politics", "private domain" and "public domain"). There are many definitions of what "politics" is, but inter alia mainstream political science views politics as the allocation of scarce resources (who gets what, where, when and how), as well as the political processes of a country such as elections, foreign affairs, the state and the economy etc. This is the domain of men: that which is concerned with activities outside the home, risks, freedom, movement, action, conquests. A domain which excludes wimmin.

It is this division that is contradicted and challenged by the feminist principle of "the personal is political". By living out this principle, feminists are saying that the private world of wimmin (according to men), the world associated with the home, the individual, the children and the domestic concerns of the husband, is also a political (public) arena. The everyday lives of wimmin are political, for example womyn/man power relations (so-called personal politics), the politics of housework and the sexual politics of rape, abuse, marriage etc.

Wimmin's day-to-day reality is no less political (and therefore unimportant) because it is "private". It too involves "power-structured relationships" and its "personal" nature does not mean that it cannot be included in the public arena.
Based on the feminist principle of "the personal as political", the exclusion of wimmin's personal experiences from mainstream political science's study of "power" is unacceptable. It is essential that wimmin's personal experiences and perceptions be included in the study of so-called "mainstream" research subjects like "power".

"The personal as political" is a call to break down the barriers between the private and public worlds of wimmin and men and, in fact, crosses the private/public division. "Politics" is usually defined as that which is "not personal", that which is done in public and not in private (Ring, 1987:753 & Hearn, 1987:11-12).

According to Stanley & Wise (1983:200, 194) the foundation of feminism is the re-evaluation of "the personal", and the insistence on the location of "politics" and "revolution" within the everyday experiences of wimmin. "The personal", lived experience of wimmin is in essence political. Wimmin should define and interpret our own experiences. We need to re-define and re-name what men have previously defined and named for us, e.g. wimmin's experiences and perceptions of rape.

The basis of feminist social science is that the personal, lived experience underlies all behaviours and actions. Therefore, we need to re-claim, name and re-name our everyday experiences (Stanley & Wise, 1983:205). This is what Ring (1987:753) refers to as "the power to create the world from one's point of view." This is the power that men have claimed for themselves and which wimmin need to claim back. We need to look at the world in terms other than the sexist, androcentric ways which we have been taught. We need to construct our own way of interpreting the world, starting with an explanation of wimmin's experiences of our own social realities. If we fail to do so we are left with a social science in which wimmin are researched and analyzed by using the same conceptual frameworks, methods of research and analytical models as those used in sexist, androcentric research. Feminist research must therefore explore the basis of our
everyday knowledge as wimmin, as feminists, as social scientists (Stanley & Wise, 1983:205-206).

The existing (male, mainstream) systems of thought treat wimmin's everyday experiences and understandings of our social reality as both peripheral and unimportant. An understanding of wimmin's oppression (for example, rape) is only possible through an understanding and analysis of everyday life i.e. where oppression is grounded. Without knowing how oppression occurs we cannot know why it occurs, and without knowing how and why, we cannot determine how to avoid its occurrence (Stanley & Wise, 1983b:134-135, 167).

The research question

What are wimmin's experiences and perceptions of social power relations, as illustrated by their experience of rape?

Composition of analysis

The link between the different aspects of this study can be summarised as follows. Mainstream political science, in its analysis of "power", excludes wimmin's experiences and perceptions of social power. It is, therefore, incomplete and cannot be accepted as the definitive analysis of power relations. Although Foucault's views on power cannot be labelled as mainstream, they lie somewhere between the mainstream point of view and a feminist vision and, will be dealt with briefly as such. Underlining mainstream political scientists' exclusion of wimmin in their analysis of "power", is the important interaction between patriarchy as manifested in societal dichotomies, and what is labelled as "gendered sexuality". Not only does this inter-connection lead to a view which excludes wimmin, but it also determines how wimmin experience what they experience. This is illustrated by the analysis of wimmin's experiences and perceptions of rape and the current rape law. This leads to the conclusion that wimmin experience and perceive
social power as powerlessness and that we must, therefore, propose a feminist alternative which will include wimmin, provide a new way of looking at wimmin's experiences, as well as an alternative vision of social power.

The following diagram provides a summary of the analysis of the study.
Diagram of composition of analysis

Mainstream political science's analysis of "power"

Feminist critique

Foucault

The exclusion of wimmin

Patriarchy manifested in dichotomies, which result in "gendered sexuality"

Research findings of wimmin's experiences and perceptions of rape

Conclusion: Wimmin's experiences are those of powerlessness

We need: An alternative feminist vision of power relations
I believe that this study suggests a different understanding of wimmin's perception of social power, and their close association of social power with violence against wimmin. It is, most importantly, an analysis of wimmin's conceptions and experiences, which have thus far been entirely excluded from the (male) mainstream point of view.

Other aspects

It should be borne in mind that, on occasion, generalizations have been made and, as a result, some arguments may sound totalizing. There are, of course, exceptions to all rules. Not all men like powerless and subordinate wimmin and many treat wimmin as the equals we are. Neither are all wimmin powerless and subordinate to men. But it should also be acknowledged, that the majority of wimmin are still subordinate and powerless, and that this position is not always as visible and overt as we might expect. Also, that many men like to be in control of wimmin and to make decisions for us.

I have worked from a (radical) feminist point of view and although the aim of the research is not to elaborate on feminism as such, the underlying feminist principles should be kept in mind. In the light of my choice to use (radical) feminist terminology, the term "rape survivor" is used instead of the more widely used "rape victim". This is a liberating term which refers to the fact that wimmin who have been raped are engaged in a day-to-day struggle to keep their lives on track. Being a "victim" is all too often ascribed to wimmin and further reinforces our conception of ourselves as powerless and at the mercy of men. These wimmin, who have survived rape, are not victims — they are survivors! "Police persons" includes both female and male police officers, in preference to the generic, but androcentric "policeman" that is usually used. In the case of specific wimmin's history, the term "herstory" is used, while "womyn" is used in stead of "woman" and "wimmin" instead of "women".
For the reader's convenience, an easily accessible glossary of terms used throughout the study, is provided.

I have also made extensive use of the comments of the rape survivors, as direct quotes, in order to provide them with a forum to speak out about their experiences.

The rape survivor respondents are wimmin who were raped during various stages of their lives, and I have not made any differentiation between someone who was raped as a child and someone who was raped as an adult. I have, consequently, not used the legal distinction between rape and statutory rape (where the rape survivor is under the age of sixteen), but have included each womyn, irrespective of the age at which she was raped.

A summary of the chapters follows: Chapter 1 describes the research methodology. It outlines the alternative feminist research methodology used in this study, as opposed to the principles of objective scientific research which are followed by mainstream political science. The chapter also provides information regarding the empirical research undertaken for the study.

Chapter 2 analyses how "power" is viewed by mainstream political scientists, and provides a feminist critique of its shortcomings.

Foucault's views on "power" are outlined in chapter 3. To some extent Foucault provides a link between the mainstream scientific and feminist points of view. His views fall somewhere between the two.

In Chapter 4 the important link between patriarchy, as manifested in societal dichotomies, and "gendered sexuality" is explained. This chapter has two important functions: on the one hand it provides the background against which the exclusion of wimmin from the mainstream analysis of "power" should be viewed; on the other hand it determines how wimmin experience what they
experience, as illustrated by the analysis of the research data in Chapter 5.

Chapter 5 focuses on wimmin's conceptions and experiences of power, through rape. The principles of the feminist theory of rape are discussed, and background information regarding the respondents is provided. The analysis focuses on the rape survivors' conceptions and experiences of power relations before, during and after being raped; as well as the influence of rape myths on society's perceptions of rape.

An analysis of the current rape law and its influence on wimmin's powerlessness, is outlined in Chapter 6. I will show how the rape law is a result of the link between the factors (patriarchy, dichotomies, gendered sexuality) discussed in chapter 4 and, how it exacerbates wimmin's negative experiences of social power, rather than providing a recourse to justice.

Chapter 7 proposes an alternative which is feminist, includes wimmin, provides a new way of analysing wimmin's experiences and which proposes a new vision of social power.

The last chapter outlines the conclusion reached and is followed by the bibliography.
CHAPTER 1

FEMINIST RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

"If I want to define myself, I must first of all say: I am a woman; on this truth must be based all further discussion. A man never begins by presenting himself as an individual of a certain sex; it goes without saying that he is a man."

(Simone de Beauvoir)

In what follows, I will outline the (subjective) feminist research methodology used for this study. This is in stark contrast to mainstream political science's practice of "objective, scientific" research. The critique against objectivity, as well as the sexist nature of mainstream political science (discussed in chapter 2), provides the backdrop against which the chapter on feminist methodology (chapter 1) must be viewed. These two elements also form part of the general critique levelled against mainstream political science (chapter 2).

1.1. Objective science

Men's epistemological stance is objectivity: the non-involved stance, the view from a distance and from no particular perspective, apparently transparent to its reality (MacKinnon, 1982:538). Objectivity is Aristotelian, data-centred, descriptive, measuring, hierarchical, systematic, fragmentizing, logical, sequential. It is also anti-emotional, cold, impersonal, unfeeling, sterile and passive. It has carefully defined rules and limits within which there is consistency and predictability (Starrett, 1982:186). Patriarchal thought-forms require the intellect alone. The emotions are feared as destroyers and contaminants of objective thought. Therefore, patriarchy requires the systematic extinction of the emotions. The projected ideal is the computer, all intellect, all reaction (Starrett, 1982:189). It does not comprehend its own perspectivity, does not recognise what it sees as a subject like itself, or that the way
it comprehends its world is a form of its subjugation and presupposes it. The objectively knowable is object. What is objectively known corresponds to the world and can be verified by pointing to it (as science does) because the world itself is controlled from the same point of view. Objectivity is the methodological stance of which (sexual) objectification is the social process and of which men's dominance is the politics, the acted-out practice (MacKinnon, 1982:538, 541, 658). Its point of view is the standard for point-of-viewlessness, its particularity the meaning of universality. Feminist criticism of objectivity is not so much that the objective stance fails to be truly objective because it has social content. The criticism is that objectivity is largely accurate to its/the/a world, which is criticized, and that it becomes more accurate as the power it represents and extends become more total (MacKinnon, 1983:638). It leaves no room for any other (one which is not objective) way of looking at the world - which is itself not objective. Objectivity becomes the standard from which we seldom part, but it is a standard that does not necessarily correctly reflect wimmin's position and point of view. Womyn is object, not objective. Being in the position of an object, that is, being an object, you cannot but feel, live, be (in) your position as object. An object is there, an object knows, reacts, fears, has to believe and live in her objectivity. Womyn is object, subjectively, not objectively. It is nonsensical that our methodology for creating what we subjectively experience should be that of objective science. We can only recall what we live every day if it is true to our nature - which is subjective.

If feminism is a critique of the objective standpoint as men see it, then it must also reject standard scientific norms as the criteria for feminist theory, because the objective standpoint we criticize is that of science. Thus, the feminist critique of the objective standpoint as men see it is a critique of science as specifically men's approach to knowledge (MacKinnon, 1987:54).
The point of science has been to replace opinion with certainty, to replace religion and faith with empirical hard data. (Men's) social science does this by analogy to the physical world: as things move, so society moves. Wimmin have become "world" for a men's-centred social science. We have become the to-be-known-about, that part of the world to be transformed and controlled. The position of power, from men's point of view, is the possibility of making (creating) the world as one thinks or wants it to be. And this is men's scientific standpoint: you can't tell the difference between what you think and the way the world is, if your standpoint for thinking and being is one of social power (MacKinnon, 1982:57-58).

Reason is superior to emotion, mind superior to body, culture superior to nature, objectivity superior to subjectivity. Reason and scientific knowledge have become masculine attributes, while femininity has become natural, passive, intuitive, and subjective.

The dominance of reason in science gave scientists a source of control of the objects of their studies. Through scientific research theory, they try to avoid metaphysical speculation and to control human passions and prejudices. The logic of this approach justified the separation of reason from emotion. Mind became separated from body, culture from nature, objectivity from subjectivity and public from private. The separation is not one of equality, but one of superiority and inferiority (hierarchical) (Ramazanoglu, 1989:46-47).

It would seem that men's, scientific way of examining the world in order to ultimately control and predict, is just another form of domination. If you can develop a methodology by which you can ensure control and prediction, you can maintain the social order of men's domination and wimmin's submission. Men's point of view(lessness) needs certainty and this can be provided by an objective scientific research methodology. A feminist perception of the social world in terms of wimmin's experiences, feelings
and lived realities is too much of an open challenge from men's objective standpoint. It leaves too much room for uncertainty, there is not enough control, and prediction is unreliable. But this is the certainty of wimmin's world: that it is uncertain, unpredictable, uncontrollable. It is not black/white, right/wrong, yes/no. It is grey. If you want to explore wimmin's lived experience of powerlessness, you cannot work in laboratory conditions. The only reliable data are the personal accounts of wimmin, their experiences, their perceptions, their lives.

In the words of the San Francisco Redstockings (1969:285-286):

"Our politics begin with our feelings: feelings are a direct response to the events and relationships that we experience; that's how we know what's really going on. Our political analysis can be trusted only so long as it does not contradict our feelings."

This is the only reality of wimmin's lives: their experiences of it and their feelings towards it. The objective viewpoints we sometimes have are nothing other than learned (socialized/gendered) behaviour and thought-patterns. We are taught how to be objective, not to get involved, to distance ourselves. Yet if we want to get to the essence of wimmin's powerlessness, if we want to learn from ourselves, then how can we be objective, how can we discard our own immediacy? Thus we are forced into a methodology of subjective experience as the point of departure. We are not objective beings.

Against this background, I will now turn to the feminist research methodology used in this study.

1.2. Subjective feminism

The method of research that I have used for this thesis is strongly aligned with radical feminism - "feminism unmodified" (MacKinnon, 1983:639), and is based on what is known as feminist methodology and feminist epistemology.
It is necessary to make the following distinction between "method", "methodology" and "epistemology". "Method" refers to the techniques used for gathering information or evidence regarding the research subject (Harding, 1987b:2-3).

"Methodology" is the theory and analysis of how research should or does proceed (Harding, 1987b:2-3 & Abbott & Wallace, 1990:205). According to Klein (1983:89) it is the overall conception of the research project, the choice of techniques used for research, as well as the form of presentation of the research results.

"Epistemology" refers to issues about an adequate theory of knowledge (Harding, 1987b:3). It raises the questions of what can be accepted as an adequate theory, and how we can judge research findings: what makes some findings more adequate and acceptable than other findings? Feminist epistemology raises questions like: who can be "a knower"? Is it only men who can "know", or are wimmin also capable of "knowing"? What kind of tests must beliefs, experiences etc. pass to be labelled "legitimate (read scientific) knowledge"? Must it be tested against the so-called valid beliefs of men and experiences already accepted as scientific knowledge? What kinds of things can be known? Is it only knowledge that can be obtained in an objective manner, or can it also be subjective, experienced knowledge? (Harding, 1987b:3).

Although some feminist writers try to distinguish between "feminist methodology" and "feminist epistemology", the finer nuances get lost in discussions about the practicalities of feminist research. It would seem that discussions on feminist research tend to use these two concepts as synonyms and the difference in focus between the two concepts fades away. Whether or not this should happen is not the point. Rather, what should be kept in mind, is that it does happen and that my discussion of the characteristics of feminist research is in line with this approach.
Harding (1987:187) summarises it by saying that a feminist science is one that can better reflect the world, rather than the incomplete accounts provided by traditional (men's) social science. It should also be remembered that feminist methods differ according to the specific circumstances of the research, and that there is not one "correct" way of doing feminist research (Klein, 1983:89).

Radical feminism is concerned with the analysis of the oppression of wimmin as wimmin, and it is "radical" because it strives to bring about fundamental changes in society. It aims to uncover and claim as valid the experiences of wimmin. Feminism claims back what wimmin have lost to men's domination.

Radical feminism is:
"... the voice of women's silence, the sexuality of our eroticized desexualization, the fullness of "lack", the centrality of our marginality and exclusion, the public nature of privacy, the presence of our absence" (MacKinnon, 1983:639).

Feminist methodology acknowledges the importance of wimmin's empowerment and liberation from male patriarchy. It is, in the words of Ackermann (1990:84):
"... the commitment to the praxis of liberation for women from all that oppresses us. It is about a different consciousness, a radically transformed perspective which questions our social, cultural, political and religious traditions and calls for structural change in all these spheres." (My emphasis)

Radical feminism, as it pertains to this study, shows a deep concern with female sexuality (i.e. MacKinnon) and its redefinition. It is concerned with men's violence against wimmin expressed through for example rape, and sees sexual violence in particular, as a significant consequence of men's domination and wimmin's oppression (Banks, 1981:230-231). The popular saying that "the personal is political" (as discussed in the introduction) is the principle which underlies feminism's theory and praxis, while consciousness-raising (see chapter 7) is an
essential part of the process/method used.

Feminist science points out the ways in which accepted patriarchal scientific methods and theories are sexist and therefore, distorting. It also tries to develop new methods and theories based on the principles of a non-sexist science (Eichler, 1980:119). Feminist methodology shares Simone de beauvoir's insight, that feminist research can only exist through the principle of wimmin defining themselves as wimmin. The starting point is thus a questioning of the intellectual, patriarchal tradition of Western "scientific" thought.

Abbott & Wallace (1990:205) remind us that it is not research methods that are either feminist or not, but rather the way in which research is carried out, as well as the theoretical framework within which results are interpreted. Feminist research should be free to combine any part(s) of any method(s) we think are promising for our research goals (Klein, 1983:96). "Doing feminist research" does not require procedures other than those we usually use in everyday life, to understand ourselves as wimmin and feminists. It is not about the techniques used, but rather the interaction between the researcher and the research process (Stanley & Wise, 1983:195).

Feminist methodology is characterised by the following (feminist epistemological) principles:

(1) Feminist researchers begin their investigation of the world around them from a position of being grounded in their own subjective oppression, and therefore reject the idea of value-free, objective, "scientific" research (Weiler, 1988:58). This is what Mies (1984) refers to as "conscious partiality" (achieved through partial identification with the research subjects). It requires that the patriarchal "view from above" be replaced by a "view from below". Feminist researchers must integrate their own subjectivity as wimmin, their own experiences of
oppression and discrimination into the research process, in what Mies (1983:120) refers to as a "double consciousness" – the female researcher's consciousness of both worlds: science and being a womyn. Feminist methodology rejects the patriarchal idea of objectivity and neutrality in relation to the research subject. Instead it values subjectivity, intuition, direct empathy and association with the research subjects who are not treated as mere objects of research. This method is what Klein (1983:94-95) refers to as "conscious subjectivity" which replaces value-free objectivity, and which places wimmin at the centre of the study where they are neither compared with, nor measured against normative men's standards. MacKinnon (1982:22,24) in rejecting the idea of universality and objectivity states that:

"... the distinction between knowing subject and known object – the division between subjective and objective postures – is simply the male epistemological stance."

My starting point has been to base this research on my own subjective experience and position as a womyn. I decided on the research topic from a subjective point of view. Violence against wimmin and the power relations involved, is a personal interest of mine. I cannot remove myself from my subjective experience of everyday life as a white womyn who can, potentially, be raped. This is the reality for all wimmin. A reality that determines our everyday lives in more ways than can be analyzed and understood from a neutral, objective stance. To be a "rapable" womyn, is to be subjective: The threat of potential rape makes every womyn "rapable", a subjective experience which cannot (from a radical feminist point of view) be objectively analyzed. I am, however, also well aware of the problems associated with such a subjective stance. Judged from men's, objective point of view("lessness"), subjectivity is not only unacceptable, it is also grounds for severe criticism when present in research. This is one of the risks of subjective research.
With regards to what Klein (1983:94-95) referred to as "conscious subjectivity": It is important not to view my inclusion of the police persons and district surgeons as providing "normative men's standards" for the perceptions of the rape survivors. The police persons and the district surgeons were not included for the purpose of comparison with the rape survivors, but rather as a further important aspects of the research. They are the people who work directly with the rape survivors and are as such important. However, they are most definitely not the "standard" against which the rape survivors must be viewed. All three groups of respondents' data must be viewed as separate, important and equal.

(2) Klein (1983:90-91) calls it "research for women", that is research that takes wimmin's needs, interests and experiences into account. It follows that feminist research is characterized by an emphasis on lived experience and everyday life. (This must be read against the background of feminists' emphasis on "the personal as political" as discussed in the introduction.) The way in which men's dominant power is exercised in our society, and the potential experience of rape is just as much a part of wimmin's daily lives as breathing.

"We need to find out what it is that we know and what it is that we experience. We need to reclaim, name and rename our experiences and our knowledge of the social world we live in and daily construct. We conceptualize this world through a language provided for us by sexist society, and by a thoroughly androcentric social science. We need to reject this imposed language and to construct our own social science, a science which starts from women's experience of women's reality. "Everyday life" is what we spend our lives doing; is what we are involved in all of our waking, and a large part of our sleeping, hours. What all people spend most of their time doing must obviously be the subject of research. What women spend most of their time doing must obviously be the subject of feminist research." (Stanley & Wise, 1983:165, 167).

This is what Stanley & Wise, 1983:203) refer to as "ethnomethodology" which views the everyday as both the topic of the research, and the resource with which it
works. It uses the everyday in order to understand the everyday experiences of wimmin. It does not claim expertise over other wimmin's lives, nor does it falsify wimmin's experiences as invalid. It places an emphasis on understanding how wimmin construct, not necessarily interpret, reality, and tries to provide an understanding of how we "do" everyday life.

When you emphasise the subjective nature of feminist research, it is inevitable that emphasis must also be placed on wimmin's lives, their lived, everyday experiences. Wimmin's experience of rape is an ordinary, everyday experience that can become a reality for any womyn. It is the ordinary, common nature of this reality that makes it important in terms of feminist research. Of equal importance is the acknowledgement that this is just one account of a specific group of wimmin's experience of rape. It cannot claim to be an analysis of all wimmin's experience. It represents only one specific feminist analysis of a particular group of wimmin and leaves enough room for other interpretations.

(3) Feminist research is therefore politically committed to changing the existing social order. The ultimate test is not whether the research proved to be "true", but whether or not it leads to progressive change (Weiler, 1988:58-63; Birke, 1986). Inter alia Callaway (1981:459), Acker et al (1983:426), Abbott & Wallace (1990:203) and Klein (1983:90-91) define feminist research as an activist enterprise that takes conscious political action to change wimmin's position in society, and through the taking of action, feminist research aims for the emancipation of wimmin. Mies (1983:118, 120) treats it as a methodological approach consistent with the political aims of the wimmin's movement. The underlying assumption is that there is a contradiction between the dominant theories of social science and methodology, and the political aims of the wimmin's movement. Therefore, when wimmin begin to change their situation of exploitation and oppression, it will
have an influence on the research areas, theories, concepts and methodologies of wimmin's studies.

This study is part of the process of documentation and analysis of wimmin's experiences and perceptions of social power in the form of rape. We need to understand our present position in society in order to explore ways of radically changing it in the future. It is not just research for the sake of research, but is based on an urgent need for information that can potentially lead to significant changes in our society.¹

(4) It follows that feminist research must operate in such a way that knowledge is open, accessible and, therefore, accountable to the society of which it forms part. Wimmin's present exclusion from so-called scientific knowledge is, to a large extent, the result of the overwhelmingly male characteristics of science. The feminist emphasis on the sharing of experience and knowledge makes it impossible for it to become an "expert" activity (Birke, 1986:164-). A basic principle of this research is that it should be written in "ordinary" language, thus making it both accessible and usable outside the academic world.

As a matter of principle I tried to write in clear, understandable, "common" language that will make the research accessible to anyone who can read English. As for the question of accountability: the research will be available to grassroots organisations working with violence against wimmin e.g. Rape Crisis. It can therefore contribute to the ongoing debate about rape.

3) For example, I have already received a request for access to the data for this research, which will be used to facilitate changes in institutional responses towards rape survivors.
(5) Although no single, unitary feminist perspective can be identified and applied to the research situation, another general theme which is implicit in feminist methodological literature, is that of the non-oppressive nature of feminist research. Oakley (1981:47) points to the necessity of a "non-hierarchical" and "non-exploitative" relationship between researcher and participant. Acker et al (1983:425) also stress the significance of the non-oppressive relationship:

"As researchers, we must not impose our definitions of reality on those researched... Recognising the objects of the research as subjects in their own right suggests that researchers must take care not to make the research relationship an exploitative one."

The attempts to minimize any possible negative power relations are grounded in the fact that both the researcher and the researched are wimmin. We share the same broad frames of reference - which makes a (non-hierarchical) relationship, based on equality, possible. This is evident from my choice of wimmin to participate in the research (as will be discussed shortly). In support of this point of view Oakley (1981:57) stresses that

"a feminist ... is by definition both inside the culture and participating in that which she is observing. Where both share the same gender socialization and critical life-experiences, social distance can be minimal. Where both (researcher and respondent) share membership of the same minority group, the basis for equality impresses itself even more urgently on the (researcher's) consciousness."

The aim of feminist science is a science that can account for all human beings. We cannot take men's behaviour/theories/beliefs/perceptions etc. to be the generic norm for all human beings (read wimmin). Part of this challenge is to de-masculinize our language. Together with this, we must cease to think in terms of the stereotyped dichotomy of masculinity and femininity. This dichotomy only serves to reinforce the patriarchal foundation of our society namely, men's domination and
wimmin's subordination (Eichler, 1980:119-120). Feminist methodology provides principles according to which empowering, non-exploitative research can be practical and meaningful to both the researcher and the researched.

The way in which the practical part of the research was carried out (as will be discussed shortly) subscribed to the principles of being "non-hierarchical" and "non-exploitative".

Against this background, the research undertaken consists of two integrated parts:

(1) a theoretical literature study of mainstream political scientists and feminist writers on "power", and
(2) an empirical study based on a three-part questionnaire (see Appendices) for rape survivors, police persons and district surgeons, which explores their experiences of rape (as an example of social power).

To enlist the co-operation of female rape survivors as respondents, I made use of what MacKinnon (1983:652) calls "self-selected respondents". The basic principle is to allow people to voluntarily select themselves as respondents. This is in itself a form of empowerment and consciousness-raising for wimmin, as each womyn had to decide for herself to respond to my request. This also means that no external pressure was used to persuade the wimmin to respond and, as such guarantees a more reliable response. The wimmin did not have to feel that some unknown "scientific" method was being used to select them as respondents. The highly sensitive nature of the subject matter, namely wimmin's experience of rape as an example of social power, made access to respondents problematic. It proved impossible to make use of inaccessible state services or voluntary

4) In line with radical feminist thought, I do not use the concept of rape victims, but rather rape survivors. It is an empowering term which reflects the day-to-day survival of wimmin despite of their having been raped.
organisations to gain access to rape survivors for two reasons:

(1) It is important for both state and voluntary organisations to protect the anonymity and confidentiality of their "clients", and

(2) in both cases some form of personal counselling had either already taken place or, was in the process of taking place. This meant that, from a feminist research point of view, it was impossible for me, as an outsider, to enter the confidential world of the rape survivor and counsellor, as my research would inevitably have some influence on the rape survivor. Counselling itself necessarily also changes rape survivors' attitudes and perceptions. The experience of rape is extremely traumatic and personal, and my priority was to adapt my research first and foremost to accommodate these circumstances.

I gained access to respondents through two series of letters published in six popular wimmin's magazines (three Afrikaans and three English) and an English weekly newspaper. The first round of letters was published during September/October 1993 and the second during April/May 1994 in "Sarie", "Rooi Rose", "De Kat", "Cosmopolitan", "Fair Lady", "Women's Value" and "The Weekly Mail". In line with MacKinnon's (1983:652) concept of "self-selected respondents", I invited white Afrikaans and/or English speaking womyn rape survivors to complete an anonymous and confidential questionnaire regarding their experience of rape.

In deciding to use only white Afrikaans and/or English speaking wommin, a number of factors were taken into consideration. This issue forms part of the larger debate within feminist circles concerning the way in which "white" wommin speak on behalf of

5) See inter alia Birke, 1986:161 for a similar argument.

6) I wish to acknowledge the importance of recognising other forms of rape, for example male rape. All forms of rape are traumatic and disempowering experiences that need to be recognized and analyzed.
"all" wimmin. The issue also had to be considered in practical research terms. The inclusion of all racial groups would have meant that, on a theoretical level, the broader question of race and class would have had to be included in addition to gender, in relation to social power. Not only would this have been too wide a field of research, but the areas of race and class are too complex to address in this study. Although I acknowledge race and class as two very important aspects of power relations, I decided not to include these in my present research.

However, I did not simply ignore race/ethnicity. In the words of Hendricks & Lewis (1994:73): "Much of the problem here...is that racism is not perceived as a white problem." No matter how much we try to eliminate race as a factor, it still plays a very important role. This would, undoubtedly, have had an impact on the way in which a respondent completed the questionnaire, and would necessarily have resulted in a divide between the respondent and myself as the interpreter of her responses. Interpretation cannot take place apart from one's own experiences and background, no matter how sincerely one tries to think in terms of another's life and experience.

"Until white interpreters address their position in existing power structures, there will continue to be a struggle over the right to interpret experience, instead of a mapping out of different experiences and of how we are to relate our understanding of our own experiences to our theorisation about others" (Hendricks & Lewis, 1994:73).

In this context the black/white divide becomes even more critical, as it forms part of the interpretation of a womyn's experience of "the personal as political". As noted by Hendricks & Lewis (1994:64, 66):

"...white power is actively reproduced in white interpreters' (often western-centric) knowledge about blacks; black inferiority is confirmed by our status as the objects of knowledge or as mere contributors to the white centre's canonical traditions. Black women have condemned the explicit and indirect ways in which they are marginalised and objectified by mainstream feminists."
I do not wish to be part of this process of marginalisation and objectification. Enough has already been said about analysis and interpretation from a "white" perspective, i.e. "white" wimmin speaking on behalf of other wimmin. I wanted to avoid the mistake of being a "white" feminist talking/writing about the issues of black wimmin. Although wimmin are brought together through their experiences of violence, there are also very real differences in the experience of rape between black and white wimmin. This is highlighted still further when writing about a concept as fundamental as "power".

"There is much evidence substantiating the reality that race and class identity creates differences in quality of life, social status and lifestyle that take precedence over the common experiences women share -- differences which are rarely transcended" (hooks, 1984:4).

In attempting to practice subjective feminist research, I can not ignore the fact that I am unable to fully relate to the world of black wimmin. This also holds true for the interpretation and analysis of research data. Furthermore, it should also be borne in mind that this is not a comparative study, but merely a means of illustrating one aspect of power relations, that of white wimmin and the power relations involved in rape.

"... white women who dominate feminist discourse today rarely question whether or not their perspective on women's reality is true to the lived experiences of women as a collective group. Nor are they aware of the extent to which their perspectives reflect race and class biases, although there has been a greater awareness of biases in recent years. White women who dominate feminist discourse, who for the most part make and articulate feminist theory, have little or no understanding of white supremacy as a racial politic, of the psychological impact of class, of their political status within a racist, sexist, capitalist state" (hooks, 1984:3).

I believe that I do not have the right to speak on behalf of anyone except that group of wimmin of which I am part. I cannot write in universal terms as if to include every womyn's experience of both power (the experience of rape) and patriarchy in a single analysis.

"Feminism reaches an impasse when researchers merely reaffirm their right to represent others; in South Africa, the trend has been to list credentials as evidence of their legitimacy as interpreters of marginal groups. This recasts the question of "who should write about whom", as "how we write about others". "How do we produce knowledge about ourselves and others and with what assumptions? What methods do we use to identify and describe different women's subjectivity and self-interest? What are the politics of the production of these knowledge?" (Hendricks & Lewis, 1994:73).

Consequently, some form of differentiation had to take place. "... black women should determine their own liberation" says Nkululeko (1987:104), and that I believe, should include talking and writing about their experiences of rape as interpreted by themselves.

My decision to use a mail questionnaire as a research method was largely dictated by the sensitive nature of the research, as well as the specific information that I required. By using "self-selected respondents" in combination with a questionnaire, I could guarantee the respondent's anonymity and confidentiality. Personal interviews were impractical as the respondents live throughout the country. The cost of travelling (or telephone interviews) proved prohibitive. Personal interviews would also have undermined the respondents' anonymity, and (as mentioned previously) could potentially influence the counselling process. Due to the traumatic nature of rape, an interview could easily have disrupted the lives of the respondents yet again by making them relive the experience(s) of rape. In addition, the danger existed that an interview could lead to further emotional trauma.

8) I used both close-ended questions where respondents chose between a number of options and open-ended questions where they could give their own account of an experience or perception.
for the respondent who has completed counselling. On the other hand, an interview could easily develop into a counselling situation. The information I required could be obtained effectively through the medium of a questionnaire. The questionnaire proved helpful in preventing respondents from deviating from the specific focus of my research, namely their experience and perceptions, rather than the details of the rapes. It is interesting to note that most respondents of their own initiative, provided varying amounts of personal information regarding the rape(s) that they experienced. This provided additional background information against which their questionnaires could be analyzed. A simple cost/benefit analysis of the respondents personal needs versus my research needs, pinpointed a questionnaire as being the best option.

In total I received an initial twenty-six letters from rape survivors, of which I could use twenty-four (one was without a return address, and one a general letter concerning battering and emotional abuse, but not rape). I thus sent out twenty-four questionnaires, twenty-two of which were returned. One could not be used as the respondent described her experience as "molestation" and not rape. Therefore, twenty-one usable questionnaires were received, a response rate of 87.5%.

The second part of the research consists of questionnaires mailed to the twenty-four full-time district surgeons under the jurisdiction of the Cape Provincial Administration: Hospital and Health Services. The geographical areas concerned are George (one respondent), Paarl (two respondents), Bellville (three respondents), Cape Town (five respondents) and Wynberg (thirteen respondents). In addition to the aforementioned reasons for using a questionnaire, I wanted both the district surgeons and the police persons to provide me with unofficial, personal responses. I was not interested in an official, politically correct, policy response. In the case of the police persons, the rank of the respondent could potentially have been a problem with regard to the inter-personal power relations between the
respondent (in all likelihood a male officer) and myself, a female. By using a questionnaire, I created a distance between myself and the respondents, to allow them to respond unofficially and, I hope, honestly. Because most of the police persons and district surgeons could have been men, they might possibly have felt inhibited in responding openly and honestly to a womyn interviewer, concerning their viewpoints on rape. Once again a questionnaire proved to be an effective way of circumventing these potential problems.

Of the twenty-four questionnaires sent out to the district surgeons, seventeen responded; a response rate of 70.8%.⁹

The third part of the research consists of questionnaires provided to police persons. Personal liaison with the South African Police (SAP) proved to be problematic, as the internal structure is complex and relatively inaccessible to outsiders. Consequently, I made use of a police liaison person (who is herself a social worker in the SAP) who was familiar with the internal structures of the SAP and who had direct access to the respondents. In an attempt to match the geographic distribution of the police with that of the district surgeons, the following areas were selected: George (three respondents), Bellville (five respondents), Cape Town (three respondents) Wynberg (seven respondents) and Oudshoorn (two respondents).

The responses from the SAP were, however, disappointing. On the advice of the liaison person, 50 questionnaires were distributed by her in the aforementioned areas. However, only 20 police persons returned the questionnaires - a response rate of only 40%. This is surprisingly low in the light of the current changes (concerning rape) taking place in the SAP, and the new emphasis being placed on police response to rape cases. (It is interesting to note that 95% of the respondents indicated that

⁹ Sending out reminders to the district surgeons about a month after they received the initial questionnaires, proved successful.
they were aware of these changes. More than half (60%) of the respondents indicated that they thought these changes are to the advantage of the rape survivor, and 80% indicated that the changed system is an improved one.)

In the following chapter I will summarise mainstream political science's conception of "power", as well as the exercise of "power" as seen through the lens of objective science. This summarised account is followed by a feminist critique of the mainstream approach.
CHAPTER 2

MAINSTREAM POLITICAL SCIENCE'S CONCEPTION OF "POWER"

"We may thus conclude that it is a general law that there should be naturally ruling elements and elements naturally ruled... the rule of the freeman over the slave is one kind of rule; that of the male over the female another... the slave is entirely without faculty of deliberation; the female indeed possesses it, but in a form which remains inconclusive..."

(Aristotle, "Politics")

In analysing the way mainstream political science uses "power" as a concept, as well as its definition of the exercise of "power", two aims will be accomplished. Firstly, as a summary of the way in which mainstream political scientists define the concept of 'power. In covering most of the mainstream literature on "power", a summarised but what is judged to be a fair account of how mainstream political scientists treat "power" as a concept will be presented. As the aim is to provide an overview of the concept, I have not engaged in detailed (and, for the most part, highly technical) arguments or discussion. It becomes clear that there is a complete exclusion of wimmin's experiences of social power. Thus this chapter provides both the predominant arguments within mainstream political science regarding "power", and clearly illustrates the shortcomings in terms of a feminist (or wimmin's) account of "power".

The second aim of the chapter is to provide an introduction to, and backdrop for, the critique that feminism levels at the mainstream approach. A feminist critique of mainstream political science's conception of "power" is given.

2.1. Conceptualising "power"

When examining the way in which mainstream political scientists try to conceptualise "power", it becomes clear that there is no single definition. Not only do definitions vary, but so do
distinctions between "power" and other related concepts e.g. "influence", "control", "authority", "coercion", "physical strength" and "force". Consequently, a great deal of time is spent on the examination/explanation of the distinction between "power" and these other concepts. As many of the definitions which follow are similar, it should be borne in mind that "power" is a broad and complex concept to begin with. The similarity of the definitions and their somewhat repetitive nature will underline the complexity of the concept, while simultaneously highlighting the main understanding of "power" in mainstream political science.

2.1.1. "Power" defined in terms of resources

A number of political scientists define "power" in terms of the resources available to particular actors. An actor (A) who has more access to certain valuable resources than another actor (B), will therefore potentially have more power. On a personal level, examples of resources are money, physical strength, economic position, social position etc. At the level of states and government institutions, examples are natural resources, economic or political power, majority support etc. In summary, resources can be seen as whatever instruments actor A can utilise to exercise power over actor B.

Dahl (1969:203) refers to resources as the base of an actor's power. Burt (1977:254) sees the CONTROL OF RESOURCES as the basis of power, which leads to the PROCESSES of converting this basis into the manifestations of power. The network of GENERAL INFLUENCE RELATIONS is thus the manifestation of power.

According to Riker (1969:215) "power" popularly refers, inter alia, to (a) resources such as money, physical strength etc. that can be used to dominate others, and (b) to the actual act of domination (of A over B).
Bierstedt (1974:237-239) identifies three sources of power:

1. **Numbers of people**, especially majorities. The power of a majority can be so great that in many social situations it is expressed as "authority". If majorities are in a position of oppression and exploitation, it is because they have either not been organised or they lack resources.

2. **Social organization** and

Lenski (1966) defines "power" in terms of resources as follows: both "authority" and "influence" are part of the category of "institutionalized power" which in turn rests on two foundations namely, the **power of position** and the **power of property**. "The power of position" is power related to the specific social roles or organizational positions of an actor, e.g. leadership positions or other positions of value to the community, while "the power of property" is power related to the private ownership of property.

Galbraith (1986:214-215) agrees with Bierstedt (1974) when he identifies three similar resources:

1. **Property or wealth**,
2. **Organization** and
3. **Personality or leadership** which provides access to one or more of the instruments of power.
2.1.2. "Power" defined in terms of value

Friedrich (1937:12) agrees with this perception when he argues that neither things nor ideas are power taken by themselves, although they can become instruments in the hands of one seeking power. To convert these things or ideas into power, actor A must use them in relation to that actor (B) who values the things or ideas sufficiently to obey A's orders in return for them. This is underlined when Bell (1975:82) states that "power" implies the existence of a valued object that can be manipulated, which is valued by the respondent (actor B), which is in relatively short supply (therefore it is valuable) and which is "divisible". Any object fulfilling these criteria can become the basis of a power relationship. Whoever controls valued objects has the potential to exercise power. This is also the viewpoint of Coleman (1977:184) who states that the value of an event is the interest that an actor has in it, weighted by the actor's power. The power of an actor is the control he has over events, weighted by the value of these events.

According to Simon (1969:70) definitions which equate influence or power with the values an individual possesses are unsuitable for political science. The difficulty is revealed when we try to state what we mean by "value". If we list specific values e.g. wealth, strength, persuasive capabilities etc., then the statement that "A possesses certain of these values" is not what we mean when we say "A has power". Such a definition also means that new values must be invented to account for persons whom we wish to regard as powerful, but whose values lie outside the usual list of values for example someone like Ghandi. An even more difficult situation arises when power is admitted into the list of social values that define power. Therefore Simon argues that power and influence must be defined in such a way as to distinguish them from value positions. With a distinction between "power" and "value" position, Simon proposes that value position be used as an index of power.
2.1.3. Power vs Influence

"Power" is sometimes defined as part of "influence" as a generic term, and at other times "power" is the generic term which is comprised of inter alia "influence", e.g.:

Banfield (1969:127-327):

```
INFLUENCE
   /\               /\               /\               /\
  AUTHORITY CONTROL POWER
```

Laswell & Kaplan (1950) and Dahl (1963):

```
INFLUENCE (general concept)
    \                       \                       \                       \          
     POWER (specific case)  POWER (specific case)  POWER (specific case)  POWER (specific case)
```

Cartwright (1969:125):

```
CAPABILITY OF INFLUENCE
    \                       \                       \                       \          
      POWER  POWER  POWER  POWER
```

Lenski (1986):

```
INSTITUTIONALIZED POWER
    /\               /\
   AUTHORITY  INFLUENCE
```
Bachrach & Baratz (1962:42):

It would seem that the distinction between "power" and "influence" is based on the way in which actor A gets actor B to do something. The presence of coercion or negative sanctions etc. defines "power", while their absence and the presence of persuasion defines "influence".

Parsons (1969:415), like Bierstedt (1974) and Bell (1975), defines "influence" as a means of persuasion. "Influence" is persuasion without the use of coercion or sanctions (negative or positive). If A can get B to do something (even against her/his will) without the use of coercion or sanctions, then he exercises "influence" not "power". Influence is thus positive while power is negative.

This is also the point of view of Mokken & Stokman (1976:37): the characteristic feature of power is the potential to restrict or expand freedom of action. This can be achieved by the application of force, coercion, or sanctions, but also positively through the allocation of necessary resources. On the other hand "influence" can be characterized as the potential to determine the outcomes of the behaviour of others, without the restriction or expansion of their freedom of action (similar to the conception of Bierstedt, 1974). The exercise of "influence" takes place mainly by means of persuasion, information and advice.
Bachrach & Baratz (1963:637) make a clear distinction between "influence" and "power". "Influence" is exercised without A resorting to either a tacit or an overt threat of severe deprivations (sanctions) to get B to change his course of action. The exercise of power depends upon potential sanctions, while the exercise of influence does not. There is also an important difference between "influence" and "manipulation" in that in the exercise of manipulation, A seeks to distinguish the nature and source of his demands on B and, if A is successful, B is totally unaware that something is being demanded of him.

There are similarities between the definitions of Bell (1975) and Bierstedt (1974:223-224), who also distinguishes between "influence" and "power". "Influence" is persuasive whereas "power" is coercive. Actor B will submit voluntarily to "influence" but "power" will require his coercive submission. "Power" and "influence" are two independent variables and are not necessarily related.

Bell (1975:17) sees "power", "influence" and "authority" as relational terms with which he implies a repetitive, institutional quality of interaction, not merely a single disconnected act. Bell (1975:26) makes a clear distinction between "power" and "influence". While "power" rests on the ability to manipulate positive or negative sanctions, which will enable the control of behaviour or action, "influence" has to do with the manipulation of perceptions. Banfield's (1969) analysis is turned around when Bell states that the successful use of power presupposes control over some resources, while "influence" rests on a variety of bases which permit actor A to change the perceptions of actor B. According to Bell (1975):

CONTROL ➔ POWER

MANIPULATION OF POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE SANCTIONS
The question arises whether a change of perceptions through influence does not also imply a change in behaviour/action. Bell's analysis rests on the distinctions between a change in perceptions through influence and a change in behaviour through power.

Bell (1975) further stresses the distinction between "power" and "influence" by defining the exercise of "power" as an actor who uses sanctions or threats to reach his goal, while an actor using "influence" will reach his goal without using sanctions or threats. His distinction rests on the instruments of persuasion available to an actor.

Against the background of the difficulty of distinguishing between "power" and "influence", Mokken & Stokman (1976:8) refer to two reasons why it is hard to distinguish "power" from "influence" in practical situations:

(1) power can be a source of influence and influence a source of power and
(2) processes occur whereby positions of influence are transformed into positions of power or vice versa.

Power can be a source of influence when actors, in their choice from the action alternatives open to them, use information by other actors who have a position of power with respect to them. Influence can also be a source of power when an actor has a particular influence relation to another who is in a position of power with respect to other actors. Influence can be transformed into power when the influence of an actor with respect to others develops into power, because his influence has expanded so that it also determines the set of alternatives open to the other
actors, and so a relation of power between actors can also develop into a relation of influence.

The problem of conceptualizing "power" and the distinction between "power" and "influence" is clearly illustrated by Dahl. Initially Dahl (1969:80) uses his familiar definition of "power": A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something he would not otherwise do. Harsanyi (1969:227) agrees with Dahl's definition, but adds two other important aspects namely: the cost of power and the strength of power. A's power over B should be defined not merely as an ability by A to get B to do X with a certain probability, but rather as an ability by A to achieve this at a certain total cost to himself; by convincing B that B would have to bear the total cost if he did not do X. The cost of A's power can be defined in terms of what it will take for A to get B to perform X, e.g. time, money, his own reputation, rewards given to B etc. At the same time there must be a measurement of the costs of B's compliance or non-compliance as well. Dahl (1963) later uses an almost identical definition for "influence". Here Dahl considers "influence" as the general concept and "power" as a special case. In yet another study (Dahl, 1961) the concepts of "power" and "influence" are used indiscriminately and more or less synonymously.

Laswell & Kaplan (1950:37) also use a general concept of "influence" which includes "power" as a special case distinguished by the involvement of severe sanctions. They (1950:71) describe "influence" as consisting of affecting the policies of those, other than the self. To have influence is to occupy a high position with respect to all values important in society, and it is exercised when its possession affects the interpersonal relations of those (other than A) active in the shaping and enjoyment of the values. According to them it is the threat of sanctions which differentiates "power" from "influence".
Laswell & Kaplan (1950:97-98) identify two ways in which influence can be exercised. The positive way is called "inducement" i.e. the exercise of influence by promise of indulgence, and the negative way is "constraint" i.e. the exercise of influence by threat of deprivation. They allow great variations in degree in the definitions of "constraint" and "inducement" - from the mildest deprivation to the most severe. Furthermore, the definitions are not limited to a particular value, e.g. wealth or physical well-being. There are two forms of constraint and/or inducement, namely coercion as a high degree and choice as a low degree. Coercion is involved in an influence situation if the alternative courses of action are associated with severe deprivations or indulgences, and choice if they are mild. Therefore, the exercise of power is simply the exercise of a high degree of coerciveness. When the values promised or threatened are sufficiently important to B, then B is coerced and, she/he is subjected to a power relationship.

2.1.4. "Power" defined as a means of obtaining something

Russell (1938:35) sees power as the production of intended effects, thus making it a property which can belong to a person or a group. These "intended effects" refer to the effects that A wants to achieve at the outset of his exercise of power. What about the effects that he does not intend, but still has on B? Are they part of his exercise of power, or are only the intended effects the result of his exercise of power? This correlates with the question of whether, if A produces no change in B's actual behaviour but only a change in his feelings, attitudes or beliefs, are we justified in imputing power to A? Wrong (1979:13-14) answers as follows: If A's intention is to affect or alter B's attitude rather than his behaviour and he succeeds, then he has power over B. If, however, his intention is to produce a specific act by B and he fails to do so with no change in B's behaviour, then he has not exercised power.
In much the same way Hobbes (1960), Goldman (1986) and Parsons (1969) conceptualise power as a means to get/obtain something. Hobbes (1960) refers to the power of a man as his present means to obtain some future apparent good. This conception of power necessarily implies conflict and therefore force, physical strength, coercion, the use of sanctions etc. "The future apparent good" that is the aim of the exercise of power according to Hobbes, will not be the same for all the actors involved in the exercise of power. The "apparent good" for actor A is not always the "apparent good" for actor B. "Apparent good" is a relative concept depending on the actor's position as actor A or B. Power is a means to an end, the vehicle by which A can better his own position to the detriment of B. Bachrach & Baratz (1963:632-633) criticise this conception of power as a possession which enables its owner to secure some future good. This includes criticism of Laswell & Kaplan's (1950:75) view that power is a simple property which can belong to a person or group. According to Bachrach & Baratz, this view (a) fails to distinguish clearly between power over people and power over matter. Power cannot be conceived as the ability to produce intended effects in general, (b) it is also impossible to measure a person's power by the total number of desires that he achieves, as one cannot have power in a vacuum, but only in relation to someone else, and (c) it is incorrect to view the possession of instruments of power as the same as the possession of power itself.

According to Parsons (1969:352) power is the general capacity of a social system to get things done in the interest of collective goals. It is the capacity of a social system to mobilize resources to attain collective goals.

For Goldman (1986:157) the central idea in power is connected with getting what one wants. It will become clear that it includes the satisfaction of A's needs despite resistance from B even if coercion, whether positive or negative, is necessary. The exercise of power in effect means that A will get what he wants at all costs.
2.1.5. "Power" defined in terms of domination

An important aspect of power is the satisfaction of A's needs, despite resistance by B. This is in fact part of the essence of the exercise of power: that A will be in a position to achieve what he wants to achieve despite B's resistance. A will have enough power to get B to act in accordance with his wishes. "Enough power" means that A will either have sufficient resources to use, or access to sufficient resources such as money (work), physical power, authority, institutions for example the state or the church etc. This will induce B to give in to A's wishes. This is exactly what the exercise of power is: the satisfaction of A's needs and wishes despite resistance. Power is the defeat of resistance. This implies that power will be exercised through coercion whether positive in terms of rewards, or negative in terms of negative sanctions or punishment. Actor B must be persuaded, deceived, bribed, or otherwise induced to accept control (power) or else he will not act according to A's wishes (Banfield, 1969:327).

The greater the power, the greater is the ability to restrict outcomes. In other words the greater the power of A, the greater is his ability to restrict outcomes that he does not want, or to restrict outcomes that B wants, to his own (A's) advantage. The ability to restrict outcomes is the essence of influence or power. It means that A's power is in terms of his ability to restrict B's choices and the outcome of his (B's) decisions (March, 1955).

Bachrach & Baratz (1962:42) develop a typology of power embracing "coercion", "influence", "authority", "force" and "manipulation". Coercion exists where A secures B's compliance by the threat of deprivation, where there is a conflict over values or courses of action between A and B. Influence exists where A, without a threat or use of deprivation, causes B to change his course of action. In the case of authority, B complies because he recognises that A's command is reasonable in terms of his own
values, or because it is perceived as legitimate and reasonable. With the exercise of force, A achieves his objectives in the face of B's noncompliance by stripping him of the choice between compliance and noncompliance. Manipulation is treated as an aspect of force where compliance is forthcoming in the absence of recognition on B's part of the source or, the exact nature of the demand upon him. Power itself is treated as the securing of compliance through the threat of sanctions.

Banfield (1969:326-327) differentiates between "authority" as the right to give or withhold action requisite to the adoption of a proposal; "control" as the ability to cause another to give or withhold action; "power" as the ability to establish control over another and; "influence" as a generic term which includes authority, control and power.

It would appear that the important issue is action and the ability of actor A to get B to give or withhold action, that is, to establish "control". In other words:

```
P  O  W  E  R  -->  C  O  N  T  R  O  L  -->  A  C  T  I  O  N
```

"Power" is seen as merely an ability while the emphasis is placed on "control". "Power" is the ability you must have to be able to control someone. Note that "power" and "control" are not used as synonyms and that "influence" is a general term including all three concepts.
Blau (1969:294) defines power as the ability of persons or groups to impose their will on others despite resistance, through deterrence either in the form of withholding regularly supplied rewards, or in the form of punishment.

To solve the problem of the relation between "power", "force" and "authority" Bierstedt (1974:229) proposes the following three definitions:

1. Power is latent force
2. Force is manifest power

Force ... means the reduction or limitation or closure or even total elimination of alternatives to the social action of one person or group, by another person or group (Bierstedt, 1950:733). Bachrach & Baratz (1963:636) reject this view. The essential difference between "power" and "force" is that in a power relationship one actor (A) obtains another's compliance (B), while in a situation involving force, A must achieve his objective, even in the face of noncompliance - hence the use of force. Force involves the actual application of the threatened sanctions that A uses in order to get B to comply. A second distinction is that once force is being exercised, B's scope of decision-making is radically limited. B is stripped of choice between compliance and noncompliance, but where power is exercised, the individual (B) retains this choice. In a power relation it is B who chooses what to do (even though his choice might be to his own disadvantage, it is still his choice), while in a force relationship the choices are up to A.

3. Authority is institutionalized power.

For Bierstedt (1974:230) "force" is the production of an effect, a change in action (behaviour) that overcomes resistance. A will be able to change B's behaviour despite resistance. The amount of force used will match B's resistance and, in the end will overcome it. Force is synonymous with coercion, which means that it brings about a change in the action of an individual or group of individuals against his/their will. It also infers the application of sanctions. All of this will be done by A to
enable him to overcome B's resistance and to get what he wants. According to Bierstedt (1974:231), this latter is a situation of manifest power. "Power" is the predisposition that makes the use of force possible:

\[
\text{POWER} \rightarrow \text{FORCE}
\]

2.1.6. Legitimized "power": Authority

Laswell & Kaplan (1950:133) treat "authority" as the expected and legitimate possession of power. To say that A has authority means not that he actually has power, but that power is assigned to him, and that those who adhere to the status quo (B) expect him to have power and regard his exercise of it as just and proper.

Bachrach & Baratz (1963:638) reject both Laswell & Kaplan's (1950:133) definition of authority as formal power, and Bierstedt's (1950:733) definition of authority as institutionalised power. According to them such definitions fail to show the bounds of authority and the circumscription of authority by the law, while constitutional legitimacy is also unacceptable, for it assumes without warrant its legitimacy. Bachrach & Baratz agree with the definition of Friedrich (1958:37) who conceptualizes authority as a quality of communication that possesses the potentiality of reasoned elaboration. Authority is treated as a relational concept: it is not A who possesses authority, but B who regards A's communication as authoritative. In the case of the exercise of authority, B complies because he recognises that the command is reasonable in terms of his own values, and therefore his decision is also rationalised.

According to Parsons (1969:370) "authority" is the right to use power, or negative sanctions. Authority is the institutional code within which the use of power is organised and legitimised. In other words, it is legitimised power. Actor A, who in this case
has the authority, is put in a position legitimately to make decisions that are binding, and actor B is bound by, and acts in accordance with, these decisions. Actor B will accept the authority of actor A, and not resist it, because authority is applied in such a way that actor B will be under the impression that actor A's decisions will correspond with actor B's personal choice. Also, that decisions taken by actor A are done with a special competence towards actor B. Authority always has the advantage of "being right", no matter how it constitutes itself (Dahl, 1970).

Bell's (1975) definition of "authority" is the same as that of Banfield (1969) namely the right to give orders, where the actor does not have to use sanctions, simply because of his position of unquestioned authority.

As is the case with Banfield (1969) and Bell (1975), Bierstedt's (1974) definition of "authority" rests also on the assumption of authority as a special part of power, namely legitimate power.

2.1.7. "Power" defined in terms of decision-making

An important conceptualisation is that in which power is treated as the influencing of behaviour or the influencing of choice (of behaviour), thereby implying a process of decision-making. The focus on observable behaviour, in identifying power, involves the study of decision-making (Polsby, 1963:121). (What Riker, 1969 refers to as ego-oriented power.) Thus for Dahl (1958:466), power can be analyzed only after careful examination of a series of concrete decisions. Polsby (1963:4) states that identifying who prevails in decision-making seems the best way to determine which individuals and groups have "more" power in social life. He also assumes that the decisions involve direct (i.e. actual and observable) conflict as phenomena of decision-making. This in fact constitutes Lukes (1974:15) so-called "one-dimensional view of power" which involves a focus on behaviour in the making of decisions on issues about which there is an observable
conflict of (subjective) interest, seen as express policy preferences, revealed by political participation.

This is synonymous with what Bachrach & Baratz (1970:7-8) name as their "first face of power", in which power is totally embodied and fully reflected in concrete decisions, or in activity which has direct bearing upon decisions being made. Their is, however, another aspect to this view of power. Power is also exercised when A devotes his energies to creating or reinforcing social and political values and institutional practices that limit the scope of the political process to public consideration of only those issues which are comparatively innocuous to A. To the extent that A succeeds in doing this, B is prevented from bringing to the fore any issue that might, in his resolution, be seriously detrimental to A's set of preferences. Thus, power is also the exercise of the prevention of the making of decisions or the exercise of choice. A's power also manifests itself to the extent that A, consciously or unconsciously, creates or reinforces barriers to the public airing of policy conflicts.

Schattschneider (1960:71) puts it as follows: all forms of political organization have a bias in favour of the exploitation of some kinds of conflict and the suppression of others, because organization is the mobilisation of bias. Some issues are organised into politics while others are organised out. This is what Lukes (1974:17-18) calls the "two-dimensional view of power" in which he includes Bachrach & Baratz's (1970:39,44) reference to decision-making and nondecision-making, where a decision is a choice among alternative modes of action and a nondecision a decision that results in the suppression or thwarting of a latent or manifest challenge to the values or interests of A (as the decision-maker). It is a means by which demands for change in the existing allocation of benefits and privileges can be suffocated before they are ever voiced, or kept covert, or killed before they gain access to the relevant decision-making arena or, lastly, maimed or destroyed in the decision-implementing stage.
of the policy process. The study of the exercise of power thus includes both the observation of decisions (choice), as well as nondecisions which prevent important issues from becoming subjected to choice. Another important aspect is that the exercise of power, in terms of decisions and nondecisions, must be made by the observation of overt or covert manifestations of conflict between A and B.

In much the same way Wagner (1969:10) refers to a theory of independent decisions in conflict situations which are necessary for a conceptualisation of power. For Laswell & Kaplan (1950:75) power is the participation in the making of decisions. The more power an actor has, the more control he will have in terms of decision-making. More power implies a greater ability to control his decisions, especially decisions affecting others, while less power will mean that an actor (A) is unable to prevent B from making her/his own decisions. This will allow other actors to make decisions for B, to their own advantage and to her/his disadvantage.

Bachrach & Baratz (1963:632) criticise those who see the measurement of the exercise of power only in terms of decision-making situations. They overlook the important area of what Bachrach & Baratz call "nondecision-making", i.e. the practice of limiting the scope of actual decision-making to "safe" issues by manipulating the dominant community values, myths, political institutions and procedures. Power is also exercised when A devotes his energy to creating or reinforcing social and political values and institutional practices that limit the scope of the political process to public consideration of only those issues which are important to A, and not only in terms of decision-making (1962:948). To the extent that A succeeds, B is prevented from bringing to the surface any issues that might be detrimental to A.10

10) See also Banfield's (1969:329) distinction between different types of power in terms of negotiations on decisionmaking.
2.1.8. "Power" defined in terms of choice of behaviour

According to van Doorn (1962/63) power is the possibility, on the part of a person or group, to restrict other persons or groups in the choice of their behaviour. Friedrich (1963) agrees with van Doorn (1962/63) when he conceptualises power as the relationship between men that manifests itself in the behaviour of those who follow or obey. While Hoogerwerf (1972) defines power as the possibility to influence the behaviour of others in accordance with actor A's own purposes. The change in behaviour will always be the cause of A's exercise of power and will be to B's disadvantage. B will not change his behaviour to his own disadvantage out of free choice, he will be forced to do so by A's exercise of power.

This is also the view of Dahl (1986:40): power is, at the most general level, the subsets of relations among social units such that the behaviour of one or more units (B) depend in some circumstances on the behaviour of other units (A). This means that the dependence of actor B as a unit is the result of actor A's exercise of power. A's behaviour (what he wants to do/get/or what he wants/needs) will be transformed through his exercise of power so as to affect, and in fact determine, B's behaviour. When A exercise power it will necessarily determine B's behaviour.

Mokken & Stokman's (1976:36) conception of power as the capacity to determine action alternatives (implying "choice") can be treated as part of power as behaviour. Power is, accordingly, dynamic as well as static. The dynamic aspect lies in the possibility of change i.e. the restriction or expansion of action alternatives. The static aspect lies in the possibility of fixing or conserving the existing sets of alternatives.
2.2. Defining the "exercise of power"

What follows is one account of the way in which mainstream political science defines the exercise of power. As I will illustrate in the feminist critique against mainstream political science, the problem, is not the mainstream scientists' analyses of the exercise of power as such, but rather the fact that wimmin are excluded from these analyses. The social power relations in which wimmin are involved do not receive the attention they deserve.

I will focus mainly on the preconditions for the exercise of power, as proposed by Bachrach & Baratz (1962), with further reference to Wagner (1969) and Harsanyi (1969).

Bachrach & Baratz (1962:19-21) identify four conditions that must be present before it can be called an "exercise of power":

(1) there must be a conflict of values between A and B. This includes both the overt signs of conflict as well as the psychological aspects. A power struggle exists either when both actors are aware of it or when only the less powerful actor is aware of it (Bachrach & Baratz, 1962:50).

(2) A must threaten B with severe sanctions in the event of B's noncompliance.

(3) A's demands, and the severity of the sanctions, must be rationally perceived by B. B's rationality lies in the fact that he chooses compliance instead of defiance because it seems the lessor of two evils (Bachrach & Baratz, 1962:22,34). Debnam (1975:897) criticizes Bachrach & Baratz's view of rationality as follows: how rational can B be when dominated by fear? Debnam questions the way "rationality" is used to describe B's actions.
(4) A must get his way with B's compliance. Debnam (1975:898) also criticises this by arguing that it puts a limitation on the definition of power. It would mean that if B did not comply, the whole exercise cannot be labelled a power exercise. According to Debnam this will result in power being a continuum with conflict and compliance as the two boundaries, separated by the threat of severe sanction and a rational perception of these.

Wagner (1969:6) describes two ways in which A's intervention (his exercise of power over B) alters B's decision to act in a certain way:
(1) either A merely informs B that the consequences of acting differently from A's suggestion would be contrary to B's own desires, or
(2) he alters the expected consequences of B's intended action, so that B now prefers something else.

In much the same way as Bachrach & Baratz (1962) and Wagner (1969), Harsanyi (1969:229) underlines this when he identifies four main ways by which actor A can get actor B to act according to his wishes.
(1) A may provide certain new advantages or disadvantages subject to no conditions,
(2) A may set up rewards or punishments subject to certain conditions as to B's future behaviour,
(3) A may supply information (or misinformation) on already existing advantages and/or disadvantages and
(4) A may rely on his legitimate authority over B, or on B's personal affection for A.

2.3. Feminist critique of the (male) mainstream conception of "power"

There are a number of problems, from a feminist perspective, with the way in which (male) mainstream political science analysis "power" and thereby excludes wimmin.
The (male) mainstream conception of power is always defined in generally negative terms, for example March (1955): "The greater the power of A, the greater is his ability to restrict outcomes ... The ability to restrict outcomes is the essence of influence or power." Goldman (1986:157) and Hobbes (1960) define power in terms of "getting what one wants despite resistance". In other words, patriarchal power is simply power over someone or something. It is always defined in terms of A having power over B. It is neither shared nor equal. Men's patriarchal power is domination in the words of Blau (1969:294): "... to impose their will. " According to Banfield (1969:327)

"... (B) must be persuaded, deceived, bribed or otherwise induced to accept control (power). " This must happen despite resistance, indicating that it will probably happen against B's wishes. "Power" is the ability to establish control over another, the ability to restrict outcomes that A does not want (March, 1955). "Power" also infers either the threat, or the use of sanctions to get B to act according to the wishes of A. It is the potential to restrict B in her/his choice of behaviour (van Doorn, 1962/'63). Similarly, Hoogerwerf's (1972) definition of "power" is the possibility to influence the behaviour of B in accordance with A's purposes.

"Power" in (male) mainstream political science terms is negative because it is defined as power outside the individual who is exercising it, or power over someone or something. It means that power is used by someone not to the benefit of all, but to the detriment of some. Power is used "to the outside" when the person who has power tries to improve her/his position by exercising power over someone else, i.e. control, domination, physical power, negative influence etc. This is not the exercise of power to benefit the self or others, but the exercise of power at the expense of someone. This use of the concept makes "power" a self-centred, exclusive, individual exercise with negative consequences.
In view of the above, a consequence of men's power is that it is negative. That is: it benefits only the person(s) who has the ability to exercise power, and not the person(s) over whom it is exercised. It is unable to be shared, to be used by all involved or to benefit all (Gearhart, 1982:199). Power in its male form boils down to either having power, or not. It is exclusive, not shared. It allows only a situation of dominance/submission i.e. all power or no power. It is the nature of men's power that leads to the extreme of men's violence against wimmin, as in the case of rape. Wimmin's insistence on power-sharing is met head-on by the inability of men to share power. Men cannot share power. It can only be exercised in terms of one party (wimmin) submitting to the power of the other (men). It cannot be equal and just. It is ultimately power exercised at the cost of wimmin.

Furthermore, (male) mainstream political science conceptualizes "power" in terms of resources. Most of the examples of such resources exclude wimmin from having power. For example, money (the economy), wealth (Riker, 1969; Galbraith, 1986); physical strength, the actual act of domination, personality or leadership (Riker, 1969; Galbraith, 1986); social organization (Bierstedt, 1974; Galbraith, 1986; Lenski, 1986) and property (Lenski, 1986; Galbraith, 1986). Men are defined in terms of these resources, not wimmin. Wimmin are largely excluded due to their position of powerlessness and the dualistic dichotomy of society. Wimmin are not defined in terms of these resources, but rather in terms of our lack thereof. (Male) mainstream political science defines "power" in terms of resources that exclude wimmin from the outset.

In terms of these examples of resources, less wimmin are able to qualify as having power, on average. Most wimmin are, to a large extent, still financially dependent on men (their husbands, boyfriends or other male family members). This is one of the reasons why wimmin are reluctant to leave violent relationships - they simply cannot support themselves and, very often their children, financially. On average, wimmin do not have the same
physical strength as men. Defining "power" in terms of physical qualities will disqualify most women in relation to men. Life-long socialization and negative stereotyping prevent most women from developing their leadership abilities, being assertive, in control or dominant, while this is often the norm for men.

Thus, in terms of the above-mentioned examples of resources, most women will not be able to claim to have "power", i.e. women are effectively excluded from the power arena.

Access to resources provides the actor with potential power, but in order to gain access to resources, the actor must have power. Therefore, powerlessness means that you do not have access to resources, while at the same time the lack of access to resources reinforces powerlessness. Thus, women are powerless due to their lack of access to resources that can empower them.

"Power" defined in these mainstream terms, excludes the majority of women from the definition of potentially powerful beings. Conversely, by accepting this analysis of power in terms of resources, women are excluded from being defined as powerful.

Therefore, either women must gain access to these resources as identified by mainstream political scientists (which is problematic in feminist terms), or the idea of power defined in terms of access to these specific resources must be re-analyzed from a women's/feminist perspective.

Furthermore, the mainstream conception of "power" tends to lapse into technical arguments on the nature of "power". In trying to conceptualise "power", it moves in the direction of natural science-like definitions by using formulas and explanations that are far removed from "power" as a social phenomenon. Political scientists try to distinguish between "power" and similar concepts, but do not arrive at any uniform distinctions. The definitions overlap and sometimes contradict one another. In general, the conceptions of "power" tend to be too specific in
the quest for a narrow, rigid definition and often lapse into
less important technicalities. The concept of "power" is often
defined in terms of another concept, just as "fuzzy" and
difficult to conceptualise as "power" itself. Different, often
contradictory, definitions are used to define the same concept,
while different concepts are regularly used as synonyms. There
is very little consistency in the different concepts that are
used to define "power".

For example, Banfield (1969:326-327) conceptualizes the exercise
of power in terms of power defined through control while Bell
(1975) conceptualizes it as control defined through power and
Bierstedt (1974:231) as power defined through force. Lenski
(1986) refers to "institutionalised power" resting on the
foundation of "power of position" and "power of property", while
Debnam (1975:906) sees "authority" and "coercion" as the
foundation of power.

Even more problematic is the extremely diverse way in which
"power" is conceptualised: the ability to establish control over
another (Banfield, 1969:326-327); the ability to manipulate
positive or negative sanctions which will enable the control of
behaviour or action through the use of sanctions or threats
thereof (Bell, 1975:17,26); something which is coercive and
sociological, but also physical strength or latent force
(Bierstedt, 1974:223-224); the securing of compliance through
threat of sanctions (Bachrach & Baratz, 1962:42; 1963:637); the
capacity of influencing B (Cartwright, 1969:125); the ability to
convert resources into influences (Burt, 1977:255); the
possibility to restrict or expand freedom of action (Mokken &
Stokman, 1976:37); if A can get B to do something that he would
not otherwise do (Dahl, 1969:80); a man's (sic) present means to
obtain some future apparent good (Hobbes, 1960); getting what one
wants (Goldman, 1986:157); the general capacity of a social
system to get things done in the interest of collective goals
(Parsons, 1969:352); the production of intended effects (Russell,
1938:35) and the ability to impose your will despite resistance
Yet another source of confusion is that "power" is used interchangeably with other concepts such as control, influence, dominance, force and coercion. In a bid to lend credibility to various definitions, mainstream political science makes use of science-like formulas in conceptualising "power", e.g. Coleman (1977:184), Goldman (1986) and Harsanyi (1969). This is also the case in terms of the possible measurement of "power" e.g. Bell (1975), March (1966), Riker (1969) and Dahl (1969). Some mainstream political scientists digress into technical arguments on the nature of "power". Aspects such as potential power vs actual power, or having power vs exercising power (Barry, 1976:91; Bell, 1975:17; Dahl, 1986:52-53 & 1969 and Lukes, 1974:12), the conscious or unconscious exercise of "power" (Russell, 1938; van Doorn, 1962/'63; Bell, 1969:18 and Bachrach & Baratz, 1975:903-904) and the different types of power are contested. This is one of the consequences of the efforts of mainstream political science to be "scientific" and objective. Conceptualisations are not based on people's subjective experiences, for example that of wimmin. Rather, it is based on the analysis of mainstream political actions only e.g. relations between states, government institutions, economic and political transactions etc.

The most important point of critique is that (male) mainstream political science does not provide, in any way, for an analysis of wimmin's experiences and perceptions of power, which is fundamentally different from men's experience and conception of power. This is reinforced by the fact that mainstream political science does not study power from the perspective of the powerless. The most powerless of all conditions is to have no words to explain the feelings and predicaments one is experiencing, while the belief systems of the dominant culture and intellectual life deny their reality (Hanmer, 1990:443). The (male) mainstream conception of "power", without exception, does not provide for wimmin's experience and conception of power.
The critique is that, although it is possible to include wimmin in the mainstream analysis of power (as will be illustrated in the discussion of Bachrach & Baratz's (1962) and Wagner's (1969) conditions for the exercise of power), it is not done. The problem is not that it is theoretically impossible to do so, the problem is that, although the theory can be applied and broadened, wimmin are completely omitted from the mainstream analysis of power. Mainstream political science is concerned with power in terms of negotiations (Harsanyi, 1969; Banfield, 1969), in formal organizations (Banfield, 1969; Bierstedt, 1974; Cartwright, 1969; Galbraith, 1986), in economic terms (Barry, 1976; Coleman, 1977; Mokken & Stokman, 1976), in state-like affairs (Bell, 1975; Dahl, 1986; Laswell & Kaplan, 1950; Lenski, 1986; Russell, 1938; Simon, 1969; Wrong, 1979), and in terms of group or class relations (Poulantzas, 1986). The only exceptions to this are a few general references to individual power (Goldman, 1986; Lukes, 1974; Wagner, 1969 and Parsons, 1969, as sociologist), but no specific reference to either wimmin's perceptions or experiences of power. If wimmin were meant to be included in the references to individual power, this would still be unacceptable as wimmin and men have neither the same conception nor the same experience of power. Furthermore, in these references to individual power, wimmin are, yet again, incorporated by the universally used example of men, as representative of wimmin.

With regard to "power" defined in terms of value: in some ways, wimmin are treated and perceived as these "valued objects" which can be manipulated and used by men. Wimmin are "valued" by men in so far as they fulfil certain criteria (submissive, passive, natural, feminine, possible mothers etc.) stipulated by men for "valued wimmin". These same criteria disqualify other wimmin (either by their own choice/preference or against their will) e.g. female bosses, lesbians, wimmin of colour, feminists etc. Control over wimmin is thus important, as more control over "valued objects" also means more power.
Mainstream political science's analysis of power in terms of decision-making also excludes wimmin. Because of wimmin's lack of power and authority, we also lack the ability to make decisions, for to be able to make independent decisions, one must have the power to do so. Wimmin are, in terms of decision-making, limited to inferior and relatively unimportant decisions such as those concerning the home and the children, while "big" issues are left to men. This is one way of measuring wimmin/men's power: who gets to make which decisions? But the power to make decisions is also the power to prevent decision-making, for example by limiting issues for discussion that will be to the disadvantage of those who have power, namely men. Wimmin (B) are thus prevented from bringing to public debate any issues that are sanctioned by men, for example the issue of rape. If men can limit the capacity of wimmin to make decisions regarding rape (for example whether or not a womyn can resist rape), then they are free to make decisions in this regard, such as to continue claiming wimmin's bodies for themselves. As long as men alone have the power of decision-making, they will be able to control the public debate on rape, maintain the silence surrounding rape and its status as a domestic issue outside the public political arena. This is what non-decision making means to wimmin in reality.

Much the same critique can be levelled at the way in which mainstream political science analyses what it views to be the exercise of power. The critique is not so much aimed at the conditions proposed by Bachrach & Baratz (1962) but, rather against the fact that no analysis of wimmin's experience is made. It is, however, possible to analyze wimmin's experience of rape for example according to Bachrach & Baratz's (1962) conditions:

Let us take the hypothetical example of an unknown man breaking into a womyn's apartment and forcing her to have sex with him, thus raping her.
It is fair to say that:

1) there is a conflict of values between A (the man) and B (the womyn). By "conflict of values" is meant that which A and B want to gain from the situation respectively. A, as the man, will probably want to have a good time, to have sex and then to leave without further ado. B, as the womyn, will resist him and definitely not have sex with him, out of her own free choice. She also does not want to be forced to have sex (by A using a weapon or any other means) or to be injured (either as a result of the sex act, or by A committing other acts of violence against her). A, on the other hand, will most likely use a certain amount of force to get what he wants. It is clear that there is most certainly a strong conflict of values. On another level it is possible to see "values" in terms of womyn's values vs men's values, or even rapist values vs victim values. Men's/rapist values are manifested as his aggression, domination and by being in control, whereas the womyn/victim values are manifested as her submission, passivity, being controlled and forced.

2) Severe sanctions and the threat thereof, are definitely involved. The worst scenario for the womyn will be death. A's ability to threaten her with death is a very real possibility. Sanctions can also include being hurt, or A's threatening to return. If A has some kind of weapon that he is willing to use, then that is a sanction he is willing to impose should B not comply.

3) The third condition, namely that B must rationally perceive the situation, is questionable from a feminist point of view. I agree with the critique of Debnam (1975:897) and also wonder how rational one can be in the face of possible rape. I think B's rational choice possibilities are to a large extent limited by the fact that A will decide what will happen regardless, and B can either comply or will be forced into sex with A through violence.
The last condition, namely that A must get his way with B's compliance, may hold true for rape, but in a somewhat different form. B's compliance will more often than not be forced compliance and not voluntarily compliance. There will be compliance in so far as A can force B to comply. B does not really have a choice of whether to comply or not, and together with the threat of severe sanctions, is forced into submission.

Despite the problems with rationally perceiving the situation and the question of compliance, it is nonetheless possible to label rape as "an exercise of power" according to the four conditions outlined by Bachrach & Baratz (1962:19-21).

It is also possible to apply Wagner (1969) to the example of rape. A will be able to inform B that acting differently would be to her disadvantage by the mere possibility and availability of negative sanctions. This includes a variety of actions open to A i.e. to use any form of further violence against B, to kill B, to rob her, to injure/kill her children etc. In the case of marital rape negative sanctions could include an economic threat i.e. the womyn could be financially dependent on her husband, or the use of threats aimed at her children. In the case of "date rape" a negative sanction is imposed by the mere fact that the person is someone you know and trusted enough to go out with. Someone you will quite possibly have to face again, someone who has influence in your social circle. A will almost always be in a position to use some kind of negative sanction to convince B to give in.

In the second case, A can change B's preferences so that they are the same as those of A. This is done long before any rape occurs and is maintained to the advantage of any would-be rapist. For example, the myth that wimmin want to be raped. By changing B's perception of the expected consequences of the action (e.g. that it might be against her wishes) A can get B to prefer something that is to her disadvantage, but is put forward by A as something she wants. If A can get B to believe this (e.g. in
the case of marital rape especially, or "date rape") then it will be impossible for B to say at a later stage that she was coerced. A will thus be in a position to alter B's decision to act in a certain way (e.g. to resist A) to his own advantage.

It is the complete exclusion of women, from any application of the mainstream analysis of the exercise of power, which forms the basis of a feminist alternative analysis of power. It is an alternative based on women's experience of power.

We can conclude that, in so far as mainstream political science is part and parcel of men's, objective science, it is broadly characterised as follows:

(1) Women are to a large degree ignored, yet conclusions and theories are phrased in such a way that it represents all of humanity. "Mankind" becomes "humankind", representing both men and women. Accordingly, what is true of men, must be true of and applicable to women. What is not important in terms of men's research and science, can therefore also not be very important to women (Eichler, 1980:118-119).

This is exactly the point of view of (male) mainstream political scientists in terms of their analysis of "power" as a political concept. "power" is defined in such a way that it excludes women's perceptions and experiences thereof.

(2) If women are considered at all, it is in so far as we are important for and in relation to men, and not by our own importance as human subjects with interests (Eichler, 1980:118-119).

11) This is what Eichler (1988:5) calls "gynopia" or female invisibility, which is arguably the case in mainstream political science's conception (or rather the lack thereof) of women in relation to "power".
Wimmin's importance in (male) mainstream political science's view of "power" is only in terms of wimmin as the acted-upon, the subordinates over whom power is exercised. Therefore, what is important to (male) mainstream political science is not wimmin's subjective perspectives or experiences of "power", but rather the analysis of power from an exclusively male orientation.

(3) Where both sexes are considered, men are generally the norm and wimmin the deviation from it (Eichler, 1980:118-119).

Thus it follows that the (male) mainstream political science conception and analysis is the norm, the standard according to which we see the world, and a feminist revision is seen as a deviation from it. This is in line with the idea of mainstream science as an objective science.

(4) Logically, the sexist content of male, scientific research is steeped in sexist language, as illustrated by the use of the generic terms "he" and "man".

(5) Sexist science is characterised by stereotypical notions of the masculine and feminine nature, and this consequently influences the description and analysis of human behaviour and situations. This is maintained by the continued existence of the male/female dichotomy (as under discussion in chapter 5) that is present in our society, and according to which men have power and are defined in terms of domination, and wimmin are powerless and are defined in terms of subordination.

(6) The result is that sexist science becomes a contributing factor in the maintenance of the sex/gender structure from which it developed in the first place (Eichler, 1980:118-119).
Oakley (1974) presents three explanations for this state of affairs:

(1) It can be traced back to the sexist "founding fathers" of social research, which is illustrated by the fact that

(2) it is, to a large extent, still a male profession with its attendant reflection of predominantly male interests and realities.

(3) The third reason concerns the "ideology of gender" which underlines social research and which stresses the construction of the world in sexually stereotypical ways. It focuses attention on only some areas of social reality (those concerning men), and takes attention away from others (those concerning wimmin). This is also clearly reflected in (male) mainstream political science.

In the following chapter a short account of Foucault's conception of social power is given. Foucault cannot be treated as a mainstream political scientist, although he is not considered to be a feminist either. His views do, however, provide an interesting bridge between mainstream political science's analysis of power, and a more feminist analysis of social power.
CHAPTER 3

FOUCAULT ON "POWER"

For the sake of a comprehensive analysis of "power", Michel Foucault's analyses of power will be discussed briefly. His analysis is an important stepping stone between mainstream political science and the feminist alternative. Foucault's work is considered by many (e.g. Fraser, 1989:28-32; Phelan, 1990:421; Braidotti, 1991:86) as controversial, provocative and problematic, especially when read against a feminist background. Many feminists are negative towards his viewpoints concerning rape, in particular (Braidotti, 1991:93-94; Barrett, 1991:151-152). Foucault's views on sexuality and power, and their implications for feminism are nonetheless an important contribution (Phelan, 1990).

Foucault's viewpoints on the nature and development of modern power as "genealogy", which describe culture as practices which are instituted historically and are therefore contingent. Foucault warns that genealogy should not be confused with hermeneutics. Genealogy is not interested in the contents of science, systems of knowledge or belief, but concerns itself with the processes, procedures and apparatuses whereby truth, knowledge and belief are produced. Foucault believed in a plurality of discursive regimes that succeed one another historically, and that each of these regimes is supported by its own practices, objects of inquiry, criteria and procedures for generating, storing and arranging data. It is the combination of the above that Foucault referred to as the "power/knowledge regime". The function of these discursive regimes are forms of social constraint, or power, which circulates in and through the production of discourses in society. In studying the genealogy of power/knowledge regimes, Foucault therefore studied the formation and functioning of networks of social practice involving constraint and discourse (Fraser, 1989:19-20). Foucault does not suggest that knowledge is a tool of power, but warns against the idea that power and knowledge are mutually
exclusive (as in the tradition of economics and philosophy), that power is bad and knowledge or truth is good. Foucault, in fact, insisted on the positive nature of the interdependence of the two concepts (Phelan, 1990:437 & Braidotti, 1991:79). With his discourse-analysis, Foucault aims to produce strategies of resistance. His idea is that of a diagram or map of power, in order to define and understand it. In this sense it is a prototype of political activity in which the decoding of power formations results in a descriptive analysis of the process of power and knowledge in the present (Braidotti, 1991:80).

To a certain extent, Foucault's concept of power was developed as a critique of the Marxist theory of power, based on the view of power as an instrument of class domination originating in economic interests. Accordingly, Foucault viewed power as something that is exercised, not possessed nor belonging to someone, but present in various practices. Foucault focused on the functioning of power: it is necessary to understand how power operates in specific methods and strategies, how major power shifts takes place and how one can analyze the political and economic dimensions of power changes. Thus, we can only study who exercises power in conjunctions with answering the how of power. Foucault changed the object of analysis from power as an object in itself, to power in terms of power relations (Barrett, 1991:136).

Foucault focused on the question of the nature and emergence of modern forms of power, according to which modernity consists in the development and operation of a radically new regime of power/knowledge. He viewed modern power as local, continuous, productive and complete. He argues that it does not develop from one central source, but circulates throughout the entire social body, down to even the smallest and most trivial circumstances. According to Foucault the modern power/knowledge regime was not imposed in a top-down manner, but developed gradually in what he calls "disciplinary institutions", beginning in the late eighteenth century. A variety of "micro-techniques" (the social
practices that constitute everyday life in modern societies) were
developed by doctors, wardens and schoolmasters and it was only
later that these techniques and practices were taken up and
integrated in so-called "global or macro-strategies of
domination". It is the tactics and strategies of the
disciplinary institutions that are definitive of modern power
(Fraser, 1989:22-24).

Foucault viewed power as being diffused throughout the social
body, and saw it as an "omnipresence of power" in the following
way:

"... it is produced from one moment to the next, at
every point, or rather in every relation from one
point to another. Power is everywhere, not because
it embraces everything, but because it comes from
everywhere."

(Foucault, 1978:93)

Foucault's belief in modern power that functions at the capillary
level, through everyday practices, has two important political
implications:

(1) This means that modern power touches people through the
various forms of constraint, constitutive of their social
practices, and not through the distortion of their beliefs.
Accordingly, practices are more fundamental than belief
systems in terms of the understanding of the hold of power
on society. The analysis and critique of these practices
are therefore more important than the analysis and critique
of ideology.

(2) State-centred and economical-political orientation
assume that power is centred in one or both of these
central points in society. This is in contrast to
Foucault's belief that power is everywhere and in everyone,

12) Domination according to Foucault is "the situation in
which those who are subject to the constraints of a system are
unable to change that system" (Phelan, 1990:437).
and it rules out the view that the transformation of state and/or economic power would be enough to also transform the modern power regime.

Therefore, Foucault had very strong positive viewpoints on what can be called the "politics of everyday life", which means that efforts to transform the regime must address these practices and relations. Foucault was successful in treating such phenomena as sexuality, the family, schools, psychiatry, medicine etc. as political phenomena, and thereby sanctioned the treatment of these problems as political problems (Fraser, 1989:25-26).

The domination in society operates through language to structure our institutions and relations. Power functions through knowledge, truth and discourses that define and legitimate its operation. Power according to Foucault, is neither force nor violence, but

"what defines a relationship of power is that it is a mode of action which does not act directly and immediately on others. Instead it acts upon their actions" (Phelan, 1990:424-425).

Power relations require that

"the other (the one over whom power is exercised) be thoroughly recognized and maintained to the very end as a person who acts" (Phelan, 1990:424-425).

The exercise of power consists, not in terms of control, but

"in guiding the possibility of conduct and putting in order the possible outcome" (Phelan1990:424-425)

The most important aspect of Foucault's work for feminism is in the area of sexuality. His starting point is the rejection of what he calls "the repressive hypothesis", the belief that the relation between society and sexuality is first and foremost a repressive one of censorship, and that power functions essentially negatively (Phelan, 1990:422).

Sexuality has become a vehicle for modern power in that it is in discourses about sex that we are controlled and society is
Sex has come to define us, it has become our truth as we are encouraged to get to the root of our sex.\textsuperscript{13} According to Foucault, sex is a production of the apparatus of sexuality, of what he calls "bio-power"\textsuperscript{14} as "the administration of bodies and the calculated management of life" (Phelan, 1990:425-426). Foucault sees, in the discourse on sexuality, one of the most powerful means to control and discipline people.

Foucault's viewpoints on sexuality help us to see that the obsession with sex in modern Western societies forms part of the operations of power through which we are intimately controlled (Phelan, 1990:427). Braidotti (1991:88) refers to three main points of similarity between Foucault and feminism:

1. The emphasis on the body as a site of power,
2. The emphasis on the specific mode of operation of power, with regard to his viewpoint on the "microphysics" of power, and
3. The important role of discourse in producing knowledge and power. According to Braidotti (1991:89) Foucault's work rests on two main pillars which can also be of importance to feminism:
   1. The quest for resistance to totalizing discourses, and
   2. the need to redefine materialism so as to include the bodily materiality of the subject.

Feminist critique against Foucault is that his suspicion of thought based on unambiguous power relations, eliminated appeals based on justice or truth, and thereby took away wimmin's basis for claims against a sexist society (Phelan, 1990:430). In some ways, the critique against Foucault is similar to that levelled against mainstream political scientists. For example, Braidotti

\textsuperscript{13} According to Foucault, sex is a fictitious object that was invented in the late eighteenth century and now functions as an instrument of domination. It did not come into existence until the modern power/knowledge regime (Fraser, 1989:59).

\textsuperscript{14} Also referred to as "bio-politics", that is, power over life and over all living matter (Braidotti, 1991:78).
(1991:86-87) refers to the fact that Foucault's references to wimmin are matter of factly in terms of references to the role of feminism as a more global movement, despite the fact that all his work focuses on the analysis of power, the body and sexuality. Also, he does not address the issues most closely linked to female sexuality such as pregnancy, birth control or feminist critique against the nuclear family. Despite the focus of his work, he never locates the female body as a site of exclusion in our society, and it seems as if sexual difference does not play a role in his analysis. The critique against Foucault's viewpoints becomes clear with reference to rape. According to Braidotti (1991:93-94) and Barrett (1991:151), Foucault's reasoning comes down to the fact that sexuality has been used as a means of punishment in Western society, according to his views on bio-power as power over the body. (Although he gives very little attention to the fact that this is specifically repressive for wimmin.) To say that sexuality is a mechanism of subjection means, according to Foucault, that only with the desexualization of conflict will resistance and transformation be possible. Therefore, sexuality must no longer be the object of norms or punishment, and it should be rid of all penalties. Thus, rape should be penalized, but as a crime of "humanity", that is a power-crime, and not a sexual crime. According to Foucault, rape must be punished not because it is a sex-specific crime, an offence that one sex exercises over the other, but simply because it is a social offence.

This is in stark contrast to the way in which radical feminists such as Andrea Dworkin or Catherine MacKinnon see rape i.e. as paradigmatic of male sexuality, and are therefore in favour of its penalization as a sexual crime. It seems as if Foucault disregards the differences between men and wimmin, and therefore the opposing interests of rape survivors and rapists, and according to Braidotti (1991:94) by doing so Foucault aligns himself with the social system which oppresses wimmin.
In the next chapter I will examine the important relationship between patriarchy as manifested in society's dichotomies, and in gendered sexuality. This relationship sheds light on the way in which mainstream political science and Foucault albeit in another way, exclude wimmin from their analyses of "power". It also determines wimmin's experiences and perceptions of social power (chapter 5 & 6).
CHAPTER 4  GENDERED SEXUALITY

"The question is not a trivial one, since the answer given it determines our vision of the future, and our evaluation of whether it is realistic to hope for a sexually egalitarian society" (Fubin, 1975:157).

In the section that follows, I will discuss the link between patriarchy, as manifested in society's dichotomies - for example, the male/female dichotomy, the nature/culture dichotomy and the public/private dichotomy - and one of its results, namely that which Catherine MacKinnon refers to as "gendered sexuality". This relation not only explains the absence of wimmin from the mainstream political science analysis of "power", it is also a determining factor for the way in which wimmin experience and perceive social power.

4.1. Patriarchy

From a feminist perspective, it can be argued that patriarchy forms the foundation for the subordinate position of wimmin in our society. Patriarchy both determines wimmin's position in society, and consequently also explains wimmin's experience of social power in, for example, our experience of rape. In order to analyze and understand wimmin's experiences and perceptions of rape, as an exercise of social power, it is necessary to analyze patriarchy itself.

"Patriarchy is the power of the fathers: a familial-social, ideological, political system in which men - by force, direct pressure, or through ritual, tradition, law, and language, customs, etiquette, education, and the division of labour, determine what part women shall or shall not play, and in which the female is everywhere subsumed under the male... Under patriarchy, I may live in 'purdah' or drive a truck; ... I may serve my husband his early-morning coffee within the clay walls of a Berber village or march in an academic procession; whatever my status or situation, my derived economic class, or my sexual preference. I live under the power of the fathers, and I have access only to so much of privilege or influence as the patriarchy is willing to accede to me, and only for so long as I will pay the price for male approval" (Rich, 1976:40)
Some feminist writers e.g. Marxist feminists, use the term "capitalist patriarchy" as they see a link between capitalism and patriarchy and therefore production. This is an attempt to transform Marxist theory so that it can account for the subordination of women as well as for the various forms of class exploitation (Beechey, 1979:66). I will, however, use the term "patriarchy", and assume that the link with capitalism will be recognised, without giving further attention to it.

The word "patriarchy" is derived from the Greek "patriarches" meaning "head of the tribe". The original patriarchs were the tribal heads referred to in the Old Testament. Later the term described certain of the most eminent bishops within the Christian church, including the Pope. The meaning began to expand in the seventeenth century with Robert Filmer, an English conservative political theorist, used the term to mean the system of rule in which the king's supreme authority was mirrored and reinforced by the father's authority within his household. Radical feminists in the late 1960s made it central to their analyses and thus greatly expanded its meaning. It has come to mean, broadly, "rule by men", although the precise definitions vary with differing theoretical approaches. One of the earliest users was Kate Millett who wrote that the principles of patriarchy appear to be twofold: male shall dominate female, and elder male shall dominate younger (Millett, 1972:25). Firestone (1970) implies that it is a system of social organisation in which men's control of women is based on their power over wives and children within the family. Bleier (1984:162) defines patriarchy as the historic system of men's domination, a system committed to the maintenance and reinforcement of men's hegemony in all aspects of life - personal and private privilege and power, as well as public privilege and power. Its institutions direct and protect the distribution of power and privilege to those who are male, according to social and economic class and roles.

According to Millett (1972:24, 38):

"groups who rule by birthright are fast disappearing, yet there remains one ancient and universal scheme for the domination of one group by another - the scheme that prevails in the area of sex." Our society, like all other civilizations, is a patriarchy in which the rule of women by men is "more rigorous than class stratification, more uniform, certainly more enduring".
Patriarchy recognizes the potential power of wimmin and the actual power of men. Its purpose is to destroy a womyn's consciousness about her potential power in order to protect the appropriation of her sexuality, her reproductive capacities, and her labour by individual men and society as a whole. Patriarchy expresses the struggle to control wimmin's options in order to ensure that their primary role remains that of child bearer and rearer. Derived from this is the more subtle forms of patriarchal organization: the sexual division of labour in the labour force, the division between private and public life and the distinction between political and family life (Eisenstein, 1981:14-16).

The right of men to control the female body is therefore a cornerstone of patriarchy. Violence and the threat of violence against wimmin represent the need of patriarchy to deny that a womyn's body is her own property and that no one should have access to it without her consent. Violence and its corollary, fear, serve to terrify females and to maintain the patriarchal definition of womyn's place. Fear of violence from men is subtle and pervasive. At a subliminal level, fear is experienced as unease, a concern to behave properly, worry that one may be laughed at or ridiculed. Fear can be activated by knowledge of actual violence to oneself, to known or unknown others, or by deviating from accepted social behaviour or even contemplating doing so. We should think in terms of a continuum of violence with the threat of force on the one end and death at the other (Hanmer, 1978:219).

The link between violence and power, and its connection to wimmin's position within patriarchy, is analyzed by Hanmer & Saunders (1984:65-66) as follows:

FEAR OF ABUSE OR ATTACK INCREASES BELIEF IN SAFETY AT HOME

RESTRICTIONS ON WHEN AND HOW WE GO OUT

WIMMIN WILL NOT RETURN TO POLICE; NOTHING CHANGES

GREATER DEPENDENCY ON INDIVIDUAL MALE "PROTECTION"

POLICE RESPONSE NOT POSITIVE TOWARDS WIMMIN

DEPENDENCY MAKES IT EASIER FOR INDIVIDUAL MEN TO VIOLATE WIMMIN WITHOUT FEAR OF REPERCUSSION
(1) Fear of violence in public places is fed by the media, by rumour and by our own or other people’s experiences. Women are expected to be more careful in their public behaviour, and when violence is committed against us, we are held at least partly responsible. Women’s fear of public violence is socially sanctioned and increases the belief that the home is a safe place.

(2) Fear of violence in public places leads to a restriction on the freedom of movement in public places for women.

(3) This results in greater dependency on the protection of men, both inside and outside the home.

(4) This creates a climate in which it is easier for individual men to use violence against "their women", as public response is limited. (This is an argument also made by Gates, 1978:11). The responses of medical and police services reinforce the expectation (and experiences) that no one can or will help. The problem of men’s violence is turned back upon the womyn.

(5) If women reach out to the criminal justice system or the police, not much happens. It neither reduce the womyn’s problem, nor her fear of further violence.

(6) The situation does not change, and we are in fact on our way back to where it all started.

This is what Sheffield (1984:3) refers to as "sexual terrorism". In this sense, it is possible to view the system of patriarchy and the exercise of men’s dominance as sexual terrorism, as "terrorism aims to frighten, and by frightening, to dominate and control". Sheffield treats patriarchy as an ideology - an integrated set of beliefs about the world that explains the way things are and provides a vision of how it ought to be. Patriarchy is an ideology that asserts the superiority of males and the inferiority of females. It also provides the rationale for sexual terrorism. The root of patriarchy is the masculine/arrior ideal. Masculinity means aggression, control, emotional reserve, rationality, sexual potency etc. Just as political terrorism relies on propaganda, so does sexual terrorism (Sheffield, 1984:5). Propaganda, by definition, is biased or even false information, its purpose
to present one point of view on a subject and to discredit opposing points of view. The propaganda of sexual terrorism is found in all expressions of the popular culture: films, television, music, literature, advertising, pornography and every other form of maintaining the dominant/submission, male/female dichotomy. Sexual terrorism consists of indiscriminate teness, unpredictability, arbitrariness, ruthless destructiveness and amorality. Every female is a potential target of violence - at any age, any time, any place. Voluntary compliance means that the institutionalization of a system of terror, requires the development of mechanisms other than sustained violence to achieve its goals. This is done so that patriarchy can dominate and violate wimmin in a "civilised manner". Open violence may attract critique from society, but voluntary compliance to patriarchy can prevent any sharp criticism. If a system is not openly violent, or can avoid being so as far as possible, then nothing can be said against it. Strategies for ensuring a significant degree of voluntary compliance must be developed. Sexual terrorism is therefore maintained by the system of sex-role socialization that instructs men to be terrorists in the name of masculinity, and wimmin to be victims in the name of femininity (Sheffield, 1984:6).

Today's male dominance goes beyond the "rule of the father", it includes the rule of husbands/lovers, of male bosses, of ruling men in most societal institutions, in politics and economics, in short - "the men's league", or "men's house". The new feminist movement uses the term as a struggle concept by which the totality of oppressive and exploitative relations which affect wimmin can be expressed. The term also denotes the historical and societal dimensions of wimmin's exploitation and oppression, and is thus less open to biological interpretations as a concept such as "male dominance" can be (Mies, 1986:37).

The crux of patriarchy, as a belief in men's superiority and wimmin's inferiority, is legitimized by four sources:

(1) A biological justification in that it emphasizes the greater physical strength of the male animal,

(2) legitimacy based on cultural and anthropological grounds: primitive societies, in the process of evolving toward civilization, moved from
matriarchy toward patriarchy, and anthropological evidence shows the universality of the patriarchal family.

(3) Western as well as non-Western religious authority is used as proof of the rightness of the inevitability of men's rule and

(4) changes in the mode of production and distribution, particularly the shift from communal to private property (Iglitzer, 1978:8-9).

Komter (1991:57) uses Gramsci's (1971) conception of ideological hegemony as a way of looking at patriarchy from a feminist perspective. Ideological hegemony is the result of a slow process by which consensus is developed between dominant and subordinate groups. It is expressed in the approval by subordinate groups of the dominant values, symbols, beliefs and opinions (Gramsci, 1971). According to this conceptualization it would be possible to conceive of patriarchy as a form of ideological hegemony. The form of consensus developed between the dominant (male) and subordinate (female) group is indeed a recognition of men's power and wimmin's powerlessness. The "approval" by the subordinate group (wimmin) of the dominant values, beliefs and opinions of patriarchy is more a matter of "accept or die" rather than (conscious) approval of men's power. Wimmin's powerlessness forces them to maintain the status quo of the ideological hegemony of patriarchy, which is the dominant/subordinate dichotomy.

Patriarchy manifests itself in various ways in society, some of which are readily visible, others are more subtle. The dichotomous manner in which our society is structured is one important manifestation, and it serves to enforce wimmin's position of subordination.

4.2. Dichotomies

I will discuss three main dichotomies (dualities) through which patriarchy manifests itself in our day-to-day world:

4.2.1. the male/female dichotomy
4.2.2. the nature/culture dichotomy and
4.2.3. the public/private dichotomy
4.2.1. The male/female dichotomy

Starrett (1982:186) refers to this as "the Vampire", or "the death pattern" which uses power within the binary structures - this dualism is also known as the adversary system. The adversary system pits one side against another, with an expected win\lose conclusion. This evolves into the world of the male/female dichotomy in which wimmin are always the other, compared to what the (male) standard is, always the opposite, that is, the negative opposite. It is a dichotomy in which wimmin are always defined in terms of the male. Grosz (1990:60) refers to it as "phallocentrism". Whenever the two sexes are represented by a singular - or human (i.e. masculine) - model. When the feminine is defined in relation to the masculine, never autonomously or in its own terms, it is represented either as the opposite, or as complementary to or the same as masculinity. Mies (1986:210) refers to it as "colonizing divisions", in which the totality is not only divided up in this manner, but the relationship established between the two sides is a dynamic, hierarchical and an exploitative one. One side progresses at the expense of the other. In the words of Simone de Beauvoir:

"Thus humanity is male and man defines woman not in herself but as relative to him; she is not regarded as an autonomous being... She is defined and differentiated with reference to man and not he with reference to her; she is the incidental, the inessential as opposed to the essential. He is the Subject, he is the Absolute - she is the Other" (de Beauvoir, 1953:18-19).

Van Zyl (1987) refers to these dualisms as a form of dehumanisation. On the one hand, violent culture creates a climate of violence. On the other hand, a climate of violence creates a culture of violence, which becomes normalised and through which control is established. The normalization of a culture of violence leads to people accepting as "normal", inter alia violence committed against wimmin.

Thus develops the male/female dichotomy in which we live day after day. A dichotomy that strengthens the belief in men's superiority and wimmin's subordination. A dichotomy which states that:

men are strong : wimmin are weak
men are intelligent : wimmin can't think for themselves
men are the leaders : wimmin follow
men produce : wimmin reproduce
men act; wimmin react
mind; body
culture; nature (I will return to this question)
public; private etc.
Thus: good/male; bad/female

The male/female dichotomy also takes the following form, which comes to the fore in our sex/gender distinction.

Female ------------------ BIOLOGICAL SEX ------- Male

Womyn ------------------ GENDER IDENTITY------ Man

Feminine ---------------- GENDER ROLE --------- Masculine
(Behaviour)

Homosexual man -------------- SEXUAL ORIENTATION Homosexual womyn &
Heterosexual womyn & Heterosexual man

(Birke, 1986:72)

The male/female dichotomy is an important source of energy for male patriarchy and consequently men’s power. As long as the binary, adversary system, in which men is depicted as right and good, to which we should all strive, and wimmin as wrong and bad, that which we must try to change in favour of men’s standard – can be maintained, it will be used as energy to feed men’s power. It is this dichotomy that infiltrates our daily thoughts and actions, we begin to believe it, and cease to challenge it. As long as it remains unchallenged, feminist power will not be possible. It exists because it is maintained and kept alive by us not challenging it, not questioning its

11) This alteration of the sequence shows the working of dichotomies relating to the unquestioned stereotypes about gay people. Birke (1986:72) argues that the question about how people become gay is based on various assumptions about gender and its biological origin. Being gay is explained by the accepted biological (female/male) dichotomy. According to this unquestioned view, gays have an abnormality of gender, which is the result of an assumed abnormality of biological sex.
validity. It needs to be broken down and replaced. Not by another dichotomy of male/female difference, but by a redefinition of socialized gender that does not put us in opposition to each other, but which will place us in relations of equality as varied individuals.

4.2.2. The nature/culture dichotomy

Ortner, 1974 explains the universal devaluation of wimmin in terms of our being identified with something that every culture devalues, something that every culture defines as being of a lower order of existence than itself. There is only one thing that would fit that description, and that is "nature" in the most generalised sense. Every culture, or "culture" as such, is engaged in the process of generating and sustaining systems of meaningful forms by means of which humanity transcends the given of natural existence, bends them to its purpose, controls them in its interest. Culture can broadly be equated with the notion of human consciousness, or with the products of human consciousness, by which humanity attempts to assert control over nature. The distinctiveness of culture rests precisely on the fact that it can, under most circumstances, transcend natural conditions and turn them to its own purpose. Thus culture asserts itself as distinct from, and superior to, nature and this distinctiveness and superiority rests precisely on the ability to transform - to "socialize" and "culturize" - nature. Wimmin are always identified with nature (by the mere fact of our biological functions e.g. menstruation, conception, lactation, childbirth etc.) as opposed to men who are identified with culture. Since it is always culture's project to subsume and transcend nature, if wimmin were considered part of nature, then culture would find it "natural" to subordinate wimmin (Ortner, 1974:72-73).

Ortner (1974:73-74) further argues that the point of departure of this argument is wimmin's body and the natural procreative functions specific to wimmin alone, identified at three levels:

(1) A womyn's body and its functions involved, most of the time, with "species life",
(2) a womyn's body and its functions place her in social roles, also of a lower level than that performed by men and
(3) this in turn give wimmin a different psychic structure also seen as being
closer to nature.

In addition to Ortner, Birke (1986:13) identifies three explanations for wimmin's identification with "nature" and the meaning thereof:

(1) Assertions of the naturalness of gender differences are usually intended to mean that the trait is biologically determined, preordained by nature. For example: The idea that wimmin "naturally" want to be mothers is part of the wider notion that there resides in every womyn an inherent maternal instinct: wimmin naturally want to be mothers because it is in their biological nature to do so.

(2) The word "natural" also represents closeness to "nature" which has connotations of being less refined, less changed, more wholesome. This implies that whatever is closer to nature is more likely to be influenced by it and is, therefore, less subject to cultural modification.

(3) "Natural" also implies statistical normality, which means that something that is most commonly done is more natural. For example, if someone says that they think it is natural for people to get married, then what they mean is that this is in fact what most people do. The statistical meaning of "natural" is often confounded with a normative meaning: the statement may mean in part that it is what most people do, but it also means that the speaker believes that this is what people should do.

4.2.3. The public/private dichotomy

According to Arendt (1958:48,7,25) the distinction between necessity (female) and freedom (male) is central to the public/private dichotomy. The public sphere is constituted by equals, and its purpose is to foster individuality and excellence, with its content consisting of only two kinds of activity: action and speech. These are the activities of men, or rather, the activities socially ascribed to men. The activities are also out of reach for wimmin who are concerned with the activities of necessity - those activities hidden from public view. It has always been the bodily aspects of human existence that have needed to be wrapped in privacy. Thus, the labourers who with their bodies minister to the (bodily) needs of life, and the wimmin who with their
bodies guarantee the physical survival of the species are hidden. Both groups are hidden because their lives were laborious, and therefore concerned with necessity and the body. Thus the very activities performed in the private realm differ from those performed in public.

The public domain may be characterised as that in which institutionalized rules and practices prevail, including political, legal, economic, cultural and social institutions such as legislative bodies, firms, schools and hospitals. It also includes the range of actions and practices covered by the law (Gould, 1983:7). The public domain constitutes everything that wimmin are excluded from, that wimmin are not suppose to be part of. In summary, the public domain is best described as action, while wimmin embody all that is passive, not involved, not active.

The private domain consists of individual actions and interpersonal relations, where these actions or relations are not institutionally prescribed or defined, but are in principle matters of the individual's own free choice (Gould, 1983:7). The very place (home, body), relations (sexual), activities (intercourse and reproduction) and feelings (intimacy and selfhood) that feminism find central to wimmin's subjection, form the core of the privacy doctrine (MacKinnon, 1983:657). The private domain is everything the public domain is not. It is concerned with the home, with the individual. The private domain is the domain of women, it is concerned with the home, the children and the domestic concerns of the husband. It is unimportant, as there are no risks involved, it has no intrinsic important meaning and does not affect the public realm. Therefore, the private domain is not valued very highly, it only exists as a support for the private (men's) world.

McWilliams (1974:160) identifies two conditions that are necessary for private issues to become public/political issues:

(1) When reality becomes discordant with social myths, e.g. the fact that thousands of wimmin were/are unhappy in the roles of wife, mother and home-maker which were supposed to provide feminine fulfilment, and

(2) when there is the opportunity to compare notes on personal unhappiness, e.g. as with the development of feminist consciousness. As we will see later.
the transfer of wimmin's issues from the private domain to the public/political domain is very important for wimmin's empowerment and a change in womyn/man power relations.

These dichotomies, as everyday manifestations of patriarchy, determine wimmin's place in society as subordinate and lead inevitably to gendered sexuality.

4.3. Gendered sexuality

Catherine MacKinnon's theory of power and subsequent explanation of wimmin's subordination can be summarised as follows: sexuality is gendered as gender is sexualized. Men and wimmin are created through the erotization of dominance and submission. The man/womyn difference and the dominance/submission dynamics define each other, with sexual objectification as the central process within this dynamic (MacKinnon, 1983:635).

MacKinnon's (1982:516) argument about wimmin’s lack of power is based on the assumption of sexuality as the basis of difference between male and female. To be deprived of one's sexuality, defines wimmin's conception of lack of power per se.

Patriarchy as ideological hegemony defines sexuality: accordingly male sexuality implies domination and female sexuality, submission. This basic distinction between male and female is at the root of the male/female dichotomy. It is underlined by male/female biological differences. The biological differences between male and female are taken as a basis on which all other differences can be built. Although the biological differences cannot be ignored, they are not enough to base a dominant/submissive dichotomy on. Development and technology has made the biological distinction irrelevant. We no longer live in a society where physical (biological) strength is of any value, but the sexual difference which developed out of the biological, is still maintained. Consequently, male biology implies physical strength and power, domination and action. It provides the male with access to the outside world (the public sphere). Female biology, on the other hand implies lack of physical strength or power or its development. submission to the stronger power of men, passivity, confinement to the safe surroundings of the home, and
therefore her function as mother in the private world.

Because of this distinction a sexual distinction between males and females was developed and is still maintained. Male sexuality is defined in terms of domination and power. To be a man is to dominate, to overpower, to be in charge. Female sexuality is defined as the opposite of male sexuality: to be overpowered, to be taken charge of. Female sexuality is what men make of it; it is men’s perception and definition. Sexuality per se (male and female) is male. Wimmin’s sexuality is devised so as to maintain men’s domination, while simultaneously assuring wimmin’s co-operation and submission.

This sexual difference is the essence of the male/female dichotomy. Patriarchy as an ideological hegemony is so strongly developed that wimmin’s powerlessness is both internalized and externally imposed (MacKinnon, 1982:520). The perception from men’s standpoint enforces wimmin’s definition, encircles her body, circumlocates her speech and describes her life. Men’s perspective is systematic and hegemonic (MacKinnon, 1983:636). It is internalized in wimmin’s male-defined sexuality, which becomes the norm and which is taken as the truth, the standard. Wimmin’s perception of their own sexuality, if unquestioned, is in accordance with men’s viewpoint and wimmin live it out daily as their own definition. Therefore the dominant/submissive dichotomy is unchallenged and the status quo is maintained in favour of men’s needs and wishes. It is also externally imposed through acceptable, unchallenged "mechanisms" of patriarchal power such as heterosexual marriage (relationships), the family norm of man, womyn and child, the institution of motherhood (Rich, 1976), restrictions on wimmin in terms of work etc.

Taken together, is (this) the production of a feminist political theory centring upon sexuality (MacKinnon, 1982:529). Sexuality is a form of power embodied in socially constructed gender. If this is true, (then) sexuality is the linchpin of gender inequality (MacKinnon, 1982:539) and subsequently men’s power and wimmin’s powerlessness.

The problem with men’s determination of sexuality becomes real in wimmin’s experience of men’s dominance and our own submission. It obliterates the distinction between abuses of wimmin and the social definition of what a womyn is (MacKinnon, 1982:532). This is the consequence of the fact that wimmin’s
social definition (as defined by men, not themselves) fully provides for womin in the position of the abused. The consequence of the dominance/submission dichotomy is men's exercise of power and abuse of womin's subordinate, powerless position. Abuse is part of the "normal" frame of reference for the social (men's) definition of womin. What a womyn is, is subordinate, an object of abuse. Therefore, the question becomes: how can the abuse of womin be wrong if their social definition allows abuse as part of a conceptualization of womin? If a womyn is, per definition, a subordinate object, how can abuse be wrong? You can't abuse an object. Wommin are, according to men's definition, powerless. Only by a feminist re-definition in terms of womin's own conception of themselves, will it be possible to change this situation of powerlessness.

Gendered sexuality must be seen against the background of womin's politics, in what came to be known as "the personal is political". The realization by feminists of womin's position within gendered sexuality led to the development of a movement away from the patriarchal way in which female sexuality was viewed. Consequently, what developed became known as sexual politics or body politics, in order to make womin aware of our subordinate position within gendered sexuality.

Men's power extends beneath the representation of reality to its construction: it makes womin (as it were) and so verifies (makes it true) who womin "are" in its own view, simultaneously confirming its way of being and its vision of truth (MacKinnon, 1982:539). For feminism, asking whether socially, there is a female sexuality, is the same as asking whether womin exist. The feminist conception of the personal as political is an attempt to answer this question. What it means is that womin's distinct ve experiences as womin occur within that sphere that has been socially lived as the personal, that is private, emotional, interiorized, particular, individual, intimate - so that what it is to know the politics of womin's situation is to know womin's personal lives (MacKinnon, 1982:534-535). This is what Mies (1986:24) refers to as the development (during the seventies) of "body politics". It is the development and raising of issues, which are in some way connected to the female body. The private sphere of womin was, for the first time, opened up as an arena for womin's struggles. By speaking openly about their most intimate relations with men, their sexuality, their experiences of menstruation, pregnancy, child
care, their relationship to their bodies, the lack of knowledge about their bodies, their problems with contraception etc., wimmin began to socialize and thus politicize their most intimate, individualised and atomized experiences.

The slogan "the personal as political" led to wimmin changing their self perception as "non-political" beings. They began to act as political subjects around issues that were important to them. A new concept of "politics" emerged which radically criticised the concept of politics in parliamentary democracy. "Politics" is no longer identified solely with going to the polls, electing one's candidate and hoping that he will change things in the name of the electorate. Feminists have tried to move away from a concept of "politics by delegation" to a concept of "politics in the first person" (Mies, 1986:28). We are interweaving biography and herstory because we discovered that what we thought were private problems, were in fact public issues (politics). Thus our personal experiences are not just anecdotes... Our personal experience are data (Bart, 1971:84).

Direct experience is a necessary precondition for knowledge. What counts as knowledge must be grounded in experience. Wimmin's experience systematically differs from men's experience upon which knowledge claims have been based. Thus, knowledge and theory are incorrect and/or biased to the extent that they exclude wimmin's experience (Harding & Hintikka, 1983:X).

Harding (1983:311-312) refers to the above argument as part of the sex/gender system of men's dominance, made possible by men's control of wimmin's productive and reproductive labour. "Reproduction" broadly includes sexuality, family life, as well as birthing which biologically reproduces the species. Harding tries to place the totality of wimmin's subordination under the heading of the sex/gender system which she considers as an organic social variable, like racism and classism, not merely an effect of something else. Like racism and sexism the sex/gender system limits and creates opportunities

16) Oakley (1972:16) makes the following distinction between biological sex and gender. "Sex" refers to the biological difference between male and female: the visible difference in genitalia and the related difference in procreative function. "Gender", however, is a matter of culture: it refers to the social stratification into "masculine" and "feminine". You are born with a specific "sex" but you are socialised into a specific "gender" group - "masculine" or "feminine". See also Gailey (1987:33-34) for a similar argument.
within which the social practices of our daily lives occur, the characteristics of social institutions and all our patterns of thought. Every aspect of the system of men’s dominance can be collectively put under the heading of the sex/gender system.

As I will show in the next chapter (an analysis of the research data), wimmin’s experiences of social power, through rape, can be more clearly understood in the light of the link between patriarchy as manifested in dichotomies and the resultant gendered sexuality.
CHAPTER 5
WIMMIN'S CONCEPTIONS AND EXPERIENCES OF "POWER" RELATIONS

"I have never been free of the fear of rape. From a very early age I, like most women, have thought of rape as part of my natural environment - something to be feared and prayed against like fire or lightning. I never asked why men raped; I simply thought it one of the many mysteries of human nature" (Susan Griffin, 1971)

In the light of mainstream political scientists' lack of concern with an analysis of wimmin's experience and perceptions of power, what follows is one account of wimmin's personal experiences and perceptions about rape as an example of social power. It is an integrated analysis consisting of:
- a background summary of the feminist theory of rape,
- the research data,
- an analysis of the rape survivor respondents' perceptions and experiences,
- an analysis of rape myths present in our society and
- final conclusions about wimmin's experiences and perceptions of social power through rape.

5.1. The feminist theory of rape

According to Smith & Bennett (1985) the feminist theory of rape has become the dominant social science explanation for rape. Feminist theory considers rape to be the result of social traditions in which males have dominated nearly all important political and economic activities, and through which the dominant/submissive, man/womyn positions are enforced and maintained. Consequently wimmin are, to a large extent, excluded from political decision-making processes, including those matters concerning rape. Wimmin are considered unequal participants in interpersonal relations and have come to be viewed by men as property over which they have power and control. Thus rape is viewed as a direct function of the degree to which wimmin are politically and economically powerless, relative to men.
Feminist theory regards rape as men's response to the social inequality between men and wimmin and, its effect on male/female sexual interaction. The perpetuation of social inequality is made possible by making the prospect of rape so intimidating, that it restricts the life-styles of most wimmin. The ever-present fear of rape causes wimmin to restrict themselves to relatively "safe" activities. The feminist explanation holds that rape is the result of men's behaviour towards wimmin which expresses itself in a possessive, dominating and demeaning manner.

Sexual gratification is not considered a prime motive, but rather rape is seen as the use of sexuality by men, to establish and maintain dominance and control over wimmin. Some feminists see rape as a "pseudosexual act" motivated by a desire for power and a hatred of wimmin, rather than by any sexual passion. Through aggressive sexual attacks, men try to establish, or confirm, a tradition of supremacy over wimmin (Ellis, 1989:10-11). This view of wimmin as objects of possession by men is well illustrated by inter alia Brownmiller's (1975) analysis of the use of rape by some men as an act of aggression against other men. According to this argument wimmin, as possessions of men, can be used by some men under certain circumstances to get to other men. Examples include the rape of wimmin during war, in inter-ethnic conflict (i.e. the rape of wimmin in Bosnia), in class conflict, gang warfare etc. By raping the wimmin of "the other men" the aggressors claim their dominance and power, illustrate the powerlessness of "the other men" to stop them and simultaneously erode the power of "the other men".

Ellis (1989) identifies five basic hypotheses derived from the feminist theory of rape:

(1) If all status disparities between men and wimmin were eliminated, so too would rape be eliminated, although initial reductions in sexual inequality might cause increases in rape due to men's frustrations with changing circumstances.
(2) The underlying motivation for rape is that of domination rather than sexuality. Rape is a form of aggression used to ensure that wimmin are sufficiently frightened and intimidated so that men are able to maintain socio-economic and political supremacy.

(3) Both pornography and prostitution tend to depict wimmin as being property over which men have control and domination, and therefore perpetuate men's attitudes toward wimmin, that are conducive to rape.

(4) A number of studies (in the USA) have found that people's attitudes have become increasingly egalitarian in recent years in terms of appropriate sex roles and that, all things being equal, these trends should indicate a decrease in rape.

(5) Attitudinal factors are important in causing rape.

In the light of the above feminist theory on rape, one hypothesis is that rape keeps wimmin in a subordinate and powerless position relative to men. Men have the dominant position in society, and therefore most of the social power. However, empirical evidence is needed to test this hypothesis and this will be attempted, using the research data. Thus, what follows is a feminist analysis of wimmin's experiences and perceptions of rape, as one form of the exercise of social power.

5.2. The research data

Due to the small scale of the study and the limited number of respondents (21 rape survivors, 24 district surgeons and 20 police persons) meaningful detailed statistical analyses of the data were not possible. Cross-tabulations of data was meaningless and I, therefore, used only frequencies.

I think it is important to note that the aim of the data was not to obtain impressive statistics, but rather to be used as
additional information that can, together with the personal viewpoints of the respondents, support or challenge the theoretical basis of the thesis.

We must take note of and ponder on the statement of Klein (1983:93) that:

"... the artificial control of variables; the use of so-called dependent and independent variables reflects our need to categorize rather than to try to convey a holistic picture of the problem researched."

This means that if the research results are not "satisfactory", we (as feminist researchers) may perpetuate the androcentric norms of (male) mainstream research, and that this may in fact not reflect wimmin's realities and will therefore not produce appropriate strategies for social change. It will only remain research "on" wimmin.

The data consists of the following:

1) Biographical data of all three groups of respondents
2) The police persons' and district surgeons' work experience
3) The rape survivors' experience of the rape(s)
4) The rape survivors' perceptions and experience of power relations:
   4.1) Before being raped
   4.2) During the attack
   4.3) After being raped

The aim of the data is:

1) To provide an account of a specific group of wimmin's experience and perceptions of rape.
2) To give an account of the perceptions and experience of a sample of district surgeons and police persons who work directly with rape survivors.
3) To illustrate, by using the data, how our patriarchal society uses wimmin's experience of rape to support wimmin's
subordinate position:

4) To support the theoretical part of the study as a practical illustration of wimmin's subordinate and powerless position due to their experience of rape. This may support the hypothesis that rape consequently leads to greater powerlessness for wimmin.

I will start with a summarised profile of the respondents, followed by detailed accounts of the data of each group of respondents.

**Summarised profile of the respondents**

The rape survivor respondents were all white wimmin (as discussed in chapter 1). The race of the rape survivors was pre-determined and controlled, but the race of the district surgeons and police persons was uncontrolled. This was because I felt that most rape survivors have no choice with regard to the race of either the district surgeons or police person who attend to them. The race of the police persons and district surgeons might also have influenced the way in which they view the rape of a white womyn. The composition of the group of permanent district surgeons also determined that I used them all, irrespective of race. Differentiation according to race would only have further limited the group of respondents. It may have been possible to select the race of the police persons, but the police liaison person who assisted me envisaged resistance from the police respondents.

The rape survivor respondents were mostly Afrikaans-speaking and married, and on average between 18 - 40 years of age. It is interesting that the ages of the respondents reflect a wide range of wimmin. They are not only young, attractive, seductive wimmin (as is argued in many rape myths), but include older wimmin who's age refutes these myths.

The majority of the rape survivors belong to the Dutch Reformed Church. Most of them have matric plus additional training, and
earn between R 0 - R 2000 per month as most are housewives, clerks or students. It is important to view the relatively low incomes of the wimmin in relation to their occupations, as it immediately places them in a financially dependent position in relation to their husbands (most are married). This question was not included for the police persons or the district surgeons due to the fact that the education/training of the district surgeons is obvious, and the rank of the police persons was used as an indication of their training.

Most of the rape survivors were raped once, (on a week day) by one person (a white rapist), between the ages of 21 - 30 years on average. The fact that most of the rapists were white can be explained in the light of the high number of acquaintance rapes. Most of the wimmin (85.7%) were familiar with their rapist(s). It is interesting to note that the majority of wimmin were raped during the week and not, as might be expected, over the weekend.

As anticipated most of the rape survivors did not report the rape(s) to the police, nor did they visit a district surgeon or other medical facility.

The profile of the district surgeons reflects the stereotypical image of district surgeons: the majority are white, Afrikaans-speaking, married men older than 51 years. Most of the district surgeons belong to the Dutch Reformed Church.

Most of the police persons are between 18 - 40 years old, which is closely related to that of the rape survivors. They too are mostly Afrikaans-speaking and married, and belong to the Dutch Reformed Church.

The gender of the police persons is equally divided between wimmin and men. While the gender of the district surgeons was uncontrolled (due to the fact that the group of respondents automatically consists of all the full-time district surgeons), the gender of the police persons was in some way controlled by
the police liaison person, who recruited volunteers to complete the questionnaire. The gender composition of the district surgeons is therefore a very accurate reflection of reality. It represents one of the problems faced by rape survivors: that we need more female district surgeons and that a womyn can in fact benefit from being attended to by a womyn district surgeon. Due to the small size of the group of police persons, I was unable to determine any real differences in opinion based on gender. The fact that half of the police persons were female reflects the efforts of the police to use more wimmin to work with rape survivors.

There is an equal distribution of respondents in terms of years of experience as either police person or district surgeon, as well as the experience of rape cases. It is important to clarify the two questions concerning years of experience as a police person or district surgeon versus their experience of rape cases. It is possible to have a lot of experience as a police person, but little experience of rape cases. Police persons are appointed to certain areas of work, and not everyone works with rape survivors. The same is true for the district surgeons: a lot of experience as a district surgeon does not necessarily mean a lot of experience of rape cases.

Most of the police persons and district surgeons think they are adequately trained to deal with rape survivors. It is possible that this is just their perception, due to the fact that a lot of emphasis has been placed on adequate training of police persons and district surgeons in the recent past. (In the light of complaints by rape survivors and support personnel working with rape survivors that many police persons and district surgeons are inadequately trained to deal with rape survivors.) It may also be that district surgeons or police persons may not want to look inadequate by saying that they are inadequately trained to deal with rape survivors.
There is an almost equal distribution amongst the police persons in terms of rank, with most being detective-sergeants. As explained earlier, the rank of the police person was used to indicate the level of training/education, as that is the indicator used by the police force.

Data according to the specific group of respondents

5.2.1. Biographical data

5.2.1.1. Age (Figure 1)

There is a strong similarity between the rape survivors and the police persons in age: most of the rape survivors (42.9%) are in the age group 18-30 years, the second highest category (33.3%) are those between the ages of 31-40 years. Almost half (45%) of the police person respondents are between the ages of 18-30 years, and a total of 40% are between 31-40. Just under half of the district surgeon respondents (47.1%) are older than 51 years of age.

5.2.1.2. Home language (Figure 2)

Afrikaans is the most important language for all three groups of respondents. The majority of rape survivor respondents (66.7%) use Afrikaans as their home language, 47.1% of the district surgeons and an overwhelming majority (85%) of the police persons speak Afrikaans as a home language.

5.2.1.3. Marital status (Figure 3)

The marital status of the respondents falls mainly within two categories: married or unmarried and not cohabiting with someone. Of the rape survivor respondents, 52.4% are married, and 33.3% are unmarried and live alone. Most of the district surgeon respondents (76.5%) are married, and almost half (45%) of the police person respondents are married. A total of 40% are
FIGURE 1: Respondents' age.
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FIGURE 2: Respondents' home language.
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FIGURE 3: Respondent's marital status.
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3 = Unmarried, cohabit with male
4 = Unmarried, not cohabiting
5 = Divorced
unmarried and are not cohabiting with someone.

5.2.1.4. Religious affiliation (Figure 4)

Most of the rape survivor respondents (52.4%) belong to the Dutch Reformed Church. Of the district surgeon respondents, 35.3% belong to the Dutch Reformed Church. Just over half (55%) of the police person respondents belong to the Dutch Reformed Church.

5.2.1.5. Gender (Figure 5)

An absolute majority (94.1%) of the district surgeon respondents are male, while the police person respondents are almost equally divided: 45% are male and 50% are female.

5.2.1.6. Race (Figure 6)

The majority of both the district surgeons (76.5%) and the police persons (75%) are white.

5.2.1.7. Education (Figure 7)

More than half the respondents (52.4%) have matric plus additional technical, technicon, college or university training.

5.2.1.8. Income (Figure 8)

One-third of the rape survivor respondents (33.3%) have a monthly income of R 1000 or less. The number of housewives (23.8%) and students (9.5%), who together make up 33.3%, and who probably do not earn much, must be taken into consideration, in this regard.

5.2.1.9. Occupation (Figure 9)

More than half the respondents (52.3%) fall into one of the following three categories: 23.8% are housewives, 19% are clerks and 9.5% are students.
FIGURE 4: Respondents' religious affiliation.

A = Dutch Reformed Church  
B = Jewish  
C = Pentecostal Protestant Church  
D = No Specific Religion  
E = Other  
F = Declined to Answer

(1) Belong (one each) to the following denominations:

All Nations Church, Anglican Church, Afrikaans Protestant Church, Apostolic Faith Mission, Roman Catholic Church, Old Apostolic Church and the Presbyterian Church.

(2) Belong (one each) to the following religious groupings:

Muslim, Presbyterian Church, Roman Catholic Church, Protestant Dutch Reformed Church and the Reformed Church.

(3) Belong (one each) to the following religious groupings:

Roman Catholic Church, Apostolic Faith Mission and the Methodist Church.
FIGURE 7: Education

(1) Some high school education but no matric
(2) High school qualification without matric
(3) Matric
(4) Matric plus additional technicon, college or university training
(5) Post-graduate qualification
FIGURE 8: Income per month.

1 = R 0 - R 1 000
2 = R 1 001 - R 2 000
3 = R 2 001 - R 3 000
4 = R 3 001 - R 4 000
5 = R 4 001 - R 5 000
6 = More than R 5 000
(1) One each of the following occupations: receptionist, computer programmer, teacher, administrator, draftsperson, shop owner, nurse, social worker, shop assistant and journalist.
5.2.1.10 **Police persons' ranks** (Figure 10)

Most (25%) of the respondents are detective-sergeants.

5.2.2. **Police persons and district surgeons experience**

5.2.2.1. **Length of time the respondents have practised as district surgeons and police persons** (Figure 11 & 12)

A total of 29.4% of the district surgeon respondents have been practising for between 1 - 5 years. Most of the police persons (25%) have been in the SAP for between 11 - 13 years. The rest of the respondents are almost equally divided into the remaining categories.

5.2.2.2. **Amount of experience with rape cases** (Figure 13 & 14)

Overall, the district surgeons have much more experience than the police persons. Most (29.4%) of the district surgeon respondents have experience of between 100 - 250 rape cases, while most (30%) of the police persons have experience of between 16 - 30 cases.

5.2.2.3. **Adequacy of training for dealing with rape survivors** (Figure 15)

Most of the respondents - 94.1% of the district surgeons and 60% of the police persons - indicated that they feel adequately trained to deal with rape survivors.

5.2.3. **Rape survivors' experience of the rape(s)**

5.2.3.1. **The rape survivor respondents' experience(s) of rape(s)** (Figure 16)

Just over half of the respondents, (eleven) 52.4% were raped once by one person.
FIGURE 10: Police persons' ranks.

1 = Constables
2 = Sergeants
3 = Captains
4 = Lieutenants
5 = Lance-Sergeants
6 = Warrant Officers
7 = Detective-Sergeants
FIGURE 11: Surgeons' time practicing.

1 = Less than 1 year
2 = 1 - 5 years
3 = 10 - 15 years
4 = 20 - 30 years
5 = 31 - 40 years
FIGURE 12: Police time practicing.

1 = 1 - 3 years
2 = 4 - 7 years
3 = 8 - 10 years
4 = 11 - 13 years
5 = 14 - 17 years
6 = 18 - 20 years
FIGURE 13: Surgeons’ experience.

1 = 100 - 250 cases
2 = 500 - 1000 cases
3 = 1500 - 2500 cases
4 = Declined to answer
FIGURE 14: Police experience.

1 = 0 - 10 cases
2 = 11 - 15 cases
3 = 16 - 30 cases
4 = 50 cases
5 = More than 100 cases
6 = Declined to answer
FIGURE 15: Adequacy of training.
FIGURE 16: Experience of rape.

1 = Once by 1 person
2 = More than once by more than one person
3 = More than once by the same person
4 = More than once by one person
5.2.3.2. Time of rape(s) (Figure 17)

Most of the rapes (33.3%) took place between six o'clock in the evening and twelve o'clock at night.

5.2.3.3. Day(s) of rape(s) (Figure 18)

Almost two-thirds of the rapes (61.9%) took place during the week (Monday to Friday).

5.2.3.4. Rapists race (Figure 19)

An overwhelming majority of the rapists (90.5%) were white.

5.2.3.5. Rapists age (Figure 20)

The highest proportion of respondents (38.1%) estimated that the rapist(s) was/were approximately between the age/s of 21 - 30 years.

5.2.3.6. Report of the rape (Figure 21)

An outright majority of the wimmin (81%) did not report the rape to the police, while 61.9% of the wimmin did not report it to a district surgeon.

What follows is an analysis of the rape survivors' perceptions and experience of power, using the data on their experience of rape. This will be followed by a detailed analysis of the three groups of respondents' perceptions regarding rape myths.

5.2.4. Rape survivor respondents perceptions and experiences of power relations

The analysis which follows is based on four main characteristics ascribed to power:

(1) independence
FIGURE 17: Time of rapes.

(1) 00:00 - 06:00
(2) 06:00 - 12:00
(3) 12:00 - 18:00
(4) 18:00 - 00:00
(5) Wimmin were raped more than once by the same man, or by more than one man, at different times.
(6) Uncertain
FIGURE 18: Day(s) of rape(s).

1 = Week (Monday - Friday)
2 = Weekends (Saturday and Sunday)
3 = Both week and weekend
4 = Uncertain of day
FIGURE 19: Rapists' race.

1 = White
2 = Black
3 = "Coloured"
FIGURE 20: Rapists' age.

1 = 21 - 30 years
2 = 16 - 20 years
3 = 31 - 40 years
4 = 41 - 50 and older than 50
5 = 16 - 20 years and 21 - 30 years
6 = 16 - 20 years and 41 - 50 years
7 = 41 - 50 years and older than 50

(*) Referred to more than one attack, or more than one rapist.
(1) Town clinic, venereal disease clinic or gynaecologist. One womyn became pregnant and put the baby up for adoption.
(2) control
(3) decision-making
(4) choice of behaviour

According to mainstream political science, power is the ability of A to control B's choice of behaviour. It means that A can influence B's decisions and in fact determines B's independence, or the lack thereof. Vice versa it means that B has very little independence and control over her/his own life. She/he lacks decision-making ability and B's behaviour is determined by what A wants. (As analyzed in chapter 2.) This is the traditional male view of personal power as power over someone else. From a feminist perspective, power is viewed as personal power and not power over someone or something else. The analysis of the data is concerned with the degree of power that each rape survivor respondent has in terms of her own life and circumstances. The four characteristics ascribed to power are analyzed in terms of the rape survivor's personal power over herself, her decisions, behaviour etc. It is not about her power over someone else. The responses of the district surgeons and the police persons are used in relation to that of the rape survivors, as a "control group" for their views and perceptions concerning rape, especially with regard to the various myths surrounding rape. An account of the perceptions of the police persons and district surgeons is vital. They are the people directly responsible for reacting to the rape survivor's plea for help. Much of the secondary trauma of rape is determined by the reactions of the police persons and district surgeons to the rape survivor. Their perceptions about the act of rape, the rape survivor and the circumstances can determine their behaviour towards the rape survivor. It is therefore important to include their views.

The aim of the research - and the manner in which the questions and statement were structured - is not to claim that this is an accurate and empirical way of "measuring" personal power. Rather, it is one way of trying to determine the degree of personal power of a rape survivor in terms of her experience of
being raped. It is an attempt to structure the very "fuzzy" concept of power. I use the concept of "degree of power", to avoid inferring that power can be accurately measured. It is not about empirical measurement and accurate statistics, but about allowing the data to support the subjective ideas about wimmin's experience of power and subjective predictions about how wimmin perceive their own power.

A five-point Likert scale was used to determine the rape survivors' views of the degree of power they had before, during and after being raped. The scale varies from the lowest value (1) to the highest value (5). Each point on the scale represents the following:

1 = Lowest value, indicating very little (a low degree of) independence/choice/control or decision.
2 = Between the lowest value and a neutral value.
3 = A neutral or average value.
4 = Between the neutral or average value, and the highest value.
5 = The highest value, indicating a high degree of independence/choice/control and decision-making.

Rape survivors' views of the degree of power they had before, during and after being raped

It is important to remember that these are the reactions of the rape survivors' themselves. This is an account of how they view themselves, their own power and circumstances. Thus, it is their account of their personal power, or the lack thereof. It must be taken into account that invariable there is a time lapse between when the wimmin were raped and when they completed the questionnaire. Their views could have changed over time due to important factors such as counselling, the experience of a previous rape(s), aging, personal growth etc. However, it remains a valid account of their experience of rape(s). Although they may have acquired a better insight into and understanding of their experiences, the memory and reality of the experiences
and, by extension, their accounts will remain unchanged.

The majority of the rape survivor respondents agree that it is important to have personal power in their lives. However, this does not mean that the respondents actually have personal power. Almost two thirds of the respondents (62%) indicated that they agree that it is very important to be in control of your own life (Figure 22), while 57% indicated that it is very important to be able to make independent decisions (Figure 23). Although the majority of women agree with these two statements, it does not necessarily mean that they have either control over their lives, or independence in decision-making. They could have viewed the question as a hypothetical statement. They could also have had their circumstances in mind while answering the question.

5.2.4.1. Perception of personal power before rape

It is interesting to note that most of the respondents had a relatively high degree of personal power before being raped. A total of 52% indicated that they had a relatively high degree of control over their lives, (Figure 24) and 53% thought of themselves as independent before being raped (Figure 25).

Why such a high percentage of respondents did not answer these two questions remains unclear. It is possible that they found it difficult to relate the questions to their personal circumstances, in which their personal power is largely determined by someone else, possibly a man, e.g. their father, husband, boyfriend etc. It is also possible that they do not think of themselves in terms of independence and control, which may have made it difficult to relate to the question.

5.2.4.2. Perception of personal power during the attack

It is evident from the previous section that most women thought of themselves as in control of their own lives and independent before they were raped. However, this perception changed
FIGURE 22: It is important to be in control of your life

1 = Lowest value, very little independence / choice / control / decision.
2 = Between lowest and neutral value
3 = Neutral or average value
4 = Between average and highest value
5 = Highest value, a high degree of independence / choice / control / decision.
6 = No answer

FIGURE 23: It is important to make your own independent decisions.
FIGURE 24: You had control over your life before being raped.

1 = Lowest value, very little independence / choice / control / decision.
2 = Between lowest and neutral value
3 = Neutral or average value
4 = Between average and highest value
5 = Highest value, a high degree of independence / choice / control / decision.
6 = No answer

FIGURE 25: You were an independent person before being raped.
dramatically during their experience of rape. Most wimmin had very little, if any, control and choice over their behaviour or emotions during the attack. Only one womyn (5%) thought that she in fact had a high degree of choice with regard to being raped. Most wimmin (57%) indicated that they had either a low degree or no choice at all in being raped (Figure 26), which indicates that they were powerless notwithstanding their wish not to be raped.

As is to be expected the majority of wimmin (52%) also indicated that they had very little choice with regard to behaviour during the attack. This is further illustrated by the analysis of the rapists behaviour and the respondents reactions, which follows. Again, only one respondent (5%) indicated that she had a high degree of choice of behaviour, while being attacked (Figure 27).

A similar picture emerges in terms of the degree of control respondents had over their emotions. Almost half of the respondents (48%) indicated that they felt they had very little control over their emotions during the rape(s). Only 9% felt that they were in control of their emotions (Figure 28).

More than two thirds of the respondents (67%) felt that they had very little, if any, control over the situation (Figure 29). This is borne out by the absolute majority of respondents (71%) who indicated that ultimately they could not physically resist the rapist(s) (Figure 30).

The wimmins' lack of control of the situation and their lack of choice of behaviour during the attack, is clearly illustrated in the behaviour of the rapists and the wimmins' reactions thereto.

A majority of the wimmin (67%) indicated that the rapist(s) used physical power or violence during the attack, while another 67% said the rapist(s) was dominant; and 38% said he was aggressive. A third (33%) characterised the rapist as violent. This is supported by 75% of the police persons who indicated that the
FIGURE 26: You had a choice to be raped.
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FIGURE 27: You had a choice in behaviour during the attack.
FIGURE 28: You were in control of your emotions during the attack.

1 = Lowest value, very little independence / choice / control / decision.
2 = Between lowest and neutral value
3 = Neutral or average value
4 = Between average and highest value
5 = Highest value, a high degree of independence / choice / control / decision.
6 = No answer

FIGURE 29: You were in control of the situation.
FIGURE 30: You could physically resist the rapist.

1 = Lowest value, very little independence / choice / control / decision.
2 = Between lowest and neutral value
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5 = Highest value, a high degree of independence / choice / control / decision.
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FIGURE 31: You are in control of your life after being raped.
rapist usually use physical force or violence. In the words of the rape survivor respondents:

"He was much bigger and stronger than I was, and hurt me badly when I tried to move." ("Hy was baie groter en sterker as ek en het my baie seer gemaak as ek probeer beweeg het.")

(Respondent nine)

"I pleaded with him to stop it. I told him he was hurting me." ("Ek het by hom gepleit om op te hou. Ek het gesê hy maak my seer.")

(Respondent twenty-one)

"He was too heavy, I could do nothing. I said 'no'." ("Hy was te swaar, ek kon niks doen nie. Ek het 'nee' gesê.")

(Respondent eight)

"I could not do anything because he beat with his fists all the time. I was scared that he would kill me."

(Respondent eighteen)

It is not only the rapist's physical force or strength that overcame the wimmin, but also the use (or the threat of use) of a weapon. Possible resistance was nullified in the face of the use (or threat) of a weapon. Twenty-four percent of the respondents indicated that the rapist(s) used a weapon, while 43% indicated that the rapist(s) either threatened to use, or did use, a weapon. This is supported by more than half (53%) of the district surgeons who indicated that there is a relationship between whether or not the womyn knew the rapist, and the amount of force or violence used against her. A majority of 70% of the police persons agreed that such a relationship does exist.

The data indicate that 85.7% of the wimmin knew their rapist(s) and were familiar with him. Yet, despite (or perhaps due to) the fact that they knew the rapist(s), he/they still used, in the
majority of cases, a considerable amount of violence. This can be explained in a number of ways: Perhaps the rapist(s) initially thought that the womyn would not resist so much because she knew him, but when met with unexpected resistance he had to resort to violence to overcome her. Another possibility is that because she knew him, he had to show her "who was boss", who was in control, who was the superior of the two. Possibly the rapist(s) used violence as a form of further intimidation, so that the womyn would realise her vulnerability and that he could (a) injure her seriously, (b) kill her or (c) return for revenge if she was to report the rape. The fact that the womyn knew the rapist was by no means a guarantee that he would not use violence against her. In fact, as the data will show, the exact opposite is true.

A total of 29% of the respondents indicated that the rapist(s) threatened her in some way, while 9% said that the rapist threatened to kill her or someone close to her.

Respondent five said:

"He threatened to kill my mother." (Hy het gedreig om my ma dood te maak.)

A majority (71%) of the respondents indicated that the rapist(s) used physical force to overcome her. In 14% of the cases, the rapist threatened to use either physical force or a weapon, while 9% of the respondents indicated that the rapist(s) used a weapon to force her to give in. While the rapist's behaviour is characterised by violence, control and domination, the behaviour of the wimmin supports the arguments made that the wimmin are powerless and unable to resist.

Some 43% of the wimmin indicated that they were ultimately unable to resist the rapist(s) either verbally or physically. This corroborates the position of the majority of the respondents (71%), who indicated the lowest degree of physical resistance, implying that they could not resist the rapist.
Two of the respondents said:

"But at some point I was too shocked - paralysed - and could not resist, he was too strong. I only cried and pleaded with him to let me go." ("Maar op 'n stadium was ek te geskok - verlam - en kon geen weerstand bied nie, hy was te sterk. Ek het net toe getjank en gepleit hy moet my laat gaan.")

(Respondent two)

"(I was) powerless, physically and mentally." ("Ek was) magteloos, fisies en geestelik.")

(Respondent seventeen)

In comparison to the rapist, the rape survivors' behaviour is characterised by powerlessness and eventual subordination. In reaction to the attack almost half of the wimmin (48%) tried to fight back and argue with the rapist, 19% argued with the rapist(s) and 14% indicated that they screamed for help. Another 14% indicated that they screamed and fought back, while still another 14% tried to run away. Fewer than one in ten (9%) of the wimmin tried to maintain a calm front. Respondent five said:

"I would like to say I was calm, but I was also extremely frightened. This man's power was overwhelming." ("Ek wil sé ek was kalm, maar ek was ook geweldig bang. Hierdie man se mag was vir my oorwel digend.")

Only 9% of the wimmin indicated that they did not try to resist, as explained by respondent twenty:

"I realised that he would hurt me if I resisted. I did, however, start crying." ("Ek het besef hy gaan my seermaak as ek my fisies teensit. Ek het wel begin huil.")

It is clear from the aforementioned that the experience of rape took away whatever amount of personal power (independence, choice in behaviour and control over their own lives) the wimmin felt they possessed before being raped. The majority of wimmin were unable to physically resist the rapist(s), and were ultimately
Powerless.

5.2.4.3. Perception of personal power after rape

The wimmin's powerlessness (and subordination) continues after the attack and the experience of rape continues to have a disempowering effect on the wimmin, as they try to cope with the ordeal.

Fully a third of the respondents (33%) indicated that they feel they have a very low degree of control over their lives since being raped, while only 5% feel they have a high degree of control over their lives (Figure 31). The respondents who felt that they had a high degree of control (before being raped, 38%) (Figure 24), dropped by 33% (Figure 31), while those who indicated that they had a low degree of control (before being raped) (Figure 24), increased by 14% (Figure 31). This is clearly evident from the wimmin's feelings about themselves and their surroundings, especially their relations with other people.

A third (33%) of the respondents indicated that they feel a lot more dependent on people after being raped, while only 14% indicated a very low degree or no increase in dependence on others, following the rape (Figure 32).

Although 24% of the respondents indicated that they had a very high degree of choice as to how to conduct their lives after being raped, an equivalent 24% indicated that they had very little or no choice. It seems that overall, one in three (33%) respondents had a reasonable degree of choice in conducting their lives after being raped (Figure 33). This ambivalent response can be due to the fact that, on the one hand, the experience of rape forced some of the wimmin to take control of their lives. The trauma of the experience could have forced some of the wimmin to take steps to be less dependent on people (especially men), to make their own decisions about what to do after the rape and to take charge of their own lives, rather than have their
FIGURE 32: You feel more dependent on people after being raped.

1 = Lowest value, very little independence / choice / control / decision.
2 = Between lowest and neutral value
3 = Neutral or average value
4 = Between average and highest value
5 = Highest value, a high degree of independence / choice / control / decision.
6 = No answer

FIGURE 33: You had a choice how to conduct your life after the rape.
husbands, male friends etc. do so. On the other hand, some wimmin were forced to be more dependent after being raped. The experience of rape removed whatever degree of choice, independence and control they may have had before being raped. Other people (husbands, boyfriends, family etc.) then took over the responsibility of making decisions, being in control etc. These results are supported by the findings with regard to reporting the rape(s) to the police and district surgeon.

A somewhat similarly ambivalent response is given with regard to whether or not the respondent reported the rape to the police and consulted the district surgeon. Less than a third (29%) of the respondents indicated that they had a high degree of independent choice about whether or not to report the rape. However, a large proportion (38%) did not have much of a choice (Figures 34 & 35). The fact that 85.7% of the wimmin knew their rapist(s) is very important with regards to the question of reporting the rape or not. Only 19% of the wimmin reported the rape to the police, while 81% did not.

This can be due to various reasons: Possibly the single most important reason for not reporting the rape(s) is the fact that in the majority of cases the rapist(s) was familiar to the womyn. The decision to report the rape, which implies that the womyn wants to take legal action against the rapist(s), is probably a very difficult one to make when the man who raped you is either a friend, former boyfriend, a neighbour, friend of the family, your employer/boss, a colleague or family member such as your own father, stepfather or uncle. The womyn's decision to report the rape(s) would definitely have implications for the relationships she has with other friends, relatives, colleagues etc. The popular myth that being raped by a man you know cannot be that bad, further discourages wimmin from reporting rapes.

It coincides with another myth which says that if you know him it was probably not rape, but consented intercourse, and therefore would not do the womyn any good to report it. These
Figure 34: You could make an dependent decision to report the rape or not.

1 = Lowest value, very little independence / choice / control / decision.
2 = Between lowest and neutral value
3 = Neutral or average value
4 = Between average and highest value
5 = Highest value, a high degree of independence / choice / control / decision.
6 = No answer

Figure 35: You had a choice of medical service or the district surgeon.
wimmin may have been under pressure not to report it (for the above reasons) which explains why 38% felt they had no choice in the matter. Wimmin in general are very well aware of these misogynist myths as well as the difficulty society and the (male) law have in seeing past them, and recognising the offence committed against the womyn. A further reason for these wimmins' reluctance to report the rapes, is the threat of both the social stigma and additional trauma, the "secondary rape", that they will have to face. Expectations of "user unfriendly" police and district surgeons together with the fear of a prolonged court case serve to further discourage wimmin from reporting rapes. This is underlined by the reasons given by the wimmin for not reporting the rapes. It also provides interesting information regarding their perceptions - whether true or false - of the police and district surgeons. These can be divided into three categories:

(1) **Negative perceptions of the police and/or the functioning of the legal systems**

A high proportion of the wimmin (38%) felt that it would not help them to report the rape, as the rapist would get away with his crime anyway. Respondent two stated:

"... what would that have helped me - maybe he won't even get a sentence, or just a light sentence, and when he gets out he will come back for revenge. He said he would come back. And to this day I expect him to appear around every corner." ("... wat sou dit help - hy kry dalk nie eers 'n vonnis nie, of net 'n ligte een en as hy weer los is kom wreek hy hom éérs op my. Hy het mos gesê hy 'Kom weer'. En tot vandag toe verwag ek hom om elke hoek en draai.")

One third of the respondents (33%) said that they thought the police would not have enough evidence. A total of 29% said that they were afraid that the police would not believe them. According to respondent seventeen:

"Who will believe someone who says that her lawful husband has raped her ?" ("Wie sal iemand glo wat sê dat haar wettige eggenoot haar verkrag het ?)
Nineteen percent indicated that they thought the courts (legal procedure) would be too hostile. Two of the respondents said:

"After such an inhumane humiliation I did not want to go through the further humiliation that the judicial system subjects a raped person to." ("Na so 'n ommenslike vernederings het ek nie kans gesien vir 'verdere vernedering' waaraan die regstelsel 'n verkragte onderwerp nie.")

(Respondent ten)

"As a journalist I've seen too often how women are humiliated in the court." ("As joernalis het ek te veel gesien hoe vroue verneder word in die Hof.")

(Respondent twenty)

A total of 14% thought the police would be hostile, while another 14% thought the police would not be able to do anything.

(2) **Personal or emotional reasons**

A third (33%) of the respondents indicated that they were too upset to cope with the situation, while another third (33%) said they were too ashamed of what had happened. Similarly, of the district surgeons who responded, 18% said that they thought this was a reason why wimmin do not come to them after being raped. Respondent nineteen stated:

(I was) "ashamed and did not want my family to know." ("Ek was skaam en wou nie hê my familie moet daarvan weet nie.")

Some 14% of the rape survivor respondents said that they did not report it because they did not want to prolong the incident. Says respondent twenty-one:

"I wanted to pretend that it was a nightmare, something that could not have happened to me." ("Ek wou dit maar as 'n nare droom afmaak, iets wat nie met my kan gebeur nie.")
(3) Social reasons

Of the respondents, 29% were afraid of the social stigma if it were known that they had been raped. A similar proportion of the district surgeons (23%) agreed that this was a reason why wimmin do not consult them after being raped. Three of the respondents commented that:

"I was afraid of my parents and family's reaction, that they would say it was my own fault, that I was looking for it. I was also afraid that my school career would suffer because of it." ("Ek was bang vir my ouers en familie se reaksie en dat hulle sou sê dit was my eie skuld, ek het daarvoor gesê. Ek was ook bang my skoolloopbaan sou daaronder ly.")

(Respondent four)

"Wanted to protect myself and my family. Did not want them to know. My father was already very sick. Did not know what their reaction would be, how they would handle it. Was also afraid of colleagues, did not want to expose myself." ("Wou myself en my familie beskerm. Wou nie gehad het hulle moes weet nie. My pa was toe reeds baie siek. Het nie geweet wat hul reaksie sou wees nie, hoe hulle dit sou hanteer nie. Was ook bang vir kollegas, wou myself nie blootstel nie.")

(Respondent eight)

One in ten respondents (10%) indicated that they did not report the rape(s) to the police as they were afraid of their partners' reaction, a further 10% indicated that they did not want to make a scene, while yet another 10% did not think it was serious enough to warrant going to the police. Respondent fifteen said that:

"Thought it did not matter to others, as I was without parents in a home for children." ("Gedink dit maak nie aan ander saak nie, aangesien ek sonder ouers was in 'n tehuis vir kinders.")

Even though 33% of the respondents indicated that they had a high degree of choice in either going to the district surgeon or to another medical service (Figure ), in reality only 19% made use
of any medical facilities. Many of the reasons for not reporting the rape(s) to the police, are also a reflection of wommin's reluctance to go to the district surgeon. This constitutes part of what is known as "the secondary rape": the examination by the district surgeon which again places the womyn in a position of powerlessness and subordination. According to the district surgeons, other reasons why wommin choose not to report the rape(s) to them, are threats by the rapist; feelings of "what's done, is done";

"I wanted to forget the incident as soon as possible." ("Ek wou die aangeleendheid so gou as moontlik vergeet.")

(Respondent thirteen)

"It made no sense." ("Dit was sinneloos.")

(Respondent fourteen)

fear of further victimization;

"Did not go to avoid a further chance of humiliation." (Het nie gegaan nie, om 'n verdere kans op vernedering te vermei.")

(Respondent ten)

they do not want to be transferred to state hospitals; they are afraid, ashamed and it is an unknown experience;

"I was too ashamed" (Ek was te skaam."

(Respondent two)

"I was ashamed and afraid" ("Ek was skaam en bang.")

(Respondent eight)

"Was too ashamed, later I felt it was not necessary." ("Was te skaam, later gevoel dit is nie nodig nie.")

(Respondent twenty)
ignorance of the law; the inaccessibility of the district surgeons; the lack of womyn district surgeons and because they do not want to interact with the police.

Some 38% of the respondents see themselves as largely independent after being raped (Figure 36), which represents a 10% drop in the number of respondents who saw themselves as independent before being raped (Figure 25). A total of 14% do not see themselves as independent at all after being raped (Figure 36), an increase of 5% over those who saw themselves as having a low degree of independence before being raped (Figure 25). As mentioned earlier, it is possible that the experience of rape forced some of the wimmin to consciously take control of their own lives and that, therefore, a proportion now see themselves as independent. The overall decrease in personal power is emphasised by the respondents reactions after the rape(s). These reactions emphasize the degree to which the wimmin have been made subordinate and powerless due to their experience of rape. These negative reactions are not only directed towards the outside world, but also towards themselves. A large majority of the wimmin feel increasingly negative towards themselves. This is undoubtedly the result of various societal myths which place the responsibility for rape on wimmin, and not on men as the offenders. (This will be discussed fully in the following section.) Rape also negatively influences the womyn's social life, her relationships with other people and her (lost) freedom of movement.

By far the majority of the respondents (76%) indicated increased negative feelings towards themselves.

\[\text{17) For an extensive explanation of wimmin's reactions after rape, i.e. "rape trauma syndrome, see Hanson, Desirée 1992 "What is Rape Trauma Syndrome?" Occasional Paper Series Institute of Criminology: University of Cape Town as well as Keyser (1993:22).}\]
FIGURE 36: You see yourself as an independent person.

1 = Lowest value, very little independence / choice / control / decision.
2 = Between lowest and neutral value
3 = Neutral or average value
4 = Between average and highest value
5 = Highest value, a high degree of independence / choice / control / decision.
6 = No answer
Some of the respondents stated that:

"Life has become complex and sinister to me, I see the dark side of everything... Since then I have felt like an empty shell, am very emotional at times—about anything, am often shaky and moody and just cannot get into gear to live again. You feel so used, so dirty, so humiliated, even if it gets better with time, your overall self-image and human relations are broken. I am ashamed to say it, but after being raped I felt numbed, did not care about my own body, I was no longer a virgin anyway."  

("Die lewe het vir my kompleks en sinister geword, in alles sien ek 'n donker kant ... Ek voel van toe af soos 'n leë dop, is vreeslik emosioneel by tye – oor enige ding, is dikwels bewerig en buierig en kan net nie weer in rat kom om te lewe nie. Mens voel so misbruik, so vuil, so verneder, al is dit beter met die tyd, jou algehele selfbeeld en mensverhoudings is heel geknak. Ek is skaam om dit te sê, maar na die verkragting was ek so gevoelstdood en het nie meer oor my eie liggaam omgee nie, was mos in elk geval nie meer 'n maagd nie.")

(Respondent two)

"I have a lot of complexes, without self-respect, nervous wreck, divorced once as a result of sex, internal conflicts about sexuality, inadequate, jealous, over-sensitive and a failure."  

("Ek is vel kompleksa, sonder menswaardigheid, senuwrak, een keer geskei agv. seks, innerlike wrokke teenoor seksualiteit, minderwaardigheid, jaloers, oorsensitief en 'n mislukking.")

(Respondent fifteen)

"Mood swings, aggression, bitterness, depression."

(Respondent nineteen)

"I started feeling I was bad, and that it was suppose to happen to me, because in some way I attract them."  

("Ek het begin voel ek is sleg en dit moet met my gebeur, want op een of ander manier lok ek hulle uit.")

(Respondent twenty-one)
"I changed within 24 hours from a spontaneous person to a closed person. Changed completely. Was afraid of babies. Could not look at baby clothes. During the first two weeks I went to bed at 4.30pm. Was very quiet and crowds made me anxious. Am receiving intensive counselling at the moment. Between May 1993 and December 1993 I've been in the (psychiatric) clinic three times. I often get nightmares about the rape, as if I'm watching a movie. Sleep with my bathroom light on. I am afraid of sleep, because that's when you don't have control over what's happening around you. It upsets my family that I'm like this. Rather want to be alone than amongst people. Many people together frighten me. Sometimes I wish I had the ability to tear out the pages of my life."  
("Ek het binne 24 uur verander van 'n spontane mens tot 'n geslote mens. Het heeltemal verander. Was bang vir babas. Kon nie na babakler kyk nie. Het eerste twee weke 4:30pm gaan slaap. Was baie stil en baie mense het my beangs laat voel. Kry op die oomblik intensiewe behandeling. Was sedert Mei 1993 tot Desember 1993 drie keer in die (sielkundige)kliniek. Ek kry nog gereeld nagmerries oor die verkragting, dis dan asof 'n rolprent voor my afspeel. Slaap met my badkamerlig aan. Het 'n vrees vir slaap omrede jy dan nie beheer het oor wat om jou gebeur nie. Dit ontstel my familie omdat ek so is. Wil eerder alleen as tussen mense wees. Baie mense maak my beangs. Soms wens ek, ek het die vermoeë gehad om die blaaie van my lewensboek uit te skeur.")

(Respondent eight)

"I've since been through three suicide attempts, numerous psychiatrists and psychologists. At present I still experience bad nightmares, even wet my bed at 21. ... not a day passes without my planning a suicide, this time a successful attempt!"  
("Intussen is ek deur drie selfmoordpogings, talle psigiaters sowel as sielkundiges. Op die oomblik ondervind ek steeds erge nagmerries, maak self my bed nat op 21. ... daar gaan nie 'n dag om wat ek nie steeds 'n selfmoord beplan nie, hierdie keer 'n suksesvolle poging!")

(Respondent four)

A large majority of the respondents (62%) record decreased social activities, 57% indicated that they now have poorer relationships with their families, another 57% said that they are afraid of going out alone and 52% are afraid of being alone at home.
Says respondent eighteen:

"... but you can't forget the shame and every night the nightmares are there. Your whole mind is in a mess. When will he be back?"

Forty-three percent have increased negative feelings towards men whom they know, while 38% have increased negative feelings towards unknown men. Almost a quarter (24%) of the respondents indicated that sexual relations with their partner had deteriorated, while another 24% have poorer heterosexual relations. According to respondent ten:

"No romantic relationship with a man was successful." ("Geen liefdesverhouding met 'n man het geslaag nie.")

Against this background most of the respondents (76.2%) agree very strongly that rape is an act of power which makes wimmin powerless and subordinate. Respondent sixteen:

"There is a definite divide between the 'anger' rapist (penis as a weapon) and the 'power' rapist (extension of patriarchy). The basis is the powerlessness of women in societal terms and poor socialisation of both men and women. No basic respect for female life and opinions. Inability to understand how a woman understands or views intimacy and a belief that they have the right, and in fact should assert themselves sexually. Also that the power of their sexual need is paramount. It's linked to a fragile ego or overblown ego. They think they are the best lovers in the world and a woman will melt once she's forced. In this sense the behaviour falls within the realm of 'normal'.

I am very thin, small-chested and didn't wear make up, provocative clothes or fancy hair. I was simply young, presentable and vulnerable."

The respondents' views on sentences for rapists should be seen in relation to the above. A total of 38% of the respondents think the death sentence is the appropriate sentence for rapists. This is despite the fact that the majority of rapists (85.7%) were known to the respondents. This is a very clear indication of the severity of the crime in the eyes of the rape survivors.

It may also be an indication of the fact that a question like this provides for a kind of "revenge" or justice, even though it
is only an opinion or wish. Says respondent two:

"Rape is worse than murder, because it turns a living person into the living dead. My biggest wish is that all rapists will get the death penalty. Then more people will report it, and maybe less rape will take place." ("Verkragting is erger as moord, want dit maak van 'n lewende, 'n lewende dooie. My grootste wens is dat verkragters voor die voet die doodstraf kry. Dan sal meer mense hulle aangee ook, en dalk minder verkragtings plaasvind.")

Twenty-four percent of the respondents thought prison sentences according to the circumstances was appropriate punishment, while another 24% indicated that the sentence should be castration. Respondent fifteen states:

"He must be humiliated, a humiliation that he will remember until his death." ("Hy moet verneder word, 'n vernederings wat hy onthou tot sy dood.")

A total of 19% of the respondents said that psychiatric rehabilitation is the appropriate sentence, while 5% favoured lifelong imprisonment.

The above results suggests the following conclusion: the experience of rape stripped these wimmin of their personal power - defined as personal control, decision-making, independence and choice of behaviour - they possessed before being raped. It made them feel powerless.

The majority of wimmin agreed that it is important to be in control of one's own lives and to be able to make independent decisions. Although the majority of wimmin had some degree of personal power before being raped, rape resulted in a drastic change. Most wimmin experienced very little personal power and control during the actual attack. This is evident from the rapists' behaviour and the respondents' reactions during the attack. While the rapists' behaviour was manifested in domination, control, physical power and violence, the wimmin were subordinate and at the mercy of their aggressors. In the end they were unable to resist the rapists and were forced into a position of absolute powerlessness. These traumatic experiences
resulted in a serious decline in personal power. Most wimmin indicated feelings of increased dependence and less personal choice and control: the majority of wimmin indicated increased negative feelings about themselves, a decrease in social activities, poorer family relationships and a reluctance to go out alone.

As analyzed in the following section, rape myths function to enforce and strengthen wimmin's position of subordination and powerlessness. They reinforce the stereotypical images of raped wimmin and rapists, while at the same time, preventing critical analyses of wimmin's experiences and perceptions of the loss of personal power through rape.
5.3. Rape myths

By analysing the popularly held rape myths in our society, it becomes clear that these myths reinforce wimmin's powerlessness. These myths function as a very strong mechanism to keep wimmin in a subordinate position. Furthermore they place much of the blame and responsibility of rape at wimmin's doorstep, while simultaneously underplaying and disregarding the "male connection" in rape.

A four-point Likert scale was used based on the three groups of respondents' reactions to statements concerning rape myths, which varies from "disagree strongly" to "agree strongly". Where this scale was used, it was done specifically to allow for comparison between the reactions of the rape survivors, the district surgeons and the police persons. The latter two groups work directly with rape survivors and can play a significant role in changing many of the stereotypes about rape. It is also a way of determining the attitudes and perceptions of those directly involved in providing the necessary services to rape survivors.

Lastly, the scale functions as a way of determining whether or not the sometimes negative attitudes towards district surgeons and police persons are justified. The inclusion of the district surgeons and police persons are definitely not "the male standard" against which the rape survivors must be measured.

Burt (1980), Brownmiller (1975) and Weis & Borges (1975) have argued that the widely accepted rape myths support and promote rape. Burt (1980:217) defines these myths as "prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victims and rapists." Brownmiller (1975:439) sees these myths as providing men with an

"ideology and psychological encouragement to commit acts of aggression without awareness, for the most part, that they have committed a punishable crime, let alone a moral wrong",

while Weis & Borges (1975:111) claim that the mythology of rape

"allows the man both to engage in the otherwise
forbidden behaviour and to rationalize and justify it after the event".

Most of these myths are well known and generally accepted, but only with closer analysis does one realise that they are just myths not facts. What follows is an analysis of these myths based on the research data. The myths further emphasize the subordinate and powerless position of wommin through their experience of rape. They can be divided into four categories:

1) Appearance and behaviour of wommin
2) The "nature" of wommin
3) The "nature" of rapists
4) The relationship between the womyn and the rapist

5.3.1. Appearance and behaviour of wommin

5.3.1.1. Myth: A womyn can "ask" to be raped by the way she dresses (Figure 37) and

5.3.1.2. Myth: A womyn can "ask" to be raped through her behaviour (body language) (Figure 38)

This line of thought is usually used in conjunction with the reasoning that men have uncontrollable sexual urges to which they must submit. If a womyn dresses provocatively and/or behaves provocatively then she cannot expect men to have control over their sexual urges. Men often define themselves as "uncontrollable", which in this sense is not something negative, but something they cannot do anything about and are therefore at the "mercy" of womyn. Corresponding to this is the view that the


19) Provocative = Any action or mannerism which is not within the prescribed patriarchal guidelines for womynhood.
only real power a womyn has is her sexual power (which is, not surprisingly, seen as negative), which she can exercise over "weak", uncontrollable men.

Implicit in this argument is the view that womyn must not provoke men (that is, use their sexual power) and then expect men to control themselves. It is however possible to use the argument in reverse: whenever a man behaves uncontrollably, then the womyn must have been provocative. In other words, she got what she was looking/asking for, she deserves to be raped i.e. the way in which a man can regain his position of power and control over the womyn. Within this context, if a man is strong, assertive, in control of his body and mind, knows what he wants, then it is viewed as positive. On the other hand, when a womyn dresses and behaves with confidence and is in control, when she feels good about herself and her body, then she is seen as provocative and "asking" to be raped.

Her control/confidence/assertiveness is classified as negative and provocative as it does not conform to the pattern of behaviour designed for womyn, which is that of passivity, dependence, weakness etc. Taken to its logical extreme, such non-conformist behaviour is a provocation to the whole of male society. Such behaviour is in opposition to what and who a womyn is supposed to be according to patriarchal society: weak, dependent, powerless, to be controlled only by a man, and not by herself.

This reasoning is one of the many mechanisms designed to keep womyn "in their place", powerless and under male control. It also forms part of the "good girl" vs "bad girl" dichotomy as discussed in relation to the first myth. It is "bad girls" who move outside their prescribed powerless position, while "good girl" do not. Again, the responsibility is placed on womyn "to prevent being raped" by not provoking uncontrollable men. It very successfully takes away the focus from the fact that the man is the offender. One might ask why the onus is not placed on
men's developing control over themselves? It is, after all, they who are out of control.

Verwey & Louw (1990:153) found that 20% of the rapists in their response group said that "when a woman dresses provocatively (sexy) she must bear the results of her actions", while at the same time 80% said that "a woman has the right to dress provocatively (sexy)." What was not stated was that such behaviour could easily be used as a justification (and even encouragement) for rape. Put bluntly: yes, womyn have the right to dress provocatively, just as men have the right to rape womyn in response. Of Williams & Holmes's (1981:117) response group 21% said that "women can ask to be raped through their behaviour/appearance."

According to Verwey & Louw (1990:154) 73% of the respondents (themselves rapists) said that "in general I feel that rape is an act which is provoked by the victim (womyn)", while only 27% said that "it is not provoked by the victim (womyn)." A further 8% stated that provocation by the victim (womyn) was their main reason for raping her.

Reactions to this myth represent an interesting divide: while the majority of the rape survivors (57%) disagree with the statement, the majority of the district surgeons (58.9%) agree with the statement. The variation within the different responses of the rape survivors is not large, as 43% agree that a womyn can ask to be raped by the way she dresses. A much clearer difference exists within the district surgeons, as 35.2% disagree with the statement. It is interesting to note that the police persons are equally divided: half (50%) disagree, while the other half (50%) agree with the statement.

A similar myth is that which concerns wimmin's behaviour. Here the same interesting similarities exists as in the previous statement. Again, the majority of the rape survivors (62%) and just more than half (55%) of the police persons disagreed with
the statement, while a slightly larger majority of the district surgeons (64.7%) agree with the statement. Some 45% of the police persons disagreed that women can ask to be raped through their behaviour. In other words, the rape survivors and the district surgeons hold opposing views on the statement.

It is unclear why such a big difference exists between the different responses. It is possible that the myths have such a strong presence in our society that they are difficult to reject. Rape survivors are often accused of dressing provocatively. Society's "dress code" places women in broadly two categories: those who dress like "whores" and those who dress like "virgins". Most people were raised to believe that women who wear short or tight dresses, skirts or pants; and dresses or shirts with low necklines are dressed like whores, and vice versa. Accordingly, those who dress provocatively are often seen as sexy and attractive. This equals, in the male rapist's mind, sexual invitation. Of course it goes without saying that patriarchy determines what is provocative/sexy and that this necessarily means that women want sexual attention. The emphasis is placed on women to be responsible and to dress more conservatively, so as not to provoke any sexual interest.

With the movement towards women's liberation, sexual freedom and body politics, feminists have tried deliberately to bring about changes in the way women think about their own appearance. More women have begun to realise that they can decide what to wear and how to wear it, and that they don't need men's approval to do so. This, however, has blurred the line between the whore/virgin appearance stereotype. While (some) women may dress according to their personal tastes and moods, thereby taking control of their own appearance (and behaviour), (some) men (and women) still think and behave in terms of the whore/virgin myth.

This is a myth still very strongly embedded in our society and one which ensures control over women.
This is evident from the fact that the majority of the district surgeons (58.9%) - of which 94.1% are male and 47.1% older than 51 years - agree with the statement that wimmin can "ask" to be raped by the way that they dress.

A simple interpretation would be that the opposing views illustrate the gap between the myth ("wimmin can ask") represented by the district surgeons, and the reality - represented by the rape survivors - (wimmin are raped regardless of their body language/behaviour and appearance).

It is unclear whether or not the equal division between those police persons who support the statement and those who disagree, also coincides with the almost equal male/female divide in the group of respondents.

The difference between the district surgeons and the police persons could also be due to the difference in gender composition of the two groups.
FIGURE 37: A womyn can "ask" to be raped by the way she dresses.
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FIGURE 38: A womyn can "ask" to be raped through her behaviour.
5.3.1.3. Myth: If a womyn goes out alone at night, she "asks" to be raped
(Figure 39)

In both the previous myths concerning female appearance and behaviour, there was a high degree of disagreement between the responses of the rape survivors and those of the district surgeons. The district surgeons' responses to this myth concerning female behaviour at night, are much more evenly distributed, while the rape survivors disagree strongly with the statement. In the case of the district surgeons, 53% disagreed with the statement, while 47% agreed. Against this, an absolute majority of the rape survivors (91%) and 80% of the police persons disagreed with the statement, while only 9% of the rape survivors and 20% of the police persons agreed.

5.3.1.4. Myth: If wimmin stay at home where they belong, they won't get raped
(Figure 40)

This myth places the emphasis on the assumed safety of the home. Therefore, if a womyn gets raped she was probably not where she was supposed to have been, and was most likely asking to be raped. But this argument does much more: it takes away wimmin's freedom of movement and ability to decide where we want to be. It places wimmin in the environment chosen for them by men, in the home where they belong, while men expand their power base in the outside (public) sphere. It is ironic that wommin are told that they are safe inside their homes and that this is where they should stay, yet it is this same private (vs the public male) sphere from which womyn struggle to free themselves. The home is the bastion of female oppression and powerlessness. Instead of gaining power in the outside (public) world, womyn are forced to retreat into the very place from which they try to free themselves -- under the misguided impression that this is where safety is to be found.

Once again it is men who have decided that wimmin will be safe inside their homes, and that we should be restricted to the home
The myth naively assumes that the home is a place of safety and protection, but forgets that it is also the site of the loss of freedom, decision-making control, and choice i.e. the loss of power. It is also the place where many rapes take place, as the data reveals. A womyn's home is only an imaginary place of safety as wimmin can potentially be raped anywhere. Hursch (1977) found that 47% of the rapes took place in the womyn's home. Paul & Muller's (1990) study concluded that 33% of the wimmin were raped in their homes, while Williams & Holmes (1981) found that 36% of the wimmin were raped in their homes. McCahill, Meyer & Fischman's (1981) study found 42% of the wimmin were raped in the common residence of the rapist and the womyn. Collings's (1987) study found 52% of the wimmin were raped indoors and similarly Verwey & Louw's (1990) study concluded that 48% of the wimmin were raped indoors.

Here there are significant differences between the responses of the rape survivors, the police persons and the district surgeons. While all the rape survivors disagree with the statement - the majority (76.2%) do so strongly - 95% of the police persons disagree with the statement. Only 64.7% of the district surgeons disagreed with the statement, while 23.5% agreed with the statement. These figures reflect the rape survivors' personal experiences. By far the greatest proportion of rape survivors, 71.3%, were raped in either their own homes (33.3%), the home of the rapist (19%) or their common residence (19%). Only 28.7% were raped outside their homes, in a so-called "unsafe" place (e.g. a park, or field, a parking area, an area of entertainment, the grounds of a school, technicon, technical college or university and a deserted street or alley).

Again, it is interesting that there is a significant 'difference between the responses of the rape survivors and the police persons in comparison to the district surgeons. However, it is unclear why this is the case. Possibly the district surgeons are
from a somewhat older generation and have more conservative viewpoints and are more susceptible to myths. The rape survivors' views are based on direct experience and the police persons on their experience of rape cases. The district surgeons, however, do not have this specific information at their disposal (their work includes only the medical and forensic investigation), and as a consequence their views may more easily reflect the impact of rape myths. The facts, however, clearly reject this viewpoint as merely a myth and nothing more.
FIGURE 39: If a womyn goes out alone by night, she "asks" to be raped.

FIGURE 40: If wimmin stay at home where they belong, they won't get raped.
5.3.1.5. Myth: A womyn who is raped was probably seductive and was asking for it (Figure 41)

Again, the focus is shifted away from the rapist and onto the behaviour of the womyn. Both the majority of the rape survivors and the district surgeons disagree with the statement. An overwhelming 95.2% of the rape survivors, 82.3% of the district surgeons and 100% of the police persons disagreed with the statement.

The attitudes of the district surgeons (i.e. the fact that they also disagree with the statement) are in contrast to their previous responses. The reason(s) for this is unclear. This myth is closely tied to the earlier myths concerning female behaviour and appearance. It assumes that female behaviour and appearance lead to provocative and seductive behaviour, which means that the womyn was "asking" to be raped and therefore deserves it.

5.3.1.6. Myth: Wimmin deserve to be raped when they...
(Figure 42)

It is often argued that if a womyn's behaviour or appearance is not that of a so-called "good womyn", then she probably deserves to be raped. In the same way, when womyn go out alone, entertain themselves without men, hitchhike, talk to strange people, get drunk, stay out late at night etc. this is condemned as "looking/asking to be raped". This is part of the way in which womyn are placed under the control of men and in a powerless position, where their behaviour and appearance is prescribed by men. The logic is constructed along the lines of: "if you do ..., then you are asking for /deserve to be raped", but "if you don't ..., then you are a "good womyn" who will not get raped." If a womyn does not stay within these boundaries decided on by male patriarchal society, then she will not have the sympathy of the community and she will stand alone in her time of distress.

The above is nothing less than a subtle justification for the act
of rape. It is an argument used, yet again, to shift the emphasis from the deviant behaviour of the man, to the womyn. At the same time it is also a sustained threat used against all womyn, a way of warning wimmin to toe the line, or else...

By far the majority of the rape survivors (96%), the district surgeons (70.6%) and the police persons 80% disagreed with the statement. Again, it is unclear why the majority of the district surgeons now also disagree with the statement, and why this is in contrast to the majority of their previous reactions. (In the conclusion I return to the question of contradictions in the respondents responses.)

The aforementioned myths regarding female behaviour and appearance make wimmin responsible for, on the one hand, the occurrence of rape and, on the other hand, the prevention of rape. They serve to emphasise wimmin's appearance and behaviour and de-emphasise male aggressive behaviour. In doing so, these myths limit wimmin's movement, choices, freedom and independence, while at the same time, they disregard male aberrant behaviour and the violation of wimmin's basic human rights.
FIGURE 41: A womyn who is raped was probably seductive and asking for it.
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FIGURE 42: Wimmin deserve to be raped when they hitchhike, go out alone etc.
5.3.2. The "nature" of wimmin

5.3.2.1. Myth: Wimmin usually make false reports of rape against innocent men 20 (Figure 43)

The logical conclusion of the above-mentioned myth is: don't believe a womyn who says she's been raped, because she actually wanted it/asked for it/was looking for it/deserved it. She was not really raped and is just making an unnecessary fuss. This is a myth which relieves men of all the blame, and which assumes that womyn are neither trustworthy nor credible. It is a myth which subtly makes it seem as if a true rape charge is the exception to the rule, and not vice versa.

A total of 68% of the male respondents and 54% of the female respondents in Williams & Holmes's (1981:136) study said that "men are often falsely accused of rape." Burt (1980:229) found that more than 50% of an adult sample agreed that at least 50% of reported rapes are only reported because "the woman was trying to get back at a man she was angry with, or was trying to cover up an illegitimate pregnancy." Hursch's (1977:14) study however found that only 0.5% of charges of womyn under the age of 16, 0.5% of charges of womyn 16 and older, and 0.3% of attempted rape charges were in actual fact proven to be false. According to Ehrhart & Sandler (1985) only about 2% of all rapes and related sex charges have been determined to be false, and Viljoen (1992:745) also states that "the incidence of false reports for rape is exactly the same as that for other felonies - about 2%"

Research shows clearly that false reports of rape are the exception rather than the rule. Here there is a high degree of similarity between the groups of respondents. By far the majority (76%) of the rape survivors, 76.5% of the district surgeons and an overwhelming 90% of the police persons disagreed with the myth that wimmin usually make false reports of rape

against innocent men. A total of 24% of the rape survivors, 11.7% of the district surgeons and 10% of the police persons agreed with the statement.

It is clear from the reactions of the respondents that all three groups of respondents strongly rejected the validity of this myth.

5.3.2.2. Myth: If a womyn wants to, she can avoid being raped (Figure 44)

Thought behind this myth is that if a womyn does get raped, she was probably asking/looking for or provoked it. Thus: if she was raped, she did not try to avoid it. This line of thought is carried still further to: she is probably a "bad girl" and therefore it does not matter that she was raped because she deserved it. If a womyn goes through life without being raped then she is a "good girl" who abides by the rules and who does what is expected of her. MacKinnon (1983:648) makes a similar point when she states that

"good girls, like children, are unconsenting, virginal, rapable. Bad girls, like wives, are consenting, whores, unrapable."

Patriarchal society provides us with two clear-cut categories of womyn: Those who deserve our sympathy if they do get raped and those who do not. What does it mean to avoid being raped? At first glance it seems advisable for womyn to stay out of the danger zone of uncontrollable male sexual urges. However, what this really means is a reduction in womyn's freedom of movement. It means constructing the fallacy that it is safe within your own home and out of the streets and other public places. It means placing womyn under male "protection" against possible rapists. It means underlining womyn's position of powerlessness: a lack of control over our own lives, including what we wear, where we go, how we behave, who we associate with etc.
Making rape "avoidable" places full responsibility on womyn, as if we are the perpetrators, while simultaneously taking away the focus on men as the aggressors. Womyn become the focal point of the crime of rape, not men. The onus is placed on wimmin to avoid being raped, and not on how to stop men from raping.

Of all the respondents, an overwhelming majority (91%) of the rape survivors and 85% of the police persons disagreed with this statement, while a lower 58.8% of the district surgeons disagreed. Some 35% of the district surgeons agreed with the statement.

Again we see a the difference between the rape survivors and the police persons on the one hand, and the district surgeons on the other hand. The reason(s) for this could be the same as for previous myths.
FIGURE 43: Wimmin usually make false rape reports against innocent men.
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FIGURE 44: If a womyn wants to, she can avoid being raped.
5.3.2.3. Myth: "Nice or good" girls don't get raped,\(^{21}\) only a certain "type" of womyn gets raped (Figure 45 & 46)

According to the good/bad (male/female) dichotomy (as discussed in chapter 5) developed and sustained by patriarchal society, only bad girls/womyn get raped as they are the "type" who "look for" or "ask" to be raped.\(^{22}\) As was argued earlier, it is not as serious if a bad womyn gets raped. Consequently, if you get raped then you must be a bad womyn who did something wrong, namely dressed too sexily or behaved provocatively.

In reality, every womyn can potentially be raped, no matter which label patriarchal society puts around her neck. Rapists do not discriminate against womyn, every womyn is rapeable. Says respondent two:

"I wish people would not think that rape only happens to certain kinds of people - it can happen to anybody, without any provocation or whatever. When people hear I've been raped, the first thing they ask is: what were you wearing or how did you provoke the person!" ("Ek wens mense wil nie dink verkragting tref net sekere mense nie - dit kan met enige iemand gebeur, sonder enige uitlokking of wat ookal. As mense hoor ek is verkrag, is die eerste wat hulle vra: wat het ek aangehad, of hoe sou ek die persoon dan uitgelok het!")

Again, the responses reveal a high degree of agreement: all the rape survivors (100%) and all the police persons (100%) disagreed with the statement, while 88.3% of the district surgeons also disagreed.

The high degree of agreement could be due to the fact that the police persons and district surgeons deal with both so-called

---

\(^{21}\) This idea is supported by the research of inter alia L'Armand, K. & Pepitone, A. 1982 "Judgements of rape: A study of victim-rapist relationship and sexual history" Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin (8).

\(^{22}\) See inter alia Pugh, M.D. 1983 "Contributory fault and rape convictions: Loglinear models for blaming the victim" Social Psychology Quarterly (46).
"nice or good" girls and "bad" girls as rape survivors. Because they have experience of all kinds of wimmin they know that it is not only "bad" wimmin who get raped.
FIGURE 45: "Nice" or "good" girls don't get raped.
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FIGURE 46: Only certain "types" of wimmin get raped.
5.3.2.4. Myth: A womyn who is not ready cannot be raped
(Figure 47)

Consequently, if she was raped, she must have been physically
"ready" for it, and it cannot therefore really be considered
rape. This myth inevitably takes the focus away from the
elements of violence and coercion used against the womyn. It
assumes that penetration is only possible when a womyn is
physically "ready" for it, and blithely ignores the fact that
force, physical violence and coercion are very often used. It
is not a question of whether or not the womyn was ready, but
rather of whether or not it was done against her will, with force
and violence. This type of argument totally ignores the fact
that rape is an act of power. It is, in fact, the man who was
ready! It is not as if a womyn goes out to find someone to rape
— whether she was ready or not has nothing to with it, she was
forced into sexual intercourse whether by means of physical
force/violence or the threat of it.

Of Verwey & Louw's (1990:153) respondents (themselves rapists) 68%
said "I think it is impossible to have sexual intercourse with
a womyn if she does not want to". This cruelly illustrates how
firmly this particular myth is entrenched.

What is relevant is the fact that the man was ready to rape the
womyn, and the focus should be on the fact that the womyn was
forced into sexual intercourse.

An overwhelming majority of all respondents disagreed with this
statement: 100% of the rape survivors and district surgeons and
95% of the police persons. Of the rape survivors, 90.5%
disagreed strongly, 52.9% of the district surgeons and 65% of
the police persons disagreed strongly.

The respondents thus support the view that rape is, despite the
fact that it is sexual, a forceful act of violent aggression,
whether or not the womyn was "ready". This is undoubtedly due
to the various respondents direct experience of the physical
damage and injury involved in the crime of rape.

5.3.2.5. Myth: Secretly womyn like being raped \(^{23}\) (Figure 48) and

5.3.2.6. Myth: Wimmin like being treated violently (Figure 49)

There is a subtle connection between this myth and the one relating to womyn's provocative behaviour and appearance. It is a typical argument used to reinforce men's position of control and womyn's position of powerlessness. It links up with the view of wimmin as sex objects designed for the sexual pleasure of men and, by extension, as incapable of refusing sexual intercourse. Although a womyn might say that she was raped, or tried to resist, ultimately she actually wanted to be overpowered by a man and forced into sexual intercourse. In this view, it doesn't really matter that she was forced to have sexual intercourse (raped), because that is what she secretly wanted. This myth also implies that womyn like being powerless, treated violently and without respect.

Again, this is a myth designed to meet the needs of men. It places men in the position of control and power. It also takes away any responsibility for doing something against the will of a womyn - because secretly it is what she wants. Once again men are dictating to womyn what they want and how they want it and are not allowing wimmin their own definition of themselves. Through the power of this myth, men are defining wimmin.

A surprisingly low proportion (18%) of Verwey & Louw's (1990:153) respondents, themselves rapists, said "I think that all women

\(^{23}\) This myth is exploded by various authors who state that womyn do not secretly want to be raped, and that virtually all womyn who have been raped report feelings of terror, humiliation and degradation. See inter alia: Dean, C.W. & deBruyn-Kops, M. 1982 "The crime and the consequences of rape" Springfield (USA): Charles C. Thomas; Ehrhart, J.K. & Sandler, B.R. 1985; Griffin, S. 1971 "Rape: The all-American crime" Ramparts (10).
FIGURE 47: A womyn who is not ready cannot be raped.
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FIGURE 48: Wimmin really like being raped.
secretly want to be raped", while the overwhelming majority (82%) said that "I don't think that all women secretly want to be raped." Some 38% said that "the victim can enjoy being raped", and 62% said "the victim cannot enjoy being raped." Interestingly, 45% of the male respondents and less than half of this proportion (19%) of the womyn in Williams & Holmes's (1981:135) study said that "women are afraid of but curious and excited about rape." Burt & Estep (1981) report that about one-fifth of an adult sample believe that womyn enjoy sexual violence, thereby illustrating the pervasiveness of this myth.

One can only conclude that it is men who like powerless womyn. However, it was argued that (secretly) womyn like to have power over themselves, and like to be in control of their own lives. Furthermore, it goes without saying that womyn do not like being raped, as illustrated by the following responses. Here one can see a strong similarity between the responses of all the respondents. By far the majority of all the groups disagreed with the statement: 86% of the rape survivors, 82.3% of the district surgeons and 100% of the police persons.

The myth that wimmin like being treated violently is used in support of the myth that wimmin secretly like being raped. It creates the impression that wimmin have a perverse lust for violence, to which men are allowed to react in the form of rape. All the respondents reacted strongly against the myth. An overwhelming majority of 95.3% of the rape survivors, 82.3% of the district surgeons and 100% of the police persons disagreed with the statement.

5.3.3. The "nature" of the rapist

5.3.3.1. Myth: Rapists (of white wimmin) are usually men of colour (Figure 50)

This myth supports the idea that rapists are strangers who frequent dark alleyways. It serves to deflect potential blame
from familiar men or even family members, and creates a false sense of security for wimmin. Furthermore, wimmin are supposed to think that in order to prevent rape, we must merely restrict our contact with unfamiliar men of colour. This is a blatantly racist myth that supports the idea that rapists belong to groups other than that of the womyn, and reinforces the larger racial myth of "us" and "them".

All the rape survivors disagreed with this statement. Their responses are corroborated by the racial distribution of their rapists (as recorded by them): the overwhelming majority of rapists (90.5%) were white, while only 4.8% were black and another 4.8% so-called "coloured" (Figure 18). The reader is reminded that, for the reasons outlined earlier, the rape survivors are themselves white. This is another interesting illustration of the tenaciousness of the various rape myths in our society. The police persons have a similarly strong viewpoint on this issue: 95% disagreed that rapists (of white wimmin) are usually men of colour. Even though the district surgeons work extensively with rape survivors, more than half of them still believe the myth of inter-racial rape. The majority (58.9%) agreed with the statement and only 23.5% disagreed. (Given the small size of the sample, one can only now speculate. The findings will ultimately have to be replicated with a larger sample in order to accept it as a generalization of the bigger population.)

The facts of this study strongly reject the notion of inter-racial rape, and reveal it to be a patriarchal myth which places the responsibility of rape at the door of the wrong group of men.
FIGURE 49: Wimmin like being treated violently.
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FIGURE 50: Rapists are usually men of colour.
5.3.3.2. Myth: Rapists are mentally ill people
(Figure 51)

This myth is very often used as a justifiable excuse or mitigating factor for rape. It immediately puts the offence in a less serious light and can even provoke sympathy for the rapist as someone who is not responsible for his deeds, and who should therefore be excused. This belief leaves the womyn in the position of being in the wrong place at the wrong time. Consequently it becomes a mistake on the part of the womyn, and not the man, as he cannot help being mentally ill i.e. driven to these deeds.

Verwey & Louw (1990:157) found that by far the majority of rapists fall in the average or "normal" category for I.Q. scores. Rapists are generally normal men. Studies done on imprisoned rapists show they have basically normal personality profiles, although they have tendencies to be impulsive, aggressive and violent (Le Grande, 1973:922). A survey of all studies on the clinical profile of sex offenders concludes that rapists "do not constitute a unique clinical or psychopathological type, nor are they as a group invariably more disturbed than the control groups to which they are compared." The rapist was found to have "a normal personality and normal sexual instincts as measured by his choice of victim for sexual gratification" (Amir, 1971:314).

Rapists are "average or normal" men and therefore any man raised in the patriarchal tradition, which sees wimmin as unequal and powerless in relation to men, can be a potential rapist.

About half of the total group of respondents, 52% of the rape survivors, 50% of the police persons and 41.2% of the district surgeons agreed with the statement. A total of 48% of the rape survivors, 52.9% of the district surgeons and 50% of the police persons disagreed with the statement. Although there is a high degree of similarity between the responses to this statement, it is interesting to note that they are evenly spread along the scale, and not strongly in favour of either of the two extremes.
This is possibly due to the fact that the state of mind of the rapist has always been a contentious issue, and that the respondents are wary of taking a strong stand on it. For the same reason, this is also a very strong myth which is widely held and seldom questioned in our society. Respondents are therefore uncertain about their own attitudes and reacted in an indecisive manner.

5.3.3.3. Myth: Rape is an expression of an uncontrollable male sexual drive, and therefore sex is the primary motivation for rape (Figure 52)

If the above is true then you cannot really blame the man, as he cannot help it and is just a victim of his own urges. This is similar to the myth that rapists are mentally ill. It is designed to create empathy for the rapist, and not for the womyn! Why is it that men are "uncontrollable"? Seen through the lens of patriarchy, men are defined as being free, uncontrollable, limitless, untamed, while womyn are in bondage, belonging to, under the control of, tamed and passive. This is just another way of allowing men to do as they wish, define things as they want to, live outside in the public sphere, "uncontrollable", yet in control (of, inter alia, womyn) and be in a position of power (see the arguments presented on the fourth myth).

The myth further implies that womyn are not only physically controlled by men, but are also under the control of the way in which men define them. Womyn are defined as being controllable by men, as being in control of e.g. their sexual urges (when the existence of our sexuality is acknowledged at all), of not being

24) Amir's (1971) findings that 71% of the rapes in his study were premeditated also refutes the general acceptance of the irresistible, uncontrollable sexual impulse as a theory for rape motivation. This is a point of view which is rejected by various (feminist) authors. See inter alia: Brownmiller, S. 1975; Ehrhart, J.K. Sandler, B.R. 1985; Schwendinger, J.R. & Schwendinger, H. 1983 "Rape and inequality" Beverly Hills: Sage Publications; Scully, D. & Marolla, J. 1985.
wild and free. Patriarchy's definition of womyn does not allow for two parties to be uncontrollable. It is expected of wimmin that they do not provoke men into becoming uncontrollable. Therefore, if a womyn is raped then she presumably provoked the man (that is, challenged his control) and, as such, has only herself to blame.

In patriarchal terms, this is a very comfortable argument as it emphasises the womyn's behaviour, instead of that of the rapist. However, it is an argument which has no validity as it de-emphasises the coercive nature of rape, and makes wimmin responsible for a deviant and criminal act. Once again, this myth serves to enforce men's power and wimmin's powerlessness. A very low 6% of Verwey & Louw's (1990) respondents (themselves rapists) indicated that their sexual drive was the main reason for the rape they committed. In the same study, 45% of the respondents "have sympathy with the rapist as he has no control over his deeds". However, the majority of 61% said that "the rape did not satisfy them sexually".

Here, once more, the similarity between the responses of the different groups of respondents is illustrated. Due to the fact that the issue is a contentious one however, neither group took an absolute stand. A majority of 61.9% of the rape survivors disagreed with the statement, 64.7% of the district surgeons and 60% of the police persons disagreed.

The strength of the myth is visible in the fact that a substantial number of respondents agreed with the myth. It seems as if this image of male sexuality is very strongly present in society and, like the previous myth, forced respondents to take a more moderate stand. Both are myths which are very difficult to refute.
FIGURE 51: Rapists are mentally sick people.
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FIGURE 52: Rape is an uncontrollable sexual desire.
5.3.4. The relation between the womyn and the rapist

5.3.4.1. Myth: The rapist is usually unknown to the womyn (Figure 53) and

5.3.4.2. Myth: The rapist is almost never a family member (Figure 54)

At the heart of this myth lies the assumption that if the womyn knew the rapist, then it was probably not rape but consensual sexual intercourse which took place. Being familiar with a man or knowing a man equals female consent to male desires and wishes. This explains the reluctance with which authorities deals with any form of acquaintance rape, i.e. date rape or marital rape or any other form of intra-family rape. If the womyn knew the man then it means that she would not have resisted, even more so if he is her (ex)-boyfriend/(ex)friend/(ex)-husband/a family member etc. It also gives rise to the accepted "fact" that this sort of acquaintance rape is not as traumatic as being raped by a stranger. It is consequently seen in a less serious light.

Central to this line of reasoning is the view that the mere fact that a womyn is associating with a man, whether he is her boyfriend or husband, implies that she has given her consent for sexual intercourse. Thus, if she claims to have been raped, the boyfriend/husband was probably only trying to get what he deserves, namely, the right to have sexual intercourse with her whenever he pleases. Of the rape survivor respondents, 38.1% have been forced to give into sex against their will 25 within marriage or a relationship. Of these, 28.6% saw it as rape at the time, while 9.5% did not see it as rape at the time of the

25) The broadly radical feminist definition of rape, is sex against the will of the womyn. Many feminists e.g. Medea, A. & Thompson, K. 1974 "Against rape. A survival manual for women: How to cope with rape psychologically and emotionally" New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux; Brownmiller, 1975 and Burgess, Ann W. & Holmstrom, Lynda L. 1974 "Rape: Victims of crisis" Bowie, Maryland, USA: Robert J. Brady Company, have defined rape as any sexual intimacy forced on one person by another.
FIGURE 53: The rapist is usually unknown to the womyn.
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FIGURE 54: The rapist is almost never a family member.
incident. This myth very successfully draws attention away from the large number of acquaintance rapes, and implies that womyn need not fear the men closest to them. This is, however, in direct contrast to the findings of numerous studies with regard to the question of the rape survivor's relationship with the rapist: Hall (1985) found that 5% of the rapists were known men. Wilson (1978) found that 16% of the rapists were friends of the wimmin and 10% were their fathers. Paul & Muller (1990) found that 21% of the rapists were friends of the wimmin. Collings (1987) reported that 59% of cases were acquaintance rapes. Verwey & Louw's (1990) study found that 10% were friends of the rape survivors and 7% were family.

Williams & Holmes (1981) reported that 28% of the rapists were other known to the wimmin by sight, or they had seen him around, knew him casually, or it was someone related/known by the husband, the family etc. McCahill et al (1981) reported that 36% of the rapists were casual acquaintances or friends while 10% were nuclear and/or extended family members. It also creates the secondary myth of the rapist as stranger, unknown to the womyn and "out there" (outside her home). This myth is very successful in protecting the interests of any man who is close to womyn, i.e. (ex)husbands, (ex)friends, (ex)boyfriends etc. It reinforces the (powerless) position of wimmin who are under the legal power of men. It makes wimmin the dependent property of men. Her husband/boyfriend etc. owns her, which implies that she must have given her consent and therefore he can do whatever he wishes - including forcefully having sexual intercourse with her. One instance of consent equals eternal consent, and leaves wimmin without any future choice.

As the research shows, the rapist is often known to the womyn in some way, but this is ignored in favour of the (more patriarchal-friendly) myth of the rapist as "the dark stranger out there".

Of all the respondents, a very high 86% of the rape survivors and 80% of the police persons disagreed with the statement that the
rapist is usually unknown to the womyn, while only 47.1% of the district surgeons disagreed. Conversely, 47% of the district surgeons agreed with the statement.

By far the largest proportion of the rape survivors, 85.7%, knew or were in some way familiar with the rapist(s) i.e. he was not a stranger. The popular belief is that because the womyn knew the rapist, she has probably had sex with him before (and, therefore, the fact that she was raped is not too serious). However, only 4.7% of the rape survivors who knew their rapist(s) had previously had sex with him/them voluntarily. The overwhelming majority 81%, had never previously had sex with the rapist.

What is interesting is the apparent difference made by previous sexual encounters with the rapist, in terms of whether it is seen as rape or not. If the womyn knew the man (he was not a stranger) but had never had sex with him before she was raped, 94.1% of the district surgeons and 100% of the police persons consider it to be rape. Surprisingly, where the womyn knew the man who had raped her and she had had sex with him voluntarily on a previous occasion, 58.8% of the district surgeons and an overwhelming majority (90%) of the police persons do consider it to be rape.

This does not support the earlier argument that if the womyn knew the man, and/or if she had previously given consent to sexual intercourse, it means that she was not raped.

In much the same vein as the previous myth, are the reactions of the respondents concerning the myth that the rapist is almost never a family member. An absolute majority of the rape survivor respondents (86%) disagreed with this statement, as did a majority of the district surgeons (70.6%) and police persons (65%). Just over 14% of the respondents were raped by an immediate family member: one by her father, one by both her father and uncle and one by her step-father.
5.4. Conclusion

An analysis of the respondents' reactions to the rape myths indicates that there was:
- no significant degree of agreement between only the rape survivors and the district surgeons
- no significant degree of agreement between only the district surgeons and the police persons
- in some cases there is a varying degree of agreement between the rape survivors, district surgeons and police persons
- in some other cases there is a significant degree of agreement between the rape survivors and police persons, while the district surgeons show a significant degree of disagreement

5.4.1. There is a significant degree of agreement between the rape survivors and the police persons, with a significant degree of disagreement by the district surgeons on some statements.

Most of these myths have to do with wimmin's appearance and behaviour:
1) Wimmin can ask to be raped by the way they dress (Figure 37)
2) Wimmin can ask to be raped through their behaviour (body language) (Figure 38)
3) If wimmin go out alone at night, they are asking to be raped (Figure 39)
4) If wimmin stay at home, where they belong, they won't get raped (Figure 40)
5) If wimmin want to, they can avoid being raped (Figure 44)

Patriarchy determines wimmin's appearance and behaviour. What these myths say is that if wimmin dress and behave appropriately, if they don't do anything irresponsible or inappropriate (i.e. go out alone at night), but rather stay at home, we can actually avoid being raped. If we behave and appear the way patriarchy would like us to, and if we stay within the safe space created
by patriarchy, we will not get raped. What these specific rape myths do, is to place all the "blame" and responsibility for rape, squarely on the shoulders of wimmin. Taken together, the myths say that wimmin are responsible for the prevention of rape, and that rape is not about aggressive male sexual behaviour. Men's behaviour is excused.

The remaining two myths on which the rape survivors and police persons are in agreement (and which the district surgeons disagree with) are related, and concern the relationship between the womyn and the rapist:

1. Rapists are usually men of colour (Figure 50)
2. The rapist(s) is/are usually unknown to the womyn (Figure 53)

It is unclear why there is such a strong degree of agreement between the rape survivors and police persons, about some of the myths, while the district surgeons disagree. It can possibly be, as argued earlier, that as five of these myths have to do with the womyn's appearance and behaviour, that the district surgeons represent a more conservative group of respondents. The district surgeons represent an unanimous group with little diversity, in comparison to the rape survivors and police persons. Most of them are older than 51 years, Afrikaans-speaking, white men. It is, therefore, almost inevitable that they will share more or less the same viewpoints regarding rape myths. The conservative make-up of the group of respondents will thus be reflected in their more conservative viewpoints which are in agreement with the myths. This is also true of their viewpoints about the relationship between the womyn and the rapist i.e. that rapists must be unknown, non-white men.

Their different viewpoints can also be the result of the fact that their contact with the rape survivors is limited to the medical and forensic investigation, and that they do not necessarily know the full the facts of a specific rape case. The information at their disposal is less than that of the police
persons who are directly involved in the comprehensive investigation of the crime. While there is a lesser possibility of misinformation and ignorance amongst the police persons, with the accompanying stronger belief in myths, the district surgeons can more easily continue to believe the myths.

In comparison to the other two groups of respondents, the rape survivors' viewpoints are directly based on their experience as rape survivors.

5.4.2. The strength of rape myths is well illustrated by the fact that some of the views held by the district surgeons are contradictory:

(1) While 47.1% of the district surgeons disagree with the statement that the rapist is usually unknown to the womyn (Figure 53), 70.6% of them disagree with the statement that the rapist is almost never a family member (Figure 54). Therefore, although seven in ten agree that the rapist is often a family member, almost half still believe that the rapist is a stranger. In stark contrast to this, 81% of the rape survivors indicated that they knew the rapist.

It is unclear why this contradiction exists. It is possible that this is just a very clear indication of the strong presence of myths in our society. It can also be an indication of the contradiction between facts and myths and the way in which they influence one another. While facts indicate that very often rapists are family members, the myth that the rapist is a stranger is just as strongly present and provides an opportunity to shift the emphasis from the family to a stranger. It makes it easier to deal with the issue, rather than to be faced with the fact that many wimmin are raped by immediate family members.

(2) The same is true for the statement about wimmin's appearance and behaviour. While 58.9% of the district surgeons agree that a womyn can ask to be raped by the way she dresses
(Figure 37), and 64.7% agree that wimmin can ask to be raped through their behaviour (body language) (Figure 38), 82.3% indicated that they disagree that wimmin who were raped were probably behaving seductively and were asking for it (Figure 41). As discussed earlier, the viewpoints about wimmin's appearance and behaviour could be a reflection of the conservative composition of the group of district surgeons. Their disagreement with the myth concerning wimmin being seductive could possibly be due to an awareness that it is not politically correct to hold this view. They may be aware of the fact that they might be criticised for such a belief. It is possible that their stated response to this myth are not a true reflection of what they really think. It is, however, also possible that it is an indication of the stronger presence of certain myths in society. Female appearance and behaviour are clearly visible and it is easier to uphold myths about it. Believing the myth about wimmin being seductive, also contradicts the position of the district surgeons that it is "nice/good" girls who do not get raped. Belief in the myths about female appearance and behaviour are easier to keep intact and to reconcile with reality.

This is also in contradiction to the district surgeons' reactions to the statement that wimmin deserve to be raped when they hitchhike, go out alone, talk to unknown men or wear sexy clothes. Only 11.7% agreed with the statement, while 76.5% disagreed. Why this contradiction after the district surgeons agreed that wimmin ask to be raped through appearance and behaviour? Maybe the contradiction is due to the wording of the myths. While the myths about appearance and behaviour use the words "can ask", this myth uses the words "deserve to". It may have been interpreted that although wimmin can "ask" to be raped, they don't "deserve" to be raped. However, this remains speculation and it is unclear why these contradictions exist, where unanimity might have been expected.

5.4.3. For some of the myths some respondents did not have very strong viewpoints either way
These myths are:

1. Rapists are mentally ill (Figure 51)
2. Rape is an uncontrollable sexual desire (Figure 52)
3. The rapist is usually unknown to the womyn (Figure 53)
4. A womyn can ask to be raped by the way she dresses (Figure 37)
5. A womyn can ask to be raped through her behaviour (body language) (Figure 38)

Neither the rape survivors, district surgeons, nor the police persons had very strong views on whether or not a rapist is mentally ill. This rather divided response could be due to the fact that the issue is controversial, and people feel reluctant to take a strong stand - especially as the rapists' mental health is usually used as a mitigating factor. It also illustrates the strength of misconceptions and the level of confusion caused by the rape myths that prevail in society.

The same can be said about the statement that rape is a result of uncontrollable sexual desire. While in each of the groups of respondents the majority disagreed with the statement, they did not do so very strongly and a significant proportion of the respondents agreed with the statement. It is interesting to note that there is very little difference between the responses of the different groups.

A similar lack of a strong standpoints either way, is present in the district surgeons responses to the statement that the rapist is usually unknown to the womyn. While 47.1% disagreed, 47% agreed with the statement (Figure 53). It is unclear why this is the situation, given the uniformity of the group of respondents.

The police persons responded similarly to the myths concerning female appearance and behaviour. They are equally divided on the myth that a womyn can ask to be raped by the way she dresses: half disagreed, while the other 50% agreed (Figure 37). In much
the same vein 55% disagreed that a womyn can ask to be raped through her behaviour, while 45% agreed with the statement (Figure 38). It is unclear whether, for example, the almost equal gender division made the difference, or perhaps the age distribution. It is unclear why respondents refrained from taking a strong, unambiguous standpoint. It could, however, indicate the relative unimportance of female behaviour and appearance where rape is concerned: wimmin get raped despite their behaviour and appearance, and not necessarily because of it. It could, therefore, indicate that we are concentrating on the wrong issues when we emphasise wimmin's behaviour and appearance.

5.4.4. There are a number of statements to which some respondents reacted in an absolute (unanimous) way:

(1) Only certain types of wimmin get raped (Figure 46)

(2) "Nice/good girls" don't get raped (Figure 45)

(3) A womyn who is not ready cannot be raped (Figure 47)

(4) If wimmin stay at home, where they belong, they won't get raped (Figure 40)

(5) Rapists are usually men of colour (Figure 50)

(6) A womyn who was raped was probably seductive and was asking for it (Figure 41)

(7) Secretly wimmin really like being raped (Figure 48)

(8) Wimmin like being treated violently (Figure 49)

All the rape survivors and police persons (100%) disagreed that it is only certain types of wimmin who get raped, while 88.3% of the district surgeons also disagreed (Figure 46). Again, all the rape survivors (100%) disagreed strongly that good girls don't get raped. All the police persons (100%) also disagreed, while 88.2% of the district surgeons disagreed with the statement (Figure 45). All the rape survivors (100%) disagreed that a womyn who is not ready cannot be raped, as did all (100%) the district surgeons (Figure 47). Every last rape survivor (100%)
disagreed that if wimmin stay at home they won't get raped, while 64.7% of the district surgeons and 95% of the police persons also disagreed (Figure 40). The rape survivors (100%) disagreed unanimously that rapists are usually men of colour, while 58.9% of the district surgeons and 95% of the police person respondents also disagreed (Figure 50). All (100%) the police persons disagreed that a womyn who was raped was probably seductive and was asking for it. A very high 95.2% of the rape survivors and 82.3% of the district surgeons also disagreed (Figure 41). All (100%) of police persons disagreed that secretly wommin really like being raped, while 86% of the rape survivors and 82.3% of the district surgeons disagreed with the statement (Figure 48). All (100%) of the police persons disagreed with the statement that wommin like being treated violently, compared to 95.3% of the rape survivors and 82.3% of the district surgeons (Figure 49).

As is evident from the reactions of the respondents, rape myths form part of the mechanism developed by patriarchal society to keep wimmin in a position of powerlessness. More specifically, the myths underline and sustain a womyn's powerlessness within the specific situation of rape; while at the same time they reinforce men's supremacy. These myths function "to keep womyn in their place", while simultaneously allowing men to determine society's beliefs, values, opinions and even so-called "facts" about rape.

The logic of rape, according to the various rape myths, says that if a womyn gets raped it is her own fault because:
* wimmin can avoid being raped,
* wimmin can "ask" to be raped through their behaviour and appearance,
* secretly wimmin like being raped,
* she is the "type" of girl to get raped,
* wimmin deserve to be raped when they...
* wimmin usually make false reports against innocent men,
* if a womyn is not ready she cannot be raped and
* if a womyn stays at home where she belongs she won't get raped,
but if, for some reason a man is guilty, then he must be excused because:
* rapists are mentally ill,
* rape is an expression of an uncontrollable male sexual drive and
* rapists are usually unknown to the womyn and are never family members.

Rape myths have two fundamental functions: to **accuse** the womyn and to **excuse** the man. Apart from the fact that rape myths justify (sexual) aggression against womyn, they also have other very important consequences:

# There is a strong correlation between the low rate of reported rapes and the widespread acceptance of rape myths (Russell, 1982).
# Rape myths also contribute to the "blaming-the-victim" attitude, which makes it more difficult for womyn to seek help after being raped (Ehrhart & Sandler, 1985).
# The fact that the question of responsibility always comes back to the womyn, distinguishes it from other crimes and definitely adds to the trauma of the rape experience (Deming & Eppy, 1981:366).
# Rape myths help to shift the responsibility and blame from the offender to the womyn (Scully & Marolla, 1985).
# Various authors stress the important effect of rape myths on the way in which womyn are treated by institutions, and the negative effect they have on public opinion regarding rape. The result of this is generally referred to as "the second assault/victimization" of the womyn.

---


What becomes clear is that the acceptance of these myths reinforces a situation in which wimmin have little or no power over their own lives, destinies, and decisions. Rape constitutes a (violent), physical removal of the womyn's power - either as a result of the man being physically stronger, or by using/threat of using a weapon. The result is the same: power is concentrated in the "hands" of the man, and the womyn is stripped of all power.

All of these stereotypical myths aim to strengthen and re-emphasise wimmin's powerlessness and men's position of total control. This is done in the following ways:

# It takes away the responsibility and guilt from the man and places it on the womyn,
# It puts the blame and responsibility on womyn for not staying within the parameters that patriarchy has set for her, in terms of behaviour and appearance,
# The deviant, coercive actions of men are de-emphasised and are treated in a less serious light.

This means that:
# The womyn is seen as wrong/bad, not the man,
# Change is the responsibility of wimmin, not men,
# Which means that rape is the problem of wimmin, not men.

The ultimate goal of the myths surrounding rape is control and power, which inevitably means less (or no) power for wimmin.

In the chapter that follows, I will outline a feminist analysis of the current rape law. In the light of wimmin's experiences of rape, one would expect the rape law to provide a recourse to justice, however, I will show how it exacerbates wimmin's negative experiences of powerlessness.
CHAPTER 6

THE RAPE LAW

"...rape is a distinct sexual crime and is definitely to be distinguished from unnatural sexual intercourse in the sense of penetration in some other form - oral, anal, or with an object. The interest protected in the case of rape (where normal sexual intercourse is involved) is the freedom of the individual to have sexual intercourse of his (sic) own free will, while in cases of unnatural sexual intercourse something is involved which is - be it with or without consent - against nature" (South African Law Commission, 1985:21-22)

"No false accusation by a girl is more common than that of forced sexual intercourse" (D.G. van der Keessel, Dutch lawyer, 1772)

The way in which the submissive and dominant characteristics of the womyn/man relationship are maintained, is clearly visible in (South African) rape law and the way in which it is practised. In what follows I will give a brief overview of what constitutes the current rape laws, as well as analyze the way in which this reinforces wommin's negative experience of rape. I will show how the rape law was written, and is maintained, from men's viewpoint, a result of the working of the inter-active forces as described in chapter 4. The result is that wommins' powerlessness and subordination are maintained, while the law protects the interests of men and offers little, if any, protection for wommin. It is a discriminatory law, which works to the benefit of men and the detriment of wommin.

The reader should bear in mind that this is not intended to be a detailed analysis of the full extent and practice of rape law. I will merely concentrate on those elements which perpetuate wommin's position of powerlessness and subordination in society. The rape law does not empower wommin, but rather, often operates to our detriment. The criticisms presented here against the way in which the present rape laws operate, can be divided into two groups, which while complementing each other, have different emphases. These are: the strong critique of Catherine
MacKinnon, who interprets the rape law in terms of the larger question of wimmin's sexuality, wimmin's subordination and men's domination; and the critique of Steven Box and Colleen Hall who emphasize the force/coercion/violence of the crime of rape.

6.1. A herstorical overview

From the earliest of times one of a womyn's primary roles has been that of reproduction. This right and ability to reproduce did, however, not legally belong to the womyn to control, but was under the control of her father and, after marriage under that of her husband and his family. Rape was, therefore, originally seen as a form of theft committed against the womyn's father or husband (Labuschagne, 1992:73). For centuries, rape was treated as part of property crime - the theft of virginity - perpetrated against the womyn's guardian (her father). Her guardian was the only person entitled to claim some form of compensation, as he would suffer a reduced bride-price as result of his (now) non-virginal daughter. The womyn herself had no claim, nor any rights, as she was not perceived to be the injured party (Hall, 1988:79). Thus, rape law is less concerned with those acts which do not violate the property rights of men over wommin (for example marital rape, rapes of unmarried wommin with prior sexual experience) but punishes those acts which do (rapes of chaste wommin).

In these earliest cases, it was the custom that the man who's womyn was raped could in return, rape one of the womyn of the offender. This was prevailing view of rape in both the Germanic and old-Roman societies. Prior to this, rape was not seen as a misconduct, but was a way of securing a wife through what was referred to as a "theft-marriage" (Labuschagne, 1992:73).

This system reflects a conception of female sexuality as the property of men. A womyn was controlled and owned and her

28) "Rape" is from the Latin "rapere", meaning to steal, seize or carry away.
consent or non-consent was totally irrelevant. Rape laws and marriage laws were twin mechanisms in the legal regulation of men's rights over female sexuality and reproductive powers (Hall, 1988:79).

In what later evolved into Roman law, rape was regarded as part of "stuprum" - the defloweration of a virtuous girl or widow without violence, according to Moorman Misdaden in Snyman (1986:400) and it was punished as a form of "raptus" (abduction) (Khan, 1985:37). It was accepted that both men and women could be raped. Although this aspect was not later imported into either South African or British law, it is present in American law. The Roman law proviso which stated the man had to have reached the age of puberty, before he could be said to be capable of having sexual intercourse, and therefore committing rape, was present in the South African law until 1987, when it was abolished (Khan, 1985:37).

In Roman Dutch law, rape was seen as sexual intercourse between a man and a woman without her consent and through violent means. The usual punishment for rape was the death penalty. The following were treated as forms of "stuprum": sexual intercourse with a woman either sleeping, intoxicated or mentally deranged, intercourse by fraud, a teacher having sexual intercourse with his pupil, or seducing a woman who was old enough to give her consent. These qualified forms of "stuprum" were punishable as seduction. It was seen as essential that the woman indicated her unwillingness to have sexual intercourse (absence of consent) by shouting out and by formally charging the man. Submission without outward rejection was viewed as consent. Marital rape was not treated as a crime, except when the man and woman were judicially separated (Khan, 1985:38-39).

6.2. The (South African) rape law

---

25) This became later known as the "Hue and Cry Rule" (Burchell & Milton, 1991:448).
MacKinnon's (1983:635) theory of power states that "sexuality is gendered as gender is sexualized." Through the erotization of dominance and submission, society creates what is known as womyn (submission) and man (dominance). This is the social meaning of sex and the feminist account of gender inequality. The central process within this dynamic is sexual objectification and the subordination of wimmin.

In the light of the above, the feminist view of rape, as central to wimmins social condition, breaks up into two possible forms of interpretation:

(1) Rape as an act of violence, not sexuality. Here rape is seen as the displacement of power, based on physical force, onto sexuality. It is not seen as domination.

(2) Rape, and the violence involved in it, as an expression of men's sexuality. This view is based on wimmins experiences and sees sexuality as a social sphere of men's power, of which forced sex is paradigmatic. Violence does not make rape less sexual, but rather to the degree that coercion is an integral part of male sexuality, rape may be sexual because it is violent.30 Rape defined as "violence not sex" or "violence against wimmin" separates sexuality from gender and affirms sex while it rejects violence (rape).

This also illustrates the difference between the point of view of the law (state) and the experience of wimmin. While the law sees the intercourse in rape, wimmin see the rape in intercourse (MacKinnon, 1983:646).

In treating rape as part of wimmin's sexuality, and in analysing its role with regard to men's power and domination, MacKinnon (1983:647) suggests that we do not look at the violation of rape, but rather at the non-violation of intercourse. In other words,

30) For further details of the first interpretation see the writings of inter alia Brownmiller, S. (1975) and for the second interpretation, see the writings of inter alia Russell, D. (1982).
in order to determine what is wrong with rape, find out what is right about (heterosexual) sex. With this as a point of departure, I will analyze the negative elements in (South African) rape law.

"If sexuality is central to women's definition and forced sex is central to sexuality, rape is indigenous, not exceptional, to women's social condition" (MacKinnon, 1989:172).

South African rape law defines "rape" as the (1) unlawful and (2) intentional (3) sexual intercourse by a male with a (4) non-consenting female (Snyman, 1986:489; Burchell & Milton, 1991:435).

The key characteristics of this law are as follows:

(1) "sexual intercourse", is the penetration of the vagina by the penis,
(2) Such intercourse must fall within the legal category of "unlawful", which means any act of intercourse occurring between unmarried partners,
(3) This act can occur only between a man (the rapist) and a womyn (the one who is raped),
(4) It must be distinguished by the fact that it takes place without the consent of the womyn, and
(5) The act must be intentional, and not negligent or "accidental" (Hall, 1988:67-68).

6.2.1 Unlawfulness

This element of the law requires that, in order for the act which was committed, to be considered rape, it must be against the law. It means that intercourse occurring between unmarried partners

---

3) Catherine MacKinnon represents the radical feminist view on rape when stating that "politically, I call it rape whenever a woman has sex and feels violated. Part of the culture of sexual inequality ... is that the definition of rape is not based on our (wimmin's) sense of our violation" (MacKinnon, 1987:82).
only, can be viewed as rape. There are however exceptions to this rule. The most important exception in which intercourse without consent was, until very recently, seen as lawful, and therefore not rape, was in the case of marital rape. The other exception to the rule, was the assumption that a boy under the age of 14 is incapable of sexual intercourse. This proviso was however abolished in 1987. Still in existence, however, is the viewpoint of rape of a prostitute, which is made clear in the following remark made in the case of R v Sibande, 1958:

"...rape upon a prostitute...though it is a crime of rape, would not ordinarily call for a penalty of equal severity to that imposed upon a woman of refinement and good character" (Burchell & Milton, 1991:441).

The prior (sexual) herstory of the womyn plays an important role in the police investigation, and may lead to the police rejecting the case as "unfounded" or "false". If the womyn is a prostitute, the case may not be considered to be rape, because she has previously consented to have sexual relations (MacDonald, 1971).

Tribal customs permitting rape in certain circumstances is however not recognized by the law (Burchell & Milton, 1991:441).

Until very recently it was still possible for a man to have sexual intercourse with his wife against her will, without the law interpreting it as rape. It was only in 1991 that legal history was made in Bisho, Ciskei, when M.R. Ncanywa was charged and convicted of raping his wife. This overturned the British rule known as Hale's Rule, and set a precedent for changing the South African law on marital rape. According to the

---

32) In the 18th century, the chief justice Lord Hale, remarked that "the husband cannot be guilty of a rape committed by himself upon his lawful wife, for by their mutual matrimonial consent and contract the wife hath given herself ... unto her husband which she cannot retract" (Gevisser, 1991:23).
Prevention of Family Violence Act no. 133 of 1993, it is now unlawful for a man to have sexual intercourse with his wife against her will, as this constitutes rape.

6.2.2 Intention refers to the requirement that, it must be shown that the man had the subjective intention of having sexual intercourse with the womyn, knowing that she did not consent to it. The element of intention is built around the issue of consent, as rape is committed only when the man foresees the possibility that the womyn did or will not consent, yet proceeds with intercourse regardless. If the man genuinely believes that the womyn did give her consent, although she did not, this mistaken belief will be attributable to the womyn's active or passive conduct (Burchell & Milton, 1991:447).

Rape is a crime against womyn, yet the womyn is held responsible for the man's interpretation of her willingness, or lack thereof, to have intercourse with him. This is tantamount to holding the victim of a robbery responsible for not convincing the thief that he did not want to be robbed. It is not the rapist who is held responsible, but rather the womyn, although she is the victim. Rape is the only crime based on the interpretations and perceptions of the offender, and not the victim. This point of view is firmly embedded in our societal beliefs, as is clearly represented by rape myths. What womyn want and say are often interpreted as meaning something other than that which is verbalised. "Hesitation" means shyness, "resistance" mean that she is playing hard to get and "no" definitely means yes. When a man initiates, sexual intercourse the womyn is supposed to hesitate so as not to appear too eager and available. In other words, her resistance is read by the man as encouragement to proceed and take control. When she says "no", he hears "yes" and continues to rape/have intercourse with or have intercourse

[33] The Prevention of Family Violence Act no. 133 of 1993 states that: "Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in any law or in the common law, a husband may be convicted of the rape of his wife."
with/rape her.

Rape law requires that the man (the accused) possesses a criminal mind ("mens rea") \(^3\) for his act to be seen as criminal. This refers to what the man understood at the time, or to what a reasonable man would have understood at the time of the incident. The problem with rape lies in its meaning for the womyn (the victim), but the law sees its criminality as central in the meaning of the act for the man (the assailant). What this means is that the man's perception of what the womyn wanted, determines whether or not she is treated as violated in terms of the law. Thus, the legal problem is to determine whose interpretation constitutes what actually happened. The assumption is that what took place exists objectively and can be determined objectively, as if its separate from the gender of the participants and the gendered nature of their interaction. What happens is that the law, in determining whether or not a rape took place, presumes a single underlying reality - that of the man - and not a split reality as caused by the inequality between men and wimmin.

What the law's interpretation in fact means is:

"... because he did not perceive that she did not want him, she was not violated. She had sex. Sex itself cannot be an injury. Women consent to sex every day. Sex makes a woman a woman. Sex is what women are for" (MacKinnon, 1983:652-653).

Seen in this light, men's belief that wimmin fabricate rape charges, after consenting to sex, makes sense. To a man the accusations are false because to them, the facts describe sex, and to interpret them as rape does not fit into their experience. Since men seldom think that their experience of the real world is not also the reality for wimmin, they can only explain it as the womyn making a false rape charge (MacKinnon, 1983:653).

\(^3\) The meaning of "mens rea", freely translated from Latin is that the act is not culpable unless a guilty mind exists. It is generally translated as "guilty mind, wrongful intent, criminal purpose or intention or criminal intention" (South African Law Commission, 1982:4).
"From whose standpoint, and in whose interest, is a law that allows one person's conditioned unconsciousness to contraindicate another's experience of violation?"

This aspect of the rape law reflects the inequality of society, by looking at an injury done to a womyn from the viewpoint of the rapist, and rewards men with acquittals for not taking wimmin's points of view of sexual encounters, into account (MacKinnon, 1983:654).

Khan (1985:6) acknowledges the problem in dealing with rape in this way. He recognizes that this can provide a man with an excuse for committing rape, e.g. that he did not know that the womyn did not consent, because he was, for example, drunk.

"... our law should not unwittingly provide a possible defence to a clever perpetrator and thereby perpetuate the crime"

6.2.3 Sexual intercourse

Rape is only committed by the insertion of a man's penis into a womyn's vagina. The definition does not include any other form of penetration, with any other object. Actual penetration of the vagina by the penis is a requisite element. The penetration may be of even the slightest degree, and it is of less importance whether or not the hymen is ruptured, semen emitted or pregnancy caused. The rape of a virgin, or the fact that the women was impregnated, constitutes an aggravation and results in a more severe penalty. Furthermore, men cannot be raped, nor can a womyn rape another womyn or a man, but a womyn can be an accomplice to the crime (Khan, 1985:9-10).
In this regard the South African Law Commission (1985: 21-22) stated:

"... rape is a distinct sexual crime and is definitely to be distinguished from unnatural sexual intercourse (!) in the sense of penetration in some other form - oral, anal or with an object. The interest protected in the case of rape (where normal sexual intercourse is involved) (!) is the freedom of the individual to have sexual intercourse of his (sic) (!) own free will, while in cases of unnatural sexual intercourse something is involved which is - be it with or without consent - against nature." (My emphasis)

This reflects a deeply entrenched dichotomy: a division of sexual activity into natural and unnatural categories. In its legal formulation, this dichotomy appears as separate categories of sexual deviance: rape, indecent assault and so-called "unnatural offenses". The implication of this is clear: if forcible anal penetration constitutes an "unnatural offence", then forcible vaginal penetration (what the law calls "rape") must be a natural offence. Vaginal "rape" is thus more natural than anal "rape"! The existence of the dichotomy cannot itself explain why anal or oral penetration, of an unwilling womyn or man is categorized as a lesser offence than vaginal penetration. From the perspective of the violated person, whether female or male, such "unnatural" penetration may well be more traumatic than vaginal rape and may cause even more severe physical injury (Hall, 1988:77-78).

One of the major problems with the current definition of rape is that it is too narrow a definition. Not only is it sex-specific, but also orifice- and instrument-specific, and precludes marital rape. This definition focuses only on vaginal penetration and ignores anal and oral penetration, by defining them as acts of indecent assault. There is also a total exclusion of any other object, except the penis, penetrating the vagina. This reveals a male preoccupation with the risk of a respectable woman getting pregnant, rather than a concern for the physical and psychological injury during and after rape. Feminists want the concept of rape broadened to make it non-sex, non-orifice and
The inadequacies of the definition may be highlighted by looking at the following examples:

(1) X, a total stranger, while threatening Y with a knife, forcibly penetrates her vaginally.

(2) X and Z take Y to a lonely spot where they force her to perform a variety of sexual acts with them. X then penetrates Y anally. Afterwards Z forces his fist into Y's vagina and rips her internally.

(3) X, a male, assaults Y, also a male, and forcibly penetrates him anally.

(4) X, a female, overpowers Y, another female, and forcibly subjects her to a variety of sexual acts.

(5) X, an employer, informs Y that she will lose her job unless she has sex with him. Y, who desperately needs the job to support her family, agrees.

(6) X, who is already married, marries the unsuspecting Y. X and Y have consensual intercourse with Y believing that she is X's lawful wife (Hall, 1988:68).

According to the present legal definition of rape, only example (1) constitutes an act of rape. Example (2), (3) and (4) will be seen as acts of indecent assault, while (5) and (6) will, at most, be treated as crimen injuria. However, there is one common factor present in each of the cases: A form of compulsion is always present irrespective of the sex of the aggressor or the "victim", the orifice penetrated or the instrument of penetration, e.g. example (1): threat, force; example (2): force; example (3): force; example (4): overpowers, force. The common denominator in all of the examples is the threat of some sort of

---

\[35\) Many feminists e.g. Brownmiller, S. 1975; Burgess, A.W. & Holmstrom, L.L. 1975 "Accountability: A Right of the victim" American Journal of Psychiatric Nursing 13(3) etc. have defined rape as any sexual intimacy forced on one person by another. Some feminists e.g.: Brownmiller, 1975 believe that penetration of any body orifice, not just the vagina, should be included in the definition of rape.
sanction, whether it is the threat of physical violence, or economic dependence, or the actual use of force and/or physical violence. The common factor is sexual access gained under coercion, which combines all the acts into one category of rape behaviour (Hall, 1988:69). In all of the examples one of the parties (B) was forced into a subordinate position of powerlessness, while the other party (A) by way of threats or actual force took control of B. It does not matter how B was forced into submission, or what B's gender is. The fact of the matter is that B was forced into submission. B's choice (of behaviour), independence and own control was taken from her/him. B was made to be powerless and subordinate - a "womyn".

"Rape is a man's act, whether it is a male or a female man, and whether it is a man relatively permanently, or relatively temporarily; and being raped is a woman's experience, whether it is a female or a male woman, and whether it is a woman relatively permanently or relatively temporarily" (Shafer & Frye, 1977:334).

The perception of rape in terms of exclusive penile penetration, demonstrates a clear male bias. According to the current law the essence of the definition is perceived as an act of "normal" heterosexual intercourse without the consent of one (female) party. The model of normal sex is in itself a men's model which views vaginal penetration by the penis as the central "normal" sexual activity (Hall, 1988:71). MacKinnon (1983:647 & 1987:87 & 1989:172) agrees with this viewpoint. It is interesting to note that the law designed to protect wimmin's sexuality from forcible violation, defines the protected in male genital terms. The male (genitals) are the important aspect. The definition does not take into account that penile invasion of the vagina may be less important in terms of wimmins sexuality, pleasure and violation, than it is to male sexuality. This definition of rape centres quite clearly upon a man-defined loss, and not on either wimmin's point of view or experience.
This essentially men’s perspective is made possible by the definition of both intercourse and rape around the requirement of penetration (a male activity), and the incorporation into both of an element of coercion. Several feminists have characterized normal (hetero) sexuality as coercive, as men’s sexuality is linked to aggression, forcefulness and initiative, while wimmin’s sexuality is constructed as passive and receptive. Normal sexuality puts men in the role of predator and women in the role of victim. The basic elements of rape are thus already present in "normal" (hetero) sexual intercourse! (Hall, 1988:71-72).

The reality of rape, as defined by the law, is of a sexual experience for the man and the womyn involved. This "reality" is men’s reality as they interpret rape from the perspective of the dominant, ruling group. This dominant ideology is strongly gender-based, a patriarchal ideology of which the present legal definition of rape forms a part. Men’s point of view (how they perceive wimmin’s experience rape) is presented as objective truth and when translated into law, it takes on the appearance of abstract universal truths (Hall, 1988:72).

In the words of Catherine MacKinnon (1983:638):

"...male power extends beneath the representation of reality to its construction: it makes women (as it were) and so verifies (makes true) who women "are" in its view, simultaneously confirming its way of being and its vision of truth..."

Men’s reality, which presents itself as the objective reality, rejects alternative, non-men’s realities (e.g. a womyn’s/feminist reality). It divides the world into "the men’s world", and the negative "other". Rape is constructed as an act of non-consensual sexual intercourse in which both the man and the womyn experience and perceive the event in a similar sexual way (Hall, 1988:73).


37) A point also made by MacKinnon, 1983.
The feminist position is that the exclusive reality which we accept as objective truth, is constructed by the dominant group—men. Consequently, the construction of rape as a sexual event does not reflect a universal truth existing "out there". The dominant meaning of rape is a sexual one, which invalidates the alternative view of rape as forms of violence. Thus, the mystification of rape in the legal definition plays a part in the maintenance of men's domination (Hall, 1988:74).

According to Hall (1988:69) the essential emphasis, in the legal definition of rape, should be the gaining of sexual access without the genuine consent of one party as well as the compulsion applied by the other party. This results in a category of rape behaviour in which the sex of the "victim" or the aggressor, the instrument used and the avenue of penetration are all irrelevant for definitional purposes.

In the words of Susan Brownmiller (1975:378):

"... while the penis may remain the rapist's favourite weapon, his prime instrument of vengeance, his triumphant display of power, it is not in fact his only tool... Sticks, bottles, and even fingers are often substituted for the "natural" thing... Who is to say that the sexual humiliation suffered through forced oral or anal penetration is a lesser violation of the personal private inner space, a lesser injury to mind, spirit and sense of self ?... All acts of sex forced on unwilling victims deserve to be treated in concept as equally grave offenses in the eyes of the law, for the avenue of penetration is less significant than the intent to degrade."

A further area where change is being fought for is in the area of sexual access, which should not be narrowly equated with penetration of any part of the "womyn's" body. Other sexual acts, which do not involve penetration, should also be included as part of rapist behaviour. In a sexual attack, the difference between penetration and other "sexual" acts is one of differing degree rather than essential nature (Hall, 1988:69-70).
6.2.4 Non-consensual act

The law divides wimmin into different spheres of consent, according to how much say we are legally presumed to have in terms of sexual access to ourselves, by various categories of men. This means that little girls (virgins) may not consent, but wives must consent, and have in fact very little, if any, choice in terms of consent. If the aim of the rape law is really to benefit wimmin, to enforce wimmin's control over their own bodies and sexuality, then their would be no question about marital rape when a womyn does not consent to sexual intercourse with her husband, nor would statutory rape be enforced, against the wishes, of underage consenting girls. (The emphasis on consent would mean that an underage girl may consent to sexual intercourse if she so wishes.) At the same time, if the man knew the womyn, consent is inferred - to the extent to which the parties involved relate to each other, it was not rape, it was personal. This is a reflection of men's perception that wimmin they know meaningfully consent to sex with them (MacKinnon, 1983:648 & 1989:175).

Sexual intercourse needs to have been performed without the consent of the womyn, for the conduct to amount to rape. As submission is often induced, passivity on the part of the womyn does not equal consent, and as a general rule, intoxication renders the womyn incapable of consenting. A womyn who is mentally ill (insane) can also not be expected to give her consent. If the man uses threats and force to induce the womyn into submission, this will vitiate consent (Khan, 1985:11,13). It is also presumed that a girl under the age of twelve years is incapable of consenting. An interesting aspect of the question of consent is the issue of submission. Submission is not consent: a difference is made between submission and consent on the basis that every consent involves submission, but submission does not necessarily involves consent (Burchell & Milton,
The application of the rule of consent, rests on the amount of physical resistance by the womyn, in comparison to the amount of physical force used by the man. At its extreme, the application of the above rule will mean that where the womyn submits without physical resistance to sexual intercourse, no rape is committed. In South Africa the essence of the law is that there must be a lack of consent, whether due to force, or fear, or fraud or the incapacity to consent. The crucial question is thus, whether or not the womyn consented to intercourse. If she did, even though reluctantly, under protest, and in tears, rape is not committed (Burchell & Milton, 1991:442-443).

Feminists criticize this part of the definition of the rape law for a number of reasons: it contains a suppressed and unjustified "exclusion" clause. It excludes a whole category of "sexually worthless" women, for example prostitutes, whores, drug addicts, alcoholics, sexually experienced women, divorced women etc. These wimmin who, because they lack "respectability", are considered to have no valid reason for not consenting to men. They do not deserve legal protection and are so-called "bad girls/wimmin". This is what Williams & Holmes (1981:26) refer to as "inappropriate rape": the rape of "an inappropriate woman", one whose reputation and/or activities are not imputable; and rape involving a weapon and/or excessive violence. This is part of the distinction between "good" women (mothers, married women, virgins) and "bad" women (prostitutes, sexually experienced women, single women, lesbians), kept in place and sustained by the male/female dichotomy.

The notion of "consent" places an unfair burden of proof on the woman. The concept of consent must also be re-examined, possibly

38) To say that every consent involves submission is, again, a very male perspective. When both parties submit (to each other) a position of equality in consent can be reached, and not a situation of one party submitting to the other.
by shifting from "without the womyn's consent" to "coerced by the offender". The consequence of the present definition is that in practice, the law is primarily concerned with sexual access achieved by the means of actual or threatened physical violence, which is considered to indicate that consent did not take place. By making lack of consent the distinguishing feature, the law misses an obvious point. It is not so much the absence of consent that is important, but the presence of coercion which makes rape different from normal acts of sexual intercourse. Where the womyn's choice is restricted by the man being able to impose sanctions for the woman's refusal, the question of her consent ought to be secondary to his ability to coerce (Box, 1983:123).

According to Box (1983:124) the law only focuses on the surface appearance of consent, rather than considering what she calls the "conditions for genuine consent", which is that both persons must be (1) conscious, (2) fully informed, (3) economically independent and (4) positive in their desires.

The very strong objection to this aspect of the legal rape definition, is that it shifts the inquiry from the behaviour of the man (the accused), to that of the womyn. Her non-consent, not his compulsion, is the issue. The nature and degree of compulsion used on the womyn becomes part of the proof of her non-consent. The law evaluates the behaviour of the man (the accused) by reference to the behaviour of the womyn, on the assumption that the rape was an interaction in which both parties had the same position of power and which therefore had the same, shared meaning for both parties. This underlying assumption is,

39) On this point MacKinnon (1983) differs radically from Box. This is exactly the point that she makes in looking at rape in terms of the bigger picture of wimmin's sexuality: that coercion, force and even violence are not excluded from "normal" sexual intercourse and that it is also sexual and part of "normal" sexuality. We must not only look at what is the violation of rape, but rather at what is the non-violation of intercourse. In order to tell what is wrong with rape, tell what is right about (heterosexual) sex (MacKinnon, 1983:647).
however, not the truth (as argued before). The result of this wrongfully placed emphasis is that it represents a distortion of the central issue: it is not so much the absence of consent as the presence of coercion which is of major importance (Hall, 1988:74-75). As stated by Steven Box (1983: 123):

"In a situation where the female's choice is severely restricted by the male being able to impose sanctions for refusal, the question of consent should become secondary to his ability to coerce."

This view represents a very important shift of focus from the subjective state of mind of the womyn, to the imbalance of power between the man and the womyn.

Because it is built on the idea of a voluntary actor, it fails to include a consideration for coerced consent or submission, other than under physical duress. For example, it ignores the possibility that a woman can be coerced to submit because of her economic dependency on the man, threats made to her etc. (Box, 1983:121). It must be taken into account that one person may exercise various kinds of power over another e.g. physical, emotional, psychological, economic, social or organizational (or a combination of them). Any of these can be used against the womyn in the process of gaining sexual access. Submitting to the sexual attack may well be the choice of the lesser of two evils and, the womyn may well be acting from a position of necessity or under duress. This brings back into focus the coercion applied to the womyn. Coercion must be the crux of the inquiry, not the victim's consent (Hall, 1988:75-76).

Because rape law is defined in men's terms, the distinction between rape and sex becomes problematic in specific cases. The way to differentiate between the two, according to the current application of the law, is to look at the level of acceptable force used by the man - starting just above the level set by (what is seen as) normal male sexual behaviour - rather than at the womyn's point of violation. Rape is treated as a sex crime that is not a crime when it looks like sex. Thus, rape is very
often determined as violent, not sexual. The point implicit in this interpretation of the rape law, is men's sexually normative level of force. The question becomes one of what is seen as force, and hence violence, in terms of sexuality. This leads to the conclusion that most rapes that wimmin experience, will not be seen as violating them until sex and violence are treated as mutually definitive (MacKinnon, 1983:649 & 1987:88–89 & 1989:173).

This brings us back to the question of consent, as the line between rape and sex centres on some measure of the womyn's "will". The law treats the womyn's will as a question of consent, and consent as a function of the presence of force used. But as long as domination and submission are eroticized, force and desire are not mutually exclusive. Wimmin are socialised into passivity and men into dominance and aggression. By calling rape violence, and not sex, the law evades the central issue of who controls wommin's sexuality and the dominance/submission dynamic that defines it. When sex is violent, wimmin may have lost control over what is done, but the absence of force (violence) does not insure the presence of wimmin's control. The presence of force does not necessarily make an interaction non-sexual. If sex is normally something men do to wimmin, then the issue is no whether there was force, but rather whether consent is an at all meaningful concept to use (MacKinnon, 1983:650).

According to the law, the difference between rape and intercourse is the lack of consent of the womyn, together with a man's (usually) knowing disregard thereof. A feminist definition, on the other hand, lies in the meaning of the act, the experience, from the wimmin's viewpoint. The problem with rape is that it is an act of the subordination of wimmin by men. The important issue is not the question of what rape "is", but rather the way its social conception is shaped and refers to certain encounters. In the present order, under conditions of inequality and subject to the power relations of gender, the question of consent is a communication under conditions of inequality. Consent in terms...
of the law becomes a question of the force used by the man or the womyn's resistance, or both (MacKinnon, 1983:652).

"It (consent) transpires somewhere between what the woman actually wanted, what she was able to express about what she wanted, and what the man comprehended she wanted" (MacKinnon, 1989:182).

In conclusion, the present legal model for rape ignores the dimension of power in sexual relationships, which usually means an imbalance of power in favour of men. Secondly, the emphasis on mutual consent ignores the element of coercion. This criticism essentially proceeds from a radically different conception of rape, and forms part of a wider critique of society. The feminist critique tries to break away from the legal definition and to locate the problem within a broader understanding of sex stratification and wommin's oppression. Within this view, rape is not an isolated, deviant, sexual act but rather an act of violence and oppression against wommin. Rape is not one form of attack, but a category of behaviour, generated and kept in place by the power imbalance between men and wommin, 'nd culturally sustained in a male patriarchal, supremacist ethos. It constitutes only one of the many forms of violence against wommin (Hall, 1988:80-81).

The origins of rape can be traced back to the imbalance of power between men and wommin as social groups, that is, in their political relationship. All wommin, irrespective of age, race, social and economic circumstances have to constantly keep the possibility of being raped in mind (Hall, 1988:81-82). This constitutes a form of control over all wommin.

In terms of Brownmiller's (1976:5) argument that the threat of rape benefits all men, MacKinnon (1983:650) argues that it constitutes the social meaning of gender. To be rapable is a position which is social, not biological, and that defines what a womyn is (MacKinnon, 1983:651).
6.2.5 The "cautionary rules"

It is said that such rules must exist "to protect the accused (man) against the dangers of wrongful conviction", as reflected in the case R v Henry and Manning (1969):

"...experience has shown that female complainants have told false stories for various reasons, and sometimes for no reason at all" (Viljoen, 1992:744).

As far back as 1682 the English judge Lord Hale said:

"Rape is an accusation easily to be made and hard to be proved and harder to be defended by the party accused, tho never so innocent",

and the Dutch lawyer D.G. van der Keessel in 1772 warned that:

"no false accusation by a girl is more common than that of forced sexual intercourse" (Burchell & Milton, 1991:447).

The cautionary rules developed out of old England, during the time when rape was usually a case of a womyn of a lower social-economic status, raped by a wealthy man of a higher socio-economic status. It was argued that it would be easy for a consenting womyn to lay a charge of rape, in order to get the rich man to marry her or to enable her to settle for a large sum of money. The cautionary rules warned the jury or judge to keep in mind that, in the case of sexual offenses, the womyn may have an ulterior motive for charging the man with rape (Keyser, 1993:1).

The above assumptions are based on the belief that wimmin will lay a rape charge because of fantasy or out of spite, and therefore justifies the use of what is known as "the cautionary rules".

The implications of the cautionary rules are:

(1) that the womyn must substantiate her claim of being raped by providing evidence that she promptly complained of the rape (the "hue and cry" rule). This means that the womyn must call attention to the physical evidence of what she had suffered as soon as possible.
(2) That her charge that she was raped should be corroborated by an independent witness and

(3) evidence of the womyn's past sexual herstory is on occasion allowed to show her propensity for engaging in sexual intercourse (Burchell & Milton, 1991:447-448). It is especially the second rule that is under strong criticism, and which is, according to Burchell & Milton (1991:448), a "lingering insult" as it seems to automatically view the evidence of womyn with suspicion. The prejudiced character of these rules becomes clear when thinking in terms of other crimes in the same way: What about unwitnessed assault, or a burglar who is caught "red-handed" but without any witnesses? (Wilmot, 1992:212).

The womyn's motive for deciding to complain and to testify is viewed with much suspicion, and according to Viljoen (1992:744) this is based on two existing images of winmin:

(1) the image of a womyn as a deliberate, vengeful creature who will deliberately fabricate evidence when sexually rejected or frustrated and

(2) the image of a womyn who is inspired by sexual fantasies and who imagines that she has been raped. This is supported by the common rape myth than winmin fantasize about being raped, that winmin, in fact, want to and like being raped.

Despite the fact that the application of the cautionary rules has come under consistent criticism, they are still in use.  

40) A number of states in the USA such as Michigan, New Mexico and Florida, have revealed corroboration requirements. Requiring additional evidence or (a) witness(es) underline the stereotypes of womyn giving false reports and the question of the womyn's consent (Caringella-MacDonald, 1985:67).

41) See the criticism of inter alia Le Grande (1973); Labuschagne (1992) & Wilmot (1992).

42) The Criminal Law Revision Committee in 1972 retained it. The Committee's "Working Paper on Sexual Offenses" in 1980 substituted the word "danger" with "special need for caution" and the final 1985 report did not discuss the issue at all. It just stated that "It is recommended that the status quo be maintained."
It is interesting to look at the reasons given, by the South African Law Commission, for not amending the law. The reasons given included:

(1) A woman may have ulterior motives for bringing a charge of rape against a man; these being spite, sexual frustration, the wish to protect a friend and various other emotional traumas unique to women's gender (!).

(2) The woman may have financial motives, especially if she is pregnant as a result of the alleged "rape".

(3) Rape is a charge which is especially difficult to refute, as it usually takes place in private, hence appearing to attribute an inventive brilliance and a fiendish intent to the vast majority of complainants in sexual cases (South African Law Commission, 1985:57-62). Keyser (1993:4) also refers to reasons given for the maintenance of the cautionary rules: women have the tendency to consciously fabricate stories about rape, women are emotional and tend to get hysterical, and then imagine that they've been raped due to sexual frustration. This kind of reasoning only highlights and further emphasizes the myths about and prejudices against women. It is to the disadvantage of women and only reinforces women's general powerlessness and position of subordination.

These remarks highlight two important questions according to Wilmot (1992:215):

(1) Surely the requirement that the state must prove its case beyond any reasonable doubt should be enough, without the added burden of having to provide corroboration? This rule appears to indicate that "beyond a reasonable doubt" is not good enough. Why then is it good enough in all other offenses?
(2) It would also seem that the South African Law Commission has contradicted itself by recommending no change to these rules, while at the same time including a clause which reads:

"Everyone has the right to equality before the law, which means...no one...shall directly or indirectly favour or prejudice any person on the ground of his or her race, colour, sex, religion, ethnic origin, social class, birth, political or other views or disabilities or other natural characteristics."

If applied consistently and if it becomes part of the South African law, this clause will outlaw the cautionary rule. The cautionary rules exist and are applied despite the evidence that shows that no more false complaints of rape, than any other crime, are made.

In the case R v J it was said that:

"There is no empirical data to support the contention that in cases of this nature more false charges are laid than in any other category of crime...", and this showed that the rule "has no other purpose than to discriminate against women complainants..."

As most of the complainants in sexual offence cases are wimmin (De Rebus, 1992:173), and "the incidence of false reports for rape is exactly the same as that for other felonies - about two percent" (Viljoen, 1992:745).

MacKinnon (1983:653) explains men's justification of the application of the cautionary rule as follows. Women are constantly abused and violated by men who have no idea of what their acts mean to wimmin, and because men define these acts as "sex", the law also defines it that way.

43) In the vast majority of sexual assault cases the target is a womyn and the perpetrator a man. 98,7% of those charged with sexual assault are male (Crime Statistics, 1986). Winnin complaints of rape, indecent assault and other prosecutions of an indecent nature numbered 10 497. Men's complainants in indecent assault numbered 188. If all the sodomy cases are added, the total number of men's complainants are 664. This means that 94% of complainants of a sexual nature were wimmin ("Crimes: Prosecutions and Convictions with regard to certain offenses, 1 July 1990 - 30 June 1991, CCS Report 00-11-01").
This means that "men's pervasive belief that women fabricate rape charges after consenting to sex makes sense in this light. To them, the accusations are false because, to them, the facts describe sex. To interpret such events as rape distorts their experience. Since they seldom consider that their experience of the real is anything other than reality, they can only explain the woman's version as maliciously invented".

An interesting development after the independence of Namibia, is the fact that the court found the application of the cautionary rule, as previously used under the South African judicial system, unacceptable in the light of the inequality with which it treats wimmin. According to the Namibian Bill of Rights Article 10(2):

"no persons may be discriminated against on the ground of sex, race, colour, ethnic origin, religion, creed, or social or economic status." (Viljoen, 1992:748)

Thus, the application of the cautionary rule did not comply with the Bill of Rights. It will be interesting to see what will happen in the future South Africa and Wilmot (1992:215) rightly asks: "Does South Africa have to wait until "gender rights" are crystallised on paper before our courts take action against violation of these rights?"

6.2.6 Cross-examination into the character and sexual herstory of the womyn

The cross-examination of the witness in terms of her character and sexual herstory is the result of the emphasis on consent. In trying to establish whether a womyn gave her consent or not, the defence council will try to determine whether or not a womyn has "a tendency or predilection for engaging in consensual sexual intercourse", since this might suggest that she had indeed consented.

According to the common law, the accused is allowed to cross-examine the complainant (the womyn) as to her character when it

\[^{11}\) This is a point also made in Keyser (1993:12-13).
is relevant to her credibility, and is allowed to cross-examine her on other sexual acts performed with the accused if consent is an issue. Denial by the womyn can also be contradicted by evidence as it is relevant to the issue. Evidence may not be led by the accused, of the womyn's alleged misconduct with other men, but such questions could be put to her in cross-examination as they are relevant to credibility. However, her denial cannot be rebutted by evidence unless the evidence could be relevant to consent (Skeen, 1990:77).

With the South African Law Commission's report on "Women and Sexual Offenses in South Africa" in 1985, the Commission concluded that cross-examination by the accused, concerning previous sexual intercourse between himself and the complainant (the womyn), should be allowed, but that cross-examination into her sexual experience with men other than the accused should be prohibited, unless an application in camera is made to the court giving grounds for the admissibility of such procedures. This would prevent unnecessary and unfair attacks on her character (South African Law Commission, 1985:78).

Cross-examination into the womyn's sexual herstory can very easily turn into an opportunity to disregard what has happened to a womyn. It is tantamount to saying that a so-called "bad womyn" cannot be raped, or that it does not matter if she's raped. It infers that some wimmin are rapable and others are not.

6.3. Conclusion

The state is male, in the feminist sense of the word. The law sees and treats wimmin the way men see and treat wimmin. In the same way the state (law) coercively and authoritatively organises the social order and society in the interest of men as a collective gender group. This is achieved through men's patriarchal control over all aspects of wimmin's sexuality. Thus, men's point of view(lessness) and experience is the state's
point of view(lessness), framed in state policy and laws. The
state is male in that objectivity is its norm. It is legitimate
by its reflection of existing society. A society that was
created by it (the state/law/men), and which is made by so seeing
it, and calling the view and relation "practical rationality"

The herstorical development of rape law can be traced back to
property law, when a womyn was treated as the property of her
(legal) guardian, usually her father. Under property law wimmin
did not have any power, not even over themselves. These
principles are, to a large extent, still present in rape law
today as well as society's way of thinking about rape. It must
be remembered that there is a strong link between societal belief
and the law and that they influence each other. To be "property"
means to be under the (legal) control, that is "power", of
someone else. It means that your independence, your choice in
matters, your ability to make decisions and to have control over
yourself is not recognised, but is taken away from you. You are
not a person, you are property, and will be treated as property
- without respect, to be used when necessary, to be there for the
pleasure of your owner, to be one of many possessions for his use
(and abuse).

There can be no doubt about the point of view of the present rape
law. The rape law was written from a white, conservative, male,
heterosexual point of view(lessness): 45 the emphasis on penile
penetration and the exclusion of any other instrument of rape;
the exclusion of any other form of rape (except that of a man
raping a womyn); the emphasis on the womyn's behaviour and
appearance instead of on the man as the offender; the question
of intent that is interpreted in terms of the man's viewpoint;
the continued application of the cautionary rules and cross-
examination into the sexual herstory of the womyn. The womyn
becomes the accused. Not only does the law (that is white,

45) Point made by Catherine MacKinnon (1983)
conservative, heterosexual men) operate only in terms of men's frame of reference, but the law also makes a moral judgement in terms of what they call "unnatural offenses" (e.g. oral, anal or any other form of sex). The lawmakers have decided for us what can be considered "natural" sex. This, not surprisingly, does not include anything other than penile penetration of the vagina, which is therefore the only "natural" sex act. This very specific and exclusive point of view becomes the law, also for wimmin and the way that we are supposed to view and experience sexual intercourse and rape.

This takes away inter alia wimmin's (here as a specific political minority group) independence and ability to make decisions in terms of the (legal) definition of rape, as well as wimmin's experience of rape as a continuum of rapist behaviour. What is defined as rape is based on men's perspective, not on wimmin's personal experience.

As wimmin move from the position of being the complainant to being the accused in a rape trial, certain very specific rules must be used to establish whether a womyn is really telling the truth, e.g. the cautionary rules and the cross-examination of the womyn. These are in fact two very discriminatory legal tools used to reinforce the views that wimmin cannot be trusted, that wimmin will lie to protect themselves, that they are falsely accusing the man etc. This re-emphasises the position of raped wimmin as "bad girls/wimmin", deviant creatures who do not deserve to have the law on their side.

It is interesting to note the way in which rape law uses the existing rape myths to its own benefit, and vice versa. The element of intention is assisted by myths such as: rapists are mentally ill or crazy people, a womyn can "ask" to be raped through her behaviour and appearance and rape is an expression of an uncontrollable male sexual drive. Therefore, it was not the intention of the man to rape the womyn, and he must be excused in terms of one (or all) of the above myths.
The issue of rape being a non-consensual act and the emphasis which is placed on whether or not the womyn did consent, is underlined by myths saying that: a womyn can "ask" to be raped through her behaviour and appearance (therefore she did consent); that secretly wimmin like being raped (and although they don't say it, it means that they consent to sexual intercourse); that wimmin deserve to be raped when they dress sexily, go out alone at night, talk to strangers, get drunk, do not stay at home, hitchhike etc. Furthermore, that wimmin usually make false reports against innocent men, therefore the cautionary rules are necessary, as is the strict application of the cross-examination into her sexual herstory. The implication here is that a womyn who says that she did not consent cannot be believed. Lastly, that a womyn who is not ready cannot be raped (therefore, the fact that she was raped means that she was "ready" and this implies that she gave her consent).

The use of the cautionary rules and the cross-examination of the womyn about her sexual herstory and experience is further justified by using myths such as: wimmin can "ask" to be raped through their behaviour and appearance; that secretly wimmin like being raped and that wimmin usually make false reports against innocent men. These rules must therefore be used to determine whether or not the womyn is telling the truth, but the law is based on the premise that wimmin do not tell the truth.

In the following chapter I will argue, against the conclusive background of the aforementioned chapters, that we need an alternative vision of power relations, and that a feminist perspective can provide this.

---

46) This can be completed by inserting any social taboo that wimmin are subjected to.
CHAPTER 7

A FEMINIST ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTION OF "POWER" RELATIONS

"Remember the Ladies, and be more generous and favourable to them than your ancestors. Do not put such unlimited power into the hands of the Husbands. Remember all men would be tyrants if they could. If particular care and attention is not paid to the Ladies, we are determined to foment a Rebellion, and will not hold ourselves bound by any Laws in which we have no voice, or Representation."

- Abigail Adams to her husband John Adams who was writing the laws of the new government of the USA, March 1776.

The aforementioned analysis makes the following very clear: the exclusion of wimmin from mainstream political science's analysis of power resulted in the absence of any account of wimmin's experiences and perceptions of social power relations, within mainstream political science.

As argued earlier, this is one of the results of the interaction between patriarchy manifested in societies dichotomies and visible in gendered sexuality. The importance of this interaction is not part of the mainstream political science's viewpoints on power. The way in which it influences and determines wimmin's experiences and perceptions of social power relations goes, therefore, unnoticed by mainstream political science, resulting in the lack of any analysis of wimmin's position in social power relations.

The conclusion of the analysis of the respondents experiences and perceptions of rape, as an example of social power, is that they experience power in the form of subordination and powerlessness - concepts completely alien to mainstream political science's one-sided analysis of power.

Against the background of mainstream political sciences exclusion of wimmin, and in the light of this feminist analysis of wimmin's experiences and perceptions of social power, I propose in what follows an alternative feminist vision of power relations: a way
of analysis social power through the specific inclusion of wimmin, a new way of looking at wimmin's experiences, and a new way of looking at social power.

7.1. Re-visited "power"

Seen through a feminist lens, power is about evolution: a turning from the dualistic, adversarial concept of power to a new and wimmin's mode. This can be described as emotional, direct, expressive, intuitive, immediate, subjective and relationship-centred (Starrett, 1982:188-189). It is a methodological expression of wimmin's situation, in which the struggle for consciousness is a struggle for world: for a sexuality, a herstory, a culture, a community, a form of power, an experience of the sacred. Feminism does not begin with the premise that it is unpremised (as men's objective science does). It does not aspire to persuade an unpremised audience because there is no such audience. Its aim is to uncover and claim as valid the experiences of wimmin, the major component of which is the devalidation of wimmin's experiences (MacKinnon, 1983:637-638). Wimmin's experiences of politics, (of life as sex objects) give rise to its own method: a feminist method with a distinctive theory of the relation between method and truth, the individual and her social surroundings, the presence and place of the natural and spiritual in culture and social being and causality itself (MacKinnon, 1982:535-536). The production of feminist knowledge is an openly subversive activity. It attempts, in its critique of existing knowledge, to undermine the foundations of man-dominated knowledge. By engaging in subversive activity, it is also openly charged with emotion and provokes emotional reactions. Feminist knowledge makes those who believe in the dominance of reason over emotion, and the superiority of rational man over emotional wimmin, angry and upset. Any evaluation of feminist knowledge must, therefore, take emotions into account. Only when reason is seen as united with emotion, subjectivity with objectivity, theory with practice, can we begin to develop adequate scientific procedures for evaluating knowledge of the
contradictions of our social existence (Ramazanoglu, 1989:49). Feminism provides an understanding of what has been excluded, degraded or violated in collective life. From this understanding we should be able to develop new parameters for thinking about human life and its possibilities, new sensibilities, new problems and new ways to approach the old problems (Brown, 1987:5).

The problems for wimmin who understand men's use of traditional power, are complex: how to break away from a force so all-encompassing? How to do so without reversing patriarchal relationships and simply substituting females for males? In other words, how to change the power that controls wimmin's lives without extending oppression either to other wimmin, to other minority groups, or to the men themselves (Howe, 1975:133).

Moglen (1983) feels strongly that wimmin need to get acquainted with power: what it is, and is not, how it operates, what it means. The subject of power, even in its male form, must become a known entity for wimmin. It is by knowing the enemy - men's power - that we will be able to resist and change it, or follow alternative (feminist) forms of power. If we choose to stay outside this terrain of men's power, we choose to operate within the boundaries of our own oppression. It is rather at the boundaries that the possibilities for change are found: at the boundaries in engagement with the centre. Wimmin must be willing to accept power, not deny it. We must understand the way it functions. The crucial engagement of the consciousness of empowerment with the consciousness of domination, must occur. We cannot and will not be empowered until we understand our own need for power and, at the same time, our deep fear of it. It is a process of demystification (Moglen, 1983:132-133). According to Janeway (1980:93) if we avoid power because we think it's dangerous, withdrawal begins, so that fear of power increases our distaste, and our distaste assures that we remain ignorant and withdrawn, and our ignorance makes power appear ever more dangerous - a process of corruption by weakness. Our approach should be one of, as Janeway (1930:330) refers to it: distrust
and disbelief - a fundamental questioning of the masculine definitions and the social mythology they serve, which puts forward both an explanation of why the world works as it does, and prescribes proper behaviour for living.

We must know "power" in order to be able to change what we don't like about it. We cannot recognise it as manmade and carry on living according to its rules. We must engage in a process of introspection to understand our own attitudes towards, and perceptions of power - what is wrong with it, and why it is unacceptable. Only then will we be able to think in terms of change, in terms of alternative power. To be able to decide on change, we must know the subject we want to change. For this we need an analysis of our daily lives which includes the experience of men's power, for example through the experience of rape. Our lived experience must become the facts that we work with in order to define "power".

In the re-analysis of "power", its success will depend on a number of important aspects. In order to establish a different way of working with "power", we need to re-think and, possibly, radically change our thoughts on issues without which a complete change from patriarchal power will not be possible.

Firstly, we must examine the modes of thought that structure science's methodologies and its views of the world. It is important to question and examine all dualisms, all dichotomous ways of thinking in which human "nature" and human activities are described, analyzed and categorized. In particular we must examine the objective/subjective and dominant/subordinate dualisms (Bleier, 1984:200,203) which exist in society.

The male/female, nature/culture and public/private dichotomies, which only result in the subordination of wimmin, must be changed radically to a state of equality. It is our patriarchal dualistic way of thinking that underlines the way we conceptualise wimmin's position of powerlessness. As long as the
existing dichotomies are maintained, we will not be able to
change wimmin's position of powerlessness. The dichotomies form
the basis of the subordinate, submissive position of wimmin and
at the same time reinforce the dominant position of men. We are
taught to think and act in dichotomous ways, and our position
according to these dichotomies also determines our position of
power, or the lack thereof. Only with a breakdown of the
dichotomies, will it be possible to establish power relations
based on equality, not gender.

Men's patriarchal power takes the form of a victor/victim design.
The first step in becoming a victim, is the alienation of the
individual from her internal energy source by forcing her to rely
on patriarchy as her source of power/energy (Gearhart, 1982:196).
The influence and the exercise of the system of patriarchy is
part of our daily existence. For example: in the sexist
application of the rape law; the way in which our perceptions
about rape are influenced by rape myths; the way in which the
services (the police and district surgeons) who are responsible
for rape survivors, operate. The system of patriarchy is the
most important source of energy/power used by humankind. Power,
as an energy source, must be understood in terms of power as
being the ability to get someone to do something against her
will. Power means possessing the ability to make things happen:
to act and to make others react. Thus power can be equated with
energy: it is a potential. (I will use the terms "power" and
"energy" interchangeably in this section.) A person's
power/energy must have a source which feeds it. In the case of
men's power, patriarchy is the source. Patriarchy, as a broad
societal system, is an almost infinite source for men's power.
The way in which patriarchy and men's power have been established
in our society, means that it is also the source of power/energy
for wimmin.

Patriarchy has established itself as the general source of power
through "internalization" (the process by which it becomes part
of our own perceptions and actions) and "external imposition"
(patriarchy kept in place as an external system) (MacKinnon, 1982:520). Because of wimmin's subordinate and powerless position, we are forced to use patriarchal energy. Consequently, we will remain in this position until such time as we change our source of power/energy. Because, patriarchy ensures men's dominant position first and foremost, wimmin are necessarily kept in place. So the very source from which wimmin try to gain power is unacceptable, and will not provide energy for our liberation.

If, within the patriarchal, man-defined society, wimmin are conceptualised as powerless and subordinate, it follows that wimmin will not have the ability to define either their own source(s) or the character of power. Thus, power in a man-defined society, will be power according to men. If the essence of men's power is domination by men and wimmin's subordination, logically, people will perceive their own personal power in these same terms. If wimmin are socialised into believing that they are powerless and subordinate, through internalization and external imposition, (MacKinnon, 1982:520) how can their perception and experience of their own power be anything other than negative and in men's terms? Thus wimmin's perception of their own power is, if unchallenged, defined by men and underlines their own subordination.

Wimmin find it difficult to define reality in a way different to those (men) who have social power. This is particularly true for wimmin whose material existence depends largely on the goodwill of the powerful (men) (Mies, 1986:15). It is only through challenging men's conception of power, and by developing a feminist conception instead, that the present situation will change to the advantage of wimmin.

As stated earlier, this development of our own consciousness, and the subsequent change to a feminist conception of power, will only be successful when wimmin begin to use a new source of power. A process of re-sourcement must occur. We must find a new place of energy, deeper than patriarchy. It can be discovered by
moving inward, towards the self, by finding our individual or intrapersonal flow of power as energy. It is a new way of:

(1) understanding and viewing reality, that is, articulating a new epistemology in discovering and analysing wimmin's experience of our own powerlessness, how we perceive our experiences of social power, what our perceptions are of our own experiences etc, and

(2) resourcement and reformulation of attitudes toward the material world, that is, articulating a new value system, a new ethic: the female body, viewed differently to men's perception thereof (Gearhart, 1982:198). It means that wimmin must determine their own views of themselves, their own sexuality and experiences thereof. Wimmin must reclaim themselves by redefining themselves. By moving inward, away from patriarchy as an energy/power source, we can create a new way of viewing and understanding reality. It will be our (wimmin's) reality, not their (men's) version of reality developed for us. With this new view of reality, will come the realization: that our reality is characterised by inequality, subordination and powerlessness. This insight will bring us to the point where we can begin to think in terms of change. We will also be able to articulate a new value system, in which we can change the reality of the human (read "wimmin") to something less of an object of men's abuse. When we can change our bodies from being men's objects to our own property, will we be able to change our lived reality. Examples of objectification abound in the way in which the rape law views wimmin, myths about rape in particular, about female sexuality in general, and the labels society pins on wimmin (e.g. good/bad girls).

We will be able to reach the new feminist vision of power through the process of consciousness-raising: the process of developing our own consciousness. When it emerged as part of the feminist movement in the late sixties, it functioned by allowing wimmin to reassess the popular beliefs and misconceptions about our self
and our place in society. It also highlighted the importance of the inner world of feelings, and enabled wimmin to articulate a broad range of personal concerns e.g. body image, appearance, sexuality and sexual relationships, motherhood etc., which gained recognition as "valid" issues (Rothfield, 1990:129; Morgan, 1970:23-24; Eisenstein, 1984).

Lerner (1986:242-243) identifies four distinct stages in consciousness-raising:

1. The awareness of a wrong. Wimmin should recognise violence against wimmin, such as rape, as men's abuse of power.

2. The development of a sense of sisterhood. Wimmin should realise that they are not alone in their experience of, say rape, but that it is shared by millions of others.

3. The autonomous definition, by wimmin, of their goals and strategies for changing their condition. Wimmin should, both as individuals and collectively, decide upon action to rectify this situation.

4. The development of an alternative vision of the future. It is only with an alternative vision that wimmin will be able to envisage themselves not as subordinate and powerless, but as being in control of their own lives.

The recognition of a wrong becomes political when wimmin realize that it is shared with other wimmin, and begin organizing in political, economic and social life to redress it. The resistance that wimmin encounter, forces them to draw on their own resources and strengths. In the process, they develop a sense of sisterhood which also leads to the formation of wimmin's culture. Wimmin should therefore, begin to define their own demands theories, so that the shift from androcentricity to "womyn-centredness" can begin to take place. When wimmin become aware of their powerlessness (for example in the situation of rape) through consciousness-raising, they realise that their individual circumstances are not the exception to the rule, but
rather the shared experience of many wimmin.

It is only within a shared sisterhood that wimmin will gain sufficient power to change their position of powerlessness, as is the case with the current improvements won with regard to the handling of rape survivors.

Consciousness-raising is not simply a technique to make people feel better about themselves or to cure their personal problems. Neither is it therapy. It is a political tool modeled on the Chinese practice called "Speaking Bitterness" (Shulman, 1980:593).

A critical function of this process is "to speak bitterness" which, according to Mitchell (1973), implies:

"... the bringing to consciousness of the virtually unconscious oppression... as women's oppression is hidden far from consciousness."

The experts on wimmin's issues have traditionally been men (for example, the way in which rape laws were written and are practised, how rape survivors are treated by police and district surgeons, and even the way in which mainstream political science ignores wimmin as a political group. Yet, if we truly want to understand the situation of wimmin within our society, we cannot do this through men. We have to base our analysis on information we can trust, information that is not suspect, that does not involve men's interaction (Shulman, 1980:594).

Herein lies the importance of wimmin's own experiences and perceptions of reality, for example, that of our powerlessness in rape. We cannot try to understand a situation of powerlessness without directly taking wimmin into account. The feminist method is through consciousness-raising: the collective, critical reconstruction of the meaning of wimmin's social experience, as wimmin live through it (MacKinnon, 1982:543). Consciousness, within a theory of subjectivity, embodies the following:
(1) The contents of our conscious minds are accessible and amenable to introspection,
(2) in principle we only have to look inside to uncover that which is present to consciousness and
(3) one can look towards consciousness for evidence of wommin's experience under patriarchy (Rothfield, 1990:130).

The development of our own consciousness is none other than getting in touch with ourselves - with who we are, what we want and don't want, what we like and dislike, how we constitute our being as a (womyn) person. It is a process conducted in a spirit of honesty and willingness to change. It is a radical choice, as we can only be honest with ourselves when we break out of the bonds that patriarchy places on us both mentally and spiritually. It is only through introspection that we can discover who we really are. Outside, we will only find men's misconceptions, an image of what patriarchy want's us to be, what we are expected to be, how to act, how to live. Outside ourselves is life according to the rules of patriarchy. It does not permit equality and only functions in the dynamics of domination and submission. Through the development of consciousness, comes the ability to recognise and analyze our own experiences under patriarchy.

"Consciousness" is by definition a subjective state of mind (as it is a personal experience), and it stands in direct contrast to men's conception of objectivity. Consciousness-raising is everything that objectivity is not. It is the process of becoming conscious of something one did not formerly perceive, of raising something from the unconscious to the conscious mind - "having your head in a different place". The meaning centres around an individual's:

(1) perception of wommin as a degraded group,
(2) self-identification with this group and a
(3) commitment to personal and social change vis a vis the position of wommin (Cassell, 1977:16-17). This is what Moglen (1983:133) refers to as "women's empowering consciousness of
dismemberment.

Through the process of consciousness-raising, women move away from individual and unique experiences (of, for example, power) to a realization of the (political) structures of oppression in our society (Edwards, 1987:13). It is the realization that our own individual experiences are also those of (hundreds of thousands) of other women. Consciousness-raising is the development of an awareness that an experience at the individual, personal level also has meaning on the broader political level. Many of the shared experiences of individual women manifest themselves in the social practice of women's subjection through men's power. From this realization should come the motivation for moving out of the personal sphere, to meet those women with similar experiences, in the public arena. It is the development of a political consciousness of personal experience - the personal is the political. According to Gearhart (1982) the personal (the experience) must become the political: in feminist terms this is the act of sharing. Through consciousness-raising, women grasp the collective reality of their condition from within the perspective of that experience, not from outside (MacKinnon, 1982:536). Janeway (1980:330) prefers to call this "bonding": the process through which individuals validate the truth and value of their individual experiences, and which should result in joint action.

7.2. Womyn-power: a feminist vision

What should emerge at the end of this process of women re-analysing "power", is "power" in a radically different form to that of men's patriarchal power.

For each womyn undergoing this process of re-examining her own situation of "power", but also for women as a group, "power" will emerge first in some form of mending-power. This will enable women to gain control, reclaim our "power" in decision making, personal choice and consequently independence.
A major result of men's patriarchal power is the fact that wimmin are turned into submissive, powerless and dependent beings. Men's power is primarily destructive, and robs wimmin of control over their own lives. The inability of men to share power in some form of equality can only result in domination. The re-conceptualisation of "power" by wimmin must somehow result in wimmin reclaiming their position as equal beings. Reclaiming, mending-power is in direct contrast to men's destructive power.

A second characteristic of womyn-power is wimmin's capacity for collective functioning (not the dominant/submissive dichotomy) which makes life-giving uses of power as energy possible. (What Janeway, 1980:171 refers to as "coming together.") The concept "collectivity" may be inadequate as it evokes notions of a pooling, an aggregate. In history, collective action has always meant settings where power-over energy (men's power) were used, and this is not what is meant here. Rather, it is a term describing the full meaning of wimmin-togetherness or wimmin-being-present-with-themselves-while-presencing-with-others. The word we need is "syzygy" (pronounced sizzagee) meaning "yoked" or "the conjunction of organisms without loss of identity" or "a related group of rational integral functions" (Gearhart, 1982:198).

Collective power is sharing power, and at the same time, self-defining power. It is a process of reclaiming the power to define. Wimmin's regaining of power begins with the refusal to accept the definition of oneself that is put forward by the powerful. It is giving yourself the right to define who and what you are and are not (Janeway, 1980:160,167). This is a point also stressed by van Zyl & Shefer (1990:4):

"... therefore also a struggle to represent themselves; ... for depicting themselves in alternate ways..."

This means that womyn-power can be collective and individual simultaneously. While all wimmin can share certain experiences of the exercise of "power" (as collective power), there remains
a degree of uniqueness in the experience of specific groups of wimmin e.g. wimmin of colour, lesbians, mothers, working class wimmin, middle class wimmin etc. (as self-defining experience of "power"). Womyn-power unites wimmin in their experience of the exercise of power, and still leaves enough room for the unique experiences of specific groups of wimmin.

This model is in stark contrast to men's dominant power, or individual power-over someone, where the exercise of power will label wimmin's experience and conception of it according to the male/female dichotomy which resembles the dominant/submissive distinction.

Womyn-power must be subjective power based on experience. Objectivity (and objectification) lies at the heart of men's patriarchal power and can never be accepted as part of womyn-power. Wimmin's position of powerlessness and subordination is, to a great extent, the direct result of the foundation of men's power in objectivity and the objectification of wimmin. Subjective power implies the involvement of the subject with herself and her environment. It also means giving acknowledgement to the feelings, experiences, perceptions, viewpoints, ideas, arguments, conceptualizations etc. of wimmin about wimmin. Subjective power is experience-centred, and implies the "wimminization"/humanization of politics, so as to incorporate the acknowledgement and practice of "the personal as the political". Within subjective power there is no place for objectification and men's practice of "objective science".

Joint action is the third step in wimmin reclaiming power, according to Janeway (1980:330). It follows what she refers to as "distrust and disbelief" and "bonding". She distinguishes between two important aspects, for achieving effective action. Firstly, joint action follows coming together. Our individual reactions are brought to a (first) test by sharing them with other wimmin. Secondly, joint action requires some kind of support system, and that means some kind of structure.
Womyn-power is active power in terms of wimmin's ability "to be and to do", according to our own preference and choice. It does away with passive wimmin, or wimmin whose actions are determined by men's needs and desires. Active power is self-determining and self-defining power. It is diametrically opposed to the power model of men consisting of passive wimmin and active men, exercised as power over someone in the all too familiar domination/submission style.

Men assume that wimmin want power in order to move "up" and replace them, or that "giving" wimmin power would, in effect, reduce their power. This view is based on the traditional concept of power as a finite quantity of control that one person or group exercises over another. If a husband has power, theoretically a wife does not; if the leader of a group is powerful, theoretically the members of the group must be without power. This is a view of power as a commodity. Such a conception of power is deeply embedded in society and, hence, in the thinking of its members: some one person or group must be better, stronger, smarter, more beautiful than the rest. According to this view, power becomes the object of a struggle to gain and hold superiority (Howe, 1975:131-132).

Womyn-power must lead to equal power between men and wimmin. If womyn-power strives for matriarchy on the same terms as patriarchy, then it will be just as unacceptable, as patriarchy. There is no justification for changing from one dominant form of society to another. Womyn-power must provide the basis for a society characterised by equality and personhood. It is only in equality that the male/female : dominant/submissive dichotomy can be eradicated.
CONCLUSION

In the preceding chapters, the subordinate position of wimmin as seen through their perceptions and experiences of rape, as a form of social power, was analyzed.

Mainstream political science participates in this subordination through the exclusion of wimmin from its analysis of power. By excluding wimmin (or through incorporating wimmin by using "man" as a generic term) it concentrates only on men's perception of power, thereby representing men's viewpoint as the only viewpoint. This objective stance alienates wimmin who experience power relations from day-to-day in the form of, amongst others, men's violence (rape) against wimmin. Feminism (and, in particular, a feminist methodology) provides wimmin with an alternative point of view of social power relations, one which takes our perceptions and experiences into account. In contrast to the objective (scientific), exclusive approach of mainstream political science, feminism proposes a subjective, experience-centred, analysis of social power which is inclusive and representative of wimmin. Mainstream political science excludes wimmin from the process of "naming", as outlined in the feminist critique against it.

Although Foucault provides an interesting and different view on social power relations, it is not a feminist analysis of social power relations.

The powerlessness of wimmin is largely the consequence of the system of patriarchy which functions (inter alia through violence or the threat thereof) to keep wimmin subordinate and men dominant. Patriarchy manifests itself daily in the popular dichotomies present in society. The male/female, nature/culture and public/private dichotomies all lead to one conclusion: that men are the dominant, powerful creatures, and wimmin, the second best. Wimmin are "the other", men are the norm. This is further evident in the way in which societies dichotomies results in
gendered sexuality. MacKinnon's analysis of gendered sexuality as the basis for wimmin's subordination, leads to the conclusion that our subordination as wimmin is locked up in the lack of control that we have over our own sexuality.

The crucial link between these three forces leads, on the one hand, to the present view of mainstream political science which excludes wimmin from any analysis of social power. On the other hand it also provides the starting point for our feminist analysis of wimmin's experiences and perceptions of power. It determines how wimmin experience social power. Wimmin's experiences and perceptions cannot be separated from the interaction of these forces. It is an integral part of our experiences.

The research data used to give an account of the way in which ordinary wimmin experience power, leads us to conclude that wimmin experience social power in the form of powerlessness. The experience of rape reduces wimmin to dependents, who lack control over their own lives. This is clearly illustrated by the way in which the respondents viewed their own personal power before, during and after being raped. By analysing the wimmin's behaviour during the actual attack as well as her reactions after being raped, it becomes clear that wimmin are powerless in relation to the behaviour of the rapist.

The perceptions of the rape survivors (in comparison to the district surgeons and police persons) regarding rape myths, provide additional information for the way in which wimmin experience and perceive rape as a form of social power. Rape myths function to maintain the stereotyped images of wimmin in general, and rape survivors in particular, and thereby reinforce wimmin's powerlessness.

In the same way, the rape law also disempowers wimmin and keeps us in a subordinate position. The rape law is a product of men's, patriarchal, exclusive thoughts as illustrated by the key
characteristics of the legal definition of rape. Instead of convicting the rapist, the burden of proof is placed on the womyn to convince the court that she did not consent to intercourse, and that she was therefore raped. While the focus ought to be on the coercion used by the man, it now centres around the issue of proving that the man had the subjective intention of having sexual intercourse (rape) with the womyn against her will, while knowing that she did not consent. The mere fact that rape constitutes, according to the law, only (natural) (hetero)sexual intercourse between a man and a non-consenting womyn, demonstrates its overtly sexist nature. Not only does the law not include any other instrument, but it is also orifice and sex-specific. Much of the emphasis of the law is placed on whether or not the womyn gave her consent, while it does not sufficiently focus on the behaviour of the rapist. The application of the cautionary rules (like rape myths) is based on an extremely sexist and negative conception of womyn. Through the continued application of this rule (despite evidence to the contrary) together with the practice of cross-examination into the character and sexual herstory of the womyn, she is treated as the accused and not the man.

This leaves us, in some way, at a crossroad: we realise that womyn are excluded from the mainstream political science analysis of power. The mainstream analysis does not provide for womyn's experiences and perceptions. We have a choice to either continue to except our exclusion, to be "the other", or we must determine our own inclusion through an alternative feminist analysis of power.

The significance of womyn's experiences as powerless and subordinate cannot be included in the analysis provided by mainstream science. Mainstream science's objectivity does not allow womyn's subjective experiences and perceptions. We must, therefore, develop what can be labelled an alternative feminist vision of power relations based on the inclusion of womyn's subjective experiences, which takes into account the subjectivity
of these experiences. Breaking down the existing societal dichotomies and the system of patriarchy, is essential in this process. Consciousness-raising provides wimmin with an opportunity to redefine our own perceptions and experiences of power, while moving steadily in the direction of reclaiming wimmin-power. A feminist vision of womyn-power can provide a new way of looking at wimmin's experiences and can ultimately leads to a new vision of power: a feminist vision.
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APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR RAPE SURVIVORS

SECTION A

1. Age
   (a) Under 18
   (b) 18 - 30
   (c) 31 - 40
   (d) 41 - 50
   (e) Older than 51

2. Home language
   (a) Afrikaans
   (b) English
   (c) Both Afrikaans and English
   (d) Other, specify ..........................................

3. Marital status
   (a) Married
   (b) Unmarried, cohabiting with male partner
   (c) Unmarried, cohabiting with female partner
   (d) Unmarried, not cohabiting
   (e) Divorced
   (f) Widowed
4. **If your marital status changed after being raped, please indicate your previous status**

   (a) Married

   (b) Unmarried, cohabiting with male partner

   (c) Unmarried, cohabiting with female partner

   (d) Unmarried, not cohabiting

   (e) Divorced

   (f) Widowed

   (g) No change

5. **Income (Per month)**

   (a) R 0 - R 1000

   (b) R 1001 - R 2000

   (c) R 2001 - R 3000

   (d) R 3001 - R 4000

   (e) R 4001 - R 5000

   (f) More than R 5000

6. **What is your occupation?**

   .................................................................

7. **What is your religious affiliation?**

   .................................................................
8. **Highest education qualification**

(a) Primary school

(b) High school without matric

(c) High school without matric, but with a trade or technical training

(d) Matric

(e) Matric plus technical, technicon, college or university training

(f) Post-graduate qualification (Hons, MA, Ph.D)

9. **Please specify the following with regard to how many times (on different occasions) you were raped, and by how many people**

(a) Raped ones by one person

(b) Raped ones by more than one person, specify number ..... 

(c) Raped more than ones by one person

(d) Raped more than ones by the same person

(e) Raped more than ones by more than one person, specify number .......

SECTION B

10. **Rapist's race**

(a) White

(b) Black

(c) Coloured

(d) Asian

(e) Uncertain
11. **Age of the rapist** (Approximately)
   (a) 16 - 20
   (b) 21 - 30
   (c) 31 - 40
   (d) 41 - 50
   (e) Older than 50
   (f) Uncertain

12. **Did you know the rapist?**
   (a) Yes
   (b) No

13. **If "yes", had you on a previous occasion had sex with him?**
   (a) Yes
   (b) No
   (c) Not applicable

14. **What was your relationship with the rapist?**
   (a) Stranger
   (b) Someone you know from seeing, but have never met
   (c) Friend
   (d) Boyfriend
   (e) Former boyfriend
   (f) Neighbour
   (g) Husband
   (h) Former husband
   (i) Friend of the family
   (j) Employer/Boss
   (k) Colleague
15. **What was the behaviour of the rapist during the attack?**
   (You may indicate more than one possibility)
   
   (a) Talkative
   (b) Aggressive
   (c) Violent
   (d) Dominating
   (e) Friendly
   (f) Silent
   (g) Threatening
   (h) Threaten to kill you
   (i) Use physical power or violence
   (j) Threaten to use physical power or violence
   (k) Use other kinds of pressure to make you give in
   (l) None of the above, specify ...................................................
       ................................................................................................

**SECTION C**

16. **Approximately what time did the rape took place?**
   
   (a) 00:00 - 06:00
   (b) 06:00 - 12:00
   (c) 12:00 - 18:00
   (d) 18:00 - 24:00
   (e) Uncertain

17. **On which day did the attack took place?**
   
   (a) Weekday (Monday - Friday)
   (b) Weekend (Saturday, Sunday)
   (c) Uncertain
18. Where did the rape take place? (If it took place in more than one place, please indicate more than one place)

(a) Your residence
(b) Residence of the rapist
(c) Common residence of the rapist and yourself
(d) Residence of your friends
(e) Residence of the rapist's friends
(f) Cinema
(g) Parking area
(h) Bar/Pub
(i) Other area of entertainment
(j) Grounds of a school, college, technicon, university
(k) Public building
(l) Park or field
(m) Your motor
(n) Rapist's motor
(o) Deserted street or alley
(p) None of the above, specify ...........................................

19. Did the rapist use a weapon? 

(a) Yes
(b) No

20. If "yes", what sort of weapon did he use? .................

.................................................................

21. If "no", did he threaten to use a weapon? 

(a) Yes
(b) No
22. How did the rapist force you to give in?
   (a) Physical force (physical power)
   (b) Threaten to use physical power or a weapon
   (c) Use of a weapon
   (d) Combination of the above
   (e) None of the above, specify ...................................................

SECTION D

23. Did you report the rape to the police?
   (a) Yes
   (b) No

24. If "yes", what was your reason(s) for reporting it? (You may indicate more than one reason)
   (a) To protect others from the rapist
   (b) Because of outrage at what he did
   (c) To punish him, have justice done
   (d) Because he is a sick person
   (e) None of the above, specify ..............................

(f) Not applicable
25. **If "no", why did you not report it to the police?** (You may indicate more than one reason)

(a) Was too upset to cope with it

(b) Was too embarrassed about it

(c) Afraid the rapist would return and take revenge

(d) By the time that you felt able to report it, you thought it was too late

(e) Did not want to prolong the incident

(f) Afraid of your partner's reaction

(g) Thought the police would have been hostile

(h) Thought the courts (law procedure) would have been hostile

(i) Thought the police would not have enough evidence

(j) Thought the police would not be able to do anything

(k) Afraid of the social stigma if it was to be known

(l) Afraid the police would not believe you

(m) Want to avoid sending the rapist to jail

(n) Did not see the use of it, he would get away with it anyway

(o) Felt sorry for the rapist

(p) Scared of identifying the wrong man

(q) Did not want to make a scene

(r) Did not think it was serious enough to go to the police

(s) Did not know who to contact

(t) None of the above, specify ...........................................................

........................................................................................................

........................................................................................................
26. Did you go to a district surgeon or other medical service?
   (a) Yes, a district surgeon
   (b) Yes, other medical service, specify ....................... 
       ...........................................................................
   (c) No

27. Did you make use of Rape Crisis or other crisis service?
   (a) Yes, Rape Crisis
   (b) Yes, other crisis service, specify ....................... 
       ...........................................................................
   (c) No

28. What was your reaction during the attack? (You may indicate more than one reaction)
   (a) Scream for help
   (b) Scream and fight back
   (c) Try to get away by fighting back and by arguing
   (d) Try to get away by arguing with him
   (e) Tried to run away
   (f) You could not resist verbally or physically
   (g) Did not try to resist
   (h) Maintained a calm front
   (i) None of the above, specify ............................... 
       ...........................................................................
       ...........................................................................
29. **What was or is your reaction(s) after the rape?** (You may indicate more than one reaction)

(a) Increased negative feelings towards unknown men
(b) Decreased social activities
(c) Worsened sexual relations with partner
(d) Worsened heterosexual relationships
(e) Increased negative feelings towards men that you know
(f) Worsened relations with family
(g) Afraid of being alone at home
(h) Afraid to go out alone
(i) Increased negative feelings towards yourself
(j) None of the above, specify ........................................

30. **What do you think the sentence of a rapist must be?**

(a) Death penalty
(b) Lifelong jail sentence
(c) Jail sentence according to the circumstances
(d) Psychiatric rehabilitation
(e) Castration
(f) None of the above, specify ........................................

**SECTION E**

31. **Have you ever been forced to give in to sex against your will within your marriage or relationship?**

(a) Yes
(b) No
32. If "yes", did you see it as rape?
   (a) Yes
   (b) No

33. Has your perception changed over time? (Do you now see it as rape?)
   (a) Yes
   (b) No

34. If you did give in to sex against your will within your marriage or relationship, what was the reason(s) for doing so? (You may indicate more than one reason)
   (a) Physical power or violence from your partner
   (b) Threats to use physical power or violence if you did not give in
   (c) Afraid that your partner will get back at you in another way if you did not give in
   (d) Afraid that your partner will not keep his financial responsibilities if you did not give in
   (e) Afraid that your partner will take it out on the children if you did not give in
   (f) You think that this is expected of you as wife or partner
   (g) Your partner says that if you refuse, you did not love him/her any more
   (h) Your partner makes you feel that if you refuse, there is something wrong with you
   (i) You accept it as normal
   (j) Afraid that if you refuse, your partner will go to someone else
   (k) None of the above, specify ...............................................

.................................................................
.................................................................
.................................................................
31. How would you evaluate your own attitude towards rape survivors? (Where 1 is the lowest value, 3 a neutral or average value and 5 the highest value) INDICATE HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT ALL OF THE POSSIBILITIES

1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5

(a) Sympathetic
(b) Inhumane
(c) Condemnatory
(d) Professional
(e) Affective
(f) Fair
(g) Unfriendly
(h) Insensitive
(i) Neutral
(j) Considerate
(k) Helpful
(l) Unconcerned
(m) Supportive
(n) Aloof
(o) Unreasonable
(p) Understanding

Any other comments:
..............................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................
36. If you did get into contact with a district surgeon or other medical service, please indicate how you experienced the district surgeon or other medical official (Where 1 is the lowest value, 3 a neutral or average value and 5 the highest value) INDICATE HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT ALL OF THE POSSIBILITIES

1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5

(a) Sympathetic
(b) Inhumane
(c) Condemnatory
(d) Professional
(e) Affective
(f) Fair
(g) Unfriendly
(h) Insensitive
(i) Neutral
(j) Considerate
(k) Helpful
(l) Unconcerned
(m) Supportive
(n) Aloof
(o) Unreasonable
(p) Understanding

Any other comments on your experience of the district surgeon or other medical service .................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
37. If you did get into contact with Rape Crisis or other crisis services, please indicate how you experienced the Rape Crisis counsellor or other crisis counsellor (Where 1 is the lowest value, 3 a neutral or average value and 5 the highest value). Indicate how you feel about all of the possibilities:

1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5

(a) Sympathetic
(b) Inhumane
(c) Condemnatory
(d) Professional
(e) Affective
(f) Fair
(g) Unfriendly
(h) Inensitive
(i) Neutral
(j) Considerate
(k) Helpful
(l) Unconcerned
(m) Supportive
(n) Aloof
(o) Unreasonable
(p) Understanding

Any other comments on your experience of Rape Crisis or other crisis service.

................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................
SECTION G

38. Please indicate your reaction to the following statements by using the scale where:
   1 = the lowest value
   2 = somewhere between 1 and 3, it is not a low value, but also not an average value
   3 = a neutral or average value
   4 = somewhere between 3 and 5, it is not an average value, but also not the highest value
   5 = the highest value Fill in the number corresponding with your feelings in the open space

(a) You had a choice to be raped
(b) You had a choice to agree "to have sex" with the rapist
(c) You were in control of the situation
(d) You could physically resist the rapist
(e) You could make an independent decision on reporting the rape or not to report it
(f) You had a choice in your behaviour during the attack
(g) You were in control of your emotions during the attack
(h) You had a choice how to conduct your life after being raped
(i) It is important to you to be able to make your own decisions
(j) You felt in control during your contact with the police
(k) You had control over your life before being raped
(l) You felt in control during your contact with the Rape Crisis person, or other crisis service person
(m) You are in control of your life after being raped
(n) You feel more dependent on people after being raped
(o) You felt in control during your visit to the district surgeon, or other medical person
(p) You see yourself as an independent person
(q) You had a choice to go to the district surgeon or other medical service, or not to go
(r) You think it is important to be in control of your own life
(s) You were an independent person before being raped
(t) You had a choice to get into contact with Rape Crisis or
other crisis service, or not to

32. Please indicate how you feel about the following statements. Where 1 = "disagree strongly", 2 = "disagree", 3 = "agree", 4 = "agree strongly". 
Fill in the number corresponding with your reaction in the open space.

(a) If a woman wants to, she can avoid being raped
(b) The rapist is usually unknown to the woman
(c) Rapists are mentally sick people
(d) A woman can "ask" to be raped by the way she dresses
(e) A woman can "ask" to be raped through her behaviour (body language)
(f) If a woman goes out alone by night she "asks" to be raped
(g) Secretly women really liked being raped
(h) The rapist is almost never a family member
(i) Only certain "types" of women are raped
(j) Women deserve to be raped when they hitchhike, go out alone, talk to unknown men or wear sexy clothes
(k) Women usually make false rape reports against innocent men
(l) A woman who is not ready, cannot be raped
(m) "Nice or good" girls don't get raped
(n) Rapists are usually non-white men
(o) If women stay at home where they belong, they won't get raped
(p) Rape is an expression of an uncontrollable sexual desire
(q) A woman who is raped was probably seductive and was asking for it
(r) Women like being treated violently
(s) Rape is violent sex
(t) Rape is sexual violence
(u) Rape is an act of power
APPENDIX 2: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DISTRICT SURGEONS

1. Age/
   Ouderdom:
   (a) 18 - 30
   (b) 31 - 40
   (c) 41 - 50
   (d) Older than/ouer as 51

2. Home language/
   Huistaal:
   (a) Afrikaans
   (b) English/Engels
   (c) Xhosa
   (d) Other, specify/Ander spesifiseer .....................

3. Gender/
   Geslag:
   (a) Female/Vroulik
   (b) Male/Manlik

4. Marital status/
   Huwelikstatus:
   (a) Married/Getroud
   (b) Unmarried, cohabiting with male partner/
       Ongetroud, bly saam met man
   (c) Unmarried, cohabiting with female partner/
       Ongetroud bly saam met vrou
   (d) Unmarried, not cohabiting/
       Ongetroud, bly nie saam
   (e) Divorced/Geskei
   (f) Widowed/Wewenaar
5. Religious affiliation/ (If any) 
Kerkverband: (Indien enige)

.................................................................

6. Race/ 
Ras:
(a) Black/Swart
(b) Coloured/Kleurling
(c) Asian/Asiër
(d) White/Blank

7. How long have you been practising as a district surgeon/ 
Vir hoe lank praktiseer u al as distriksgeneesheer ?

............. Years/Jaar
............. Months/Maande

8. How much experience have you had with rape cases/ 
Hoeveel ondervinding het u met verkragtingsake ?

............. Years/Jare (Approximately/Min of meer)
............. Number of cases/Aantal gevalle 
(Aproximately/Min of meer)

9. Do you think you are adequately trained to deal with rape 
survivors/ 
Dink u, u is genoegsaam opgelei om met verkragte persone te 
werk ?

(a) Yes/Ja
(b) Not really/Nie regtig nie
(c) No/Nee
10. **How do you feel about an organisation such as Rape Crisis which deals with rape survivors?**

   (a) They do a good job and provide a necessary service/
       Hulle doen goeie werk en lewer 'n diens wat benodig word

   (b) I feel positive about them/
       Ek voel positief oor hulle

   (c) They get in the way and are a hindrance/
       Hulle is in die pad en is 'n hindernis

   (d) I feel negative about them and prefer not to have contact with them/
       Ek voel negatief oor hulle, en verkies om nie met hulle kontak te hê nie

   (e) They are unfamiliar to me/Hulle is onbekend aan my

   (f) Other comment/Verdere kommentaar ..................................

11. **What do you think the sentence of a rapist should be?**

    (a) Death penalty/Doodstraf

    (b) Lifelong jail sentence/
        Lewenslange tronkstraf

    (c) Jail sentence according to the circumstances/
        Tronkstraf afhangende van die omstandighede

    (d) Psychiatric rehabilitation/
        Psigiatriese rehabilitasie

    (e) Castration/Kastrasie

    (f) Other, specify/Ander, spesifiseer .........................

12. **Do you think it makes a difference to a rape survivor (the woman) whether, the district surgeon that she deals with is a man or a woman?**

    (a) Yes, it makes a difference/
        Ja, dit maak 'n verskil

    (b) No, it does not make a difference/
        Nee, dit maak nie 'n verskil nie
13. **Does the rape survivor (the woman) have a choice between dealing with a male or female district surgeon?**

(a) Yes/Ja

(b) No/Nee

14. **If the woman knew the man who had raped her, and had previously had sex with him voluntarily, (on a previous occasion), do you then consider it to be "rape"?**

(a) Yes/Ja

(b) No/Nee

Comments/Komentaar.................................

15. **If the woman knew the man who had raped her (he was not a stranger), but she had never had sex with him before, do you consider it to be "rape"?**

(a) Yes/Ja

(b) No/Nee

Comments/Komentaar.................................

16. **Do you believe that "marital rape" exists (that a husband can rape his wife)?**

(a) Yes/Ja

(b) No/Nee

Comments/Komentaar.................................
17. Is there a relationship between whether the woman knew her rapist, and the amount of force or violence used by him against her?

(a) Yes, there is a relationship/
Ja, daar is 'n verband

(b) No, there is no relationship/
Nee, daar is nie 'n verband nie

18. Why do you think women don't go to the district surgeon after being raped?

(a) Very often/Baie gereeld

(b) Often/Gereeld

(c) Seldom/Selde

(d) Very seldom/Baie selde

19. Do you think these are justifiable (valid) reasons for not using the district surgeon?

(a) Yes, there is a relationship/
Ja, daar is 'n verband

(b) No, there is no relationship/
Nee, daar is nie 'n verband nie

19. Do you think these are justifiable (valid) reasons for not using the district surgeon?

(a) Yes, there is a relationship/
Ja, daar is 'n verband

(b) No, there is no relationship/
Nee, daar is nie 'n verband nie

20. How often do you find a woman making a false rape charge?

(a) Very often/Baie gereeld

(b) Often/Gereeld

(c) Seldom/Selde

(d) Very seldom/Baie selde
21. Do you have any experience of male rape?
Het u enige ondervinding van manlike verkragting?
(a) Yes/Ja
(b) If "yes", approximately how many cases/Indien "ja", ongeveer hoeveel gevalle .................
(c) No/Nee

22. Do you believe that a man can be raped?
Glo u dat 'n man verkrag kan word?
(a) Yes/Ja
(b) No/Nee

23. Do you believe there is a difference, in the persons experience, between "rape" and "sodomy"? ("Rape" and "sodomy" both being forced sexual intercourse against the will of the person)/
Glo u daar is 'n verskil in terme van die persoon se ervarinq daarvan, tussen "verkragting" en "sodomie"?
("Verkragting" en "sodomie" as gelykstaande aan gedwonge seksuele omgang teen die wil van die persoon)
(a) Yes, there is a difference in experience/Ja, daar is 'n verskil in ervaring
(b) No, there is no difference in experience/Nee, daar is geen verskil in ervaring nie

24. Do you believe the current law to be adequate in distinguishing between "rape" and "sodomy", or do you believe the law should change/
Dink u die huidige wetgewing is voldoende in die onderskeid wat getref word tussen "verkragting" en "sodomie", of dink u die wetgewing moet verander?
(a) The law is adequate, and need no change/Die wetgewing is voldoende en geen veranderinge is nodig nie
(b) The law should be changed/Die wetgewing moet verander word
25. In your medical examination of the woman, what constitutes "rape"? What is needed as proof to show that the woman was raped? 

Wat behels "verkragting" in terme van u mediese onderzoek van die vrou? Wat word benodig om te kan bewys dat die vrou verkraag is?

26. What are your ideas on the prevention of rape? 

Wat is u idees in verband met die voorkoming van verkragting?

27. Do we need more changes in the way in which we deal with rape cases? 

Benodig ons meer veranderinge in terme van die manier waarop ons verkragtings hanteer?

(Can indicate more than one/Kan meer as een aandui)

(a) Yes, procedural changes (specify) 

Ja, veranderinge in terme van die prosedures (spesifiseer)

(b) Yes, changes in the law (specify) 

Ja, veranderinge in wetgewing (spesifiseer)

(c) Yes, changes in the attitude of people working with rape survivors (specify) 

Ja, veranderinge in die houdings van mense wie met verkragte persone werk (spesifiseer)

(d) No, we do not need any changes/ 
Nee, ons benodig geen veranderinge nie

28. In the course of dealing with a rape case, do you ever get into contact with the police? 

In u hantering van 'n verkragtingsaak, kom u ooit in aanraking met die polisie?

(a) Yes/Ja 

(b) No/Nee
29. Are you aware of any complaints that the police have about how the district surgeon deals with rape cases? What are these complaints?

Is u bewus van enige klagtes van die polisie met betrekking tot die manier waarop die distriksgeneesheer verkragtingsake hanteer? Wat is die klagtes?

.................................................................

.................................................................

30. Do you have any complaints or comments with regard to the way in which the police deal with rape cases?

Het u enige klagtes of kommentaar met betrekking tot die manier waarop die polisie met verkragtingsake werk?

.................................................................
31. If you do come into contact with the police, how would you evaluate his or her overall attitude towards rape survivors? Indien u wel met die polisie in aanraking kom, hoe sal u sy of haar houding, in die algemeen, teenoor verkragte persone evalueer?

(Where 1 is the lowest value, 3 a neutral or average value and 5 the highest value/Waar 1 die laagste waarde is, 3 'n neutrale of gemiddelde waarde en 5 die hoogste waarde)

**INDICATE HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT ALL OF THE POSSIBILITIES BY ENCIRCLING THE CORRECT NUMBER/**

**DUI AAN HOE U OOR AL DIE MOONTLIKHEDE VOEL DEUR DIE KORREKTE NOMMER TE OMKRING**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Sympathetic/Simpatiek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Inhumane/Onmenslik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Condemnatory/Veroordelend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Professional/Professioneel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Affective/Doeltreffend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Fair/Regverdig</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Unfriendly/Onvriendelik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Insensitive/Onsensitief</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Neutral/Neutraal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Considerate/Bedagsaam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) Helpful/Behulpsaam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l) Unconcerned/Onbesorg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m) Supportive/Ondersteunend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n) Aloof/Afsydig</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o) Unreasonable/Onredelik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p) Understanding/Begrypend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments/Kommentaar:..................................................**
32. How would you evaluate the overall attitude of district surgeons towards rape survivors/Hoe sal u, in die algemeen, distriksgeneeshere se houding teenoor verkragte persone evalueer? (Where 1 is the lowest value, 3 a neutral or average value and 5 the highest value/Waar 1 die laagste waarde is, 3 'n neutrale of gemiddelde waarde en 5 die hoogste waarde)

INDICATE HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT ALL OF THE POSSIBILITIES BY ENCIRCLING THE CORRECT NUMBER/
DUI AAN HOE U OOR AL DIE MOONTLIKHEDE VOEL DEUR DIE KORREKTE SYFER TE OMKRING

(a) Sympathetic/Simpatiek 1 2 3 4 5
(b) Inhumane/Onmenslik 1 2 3 4 5
(c) Condemnatory/Veroordelend 1 2 3 4 5
(d) Professional/Professioneel 1 2 3 4 5
(e) Affective/Doeltreffend 1 2 3 4 5
(f) Fair/Regverdig 1 2 3 4 5
(g) Unfriendly/Onvriendelik 1 2 3 4 5
(h) Insensitive/Onsensitief 1 2 3 4 5
(i) Neutral/Neutraal 1 2 3 4 5
(j) Considerate/Bedagsaam 1 2 3 4 5
(k) Helpful/Behulpsaam 1 2 3 4 5
(l) Unconcerned/Onbesorg 1 2 3 4 5
(m) Supportive/Ondersteunend 1 2 3 4 5
(n) Aloof/Afsydig 1 2 3 4 5
(o) Unreasonable/Onredelik 1 2 3 4 5
(p) Understanding/Begrypend 1 2 3 4 5

Comments/Kommentaar: ..................................................
33. Please indicate how you feel about the following statements/
Dui asseblief aan hoe u oor die volgende stellings voel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where/Waar</th>
<th>Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = disagree strongly/verskil sterk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = disagree/verskil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = agree/stem saam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = agree strongly/stem sterk saam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fill in the number which corresponds to your reaction in the open spaces/
Vul die nommer wat met u gevoel ooreenstem in die oop spasie in

(a) If a woman wants to, she can avoid being raped/
As 'n vrou wil, kan sy 'n verkragting vermy
(b) The rapist is usually unknown to the woman/
Die verkragter is gewoonlik onbekend aan die vrou
(c) Rapists are mentally ill/
Verkragters is verstandelike of geestelike siek mense
(d) A woman can "ask" to be raped by the way she dresses/
'n Vrou kan "vra" om verkrag te word deur die manier waarop sy aantrek
(e) A woman can "ask" to be raped through her behaviour (body language)/
'n Vrou kan "vra" om verkrag te word deur haar gedrag of optrede (liggaamstaal)
(f) If a woman goes out alone at night she "is asking" to be raped/
As 'n vrou alleen saans uitgaan, vra sy om verkrag te word
(g) Secretly women actually liked being raped/
Vroue hou in die geheim eintlik daarvan om verkrag te word
(h) The rapist is almost never a family member/
Die verkragter is omtrent nooit 'n familielid nie
(i) Only certain "types" of women are raped/
Net sekere "tipes" vroue word verkrag
(j) Women deserve to be raped when they hitchhike, go out alone, talk to unknown men or wear sexy clothes/
Vroue verdien om verkrag te word as hulle ryloop, alleen uitgaan, praat met onbekende mans of "sexy" klere dra
(k) Women usually make false rape reports against innocent men.
    Vroue maak gewoonlik vals klagte teen onskuldige mans.
    'n Vrou wie nie gereed is nie, kan nie verkrag word nie.

(1) A woman who is not ready, cannot be raped.

(m) "Nice or good" girls don't get raped.
    "Ordentlike" vroue word nie verkrag nie.

(n) Rapists are usually non-white men.
    Verkragters is gewoonlik nie-blanke mans.

(o) If women stay at home where they belong, they won't get raped.
    As vroue by die huis bly waar hulle hoort, sal hulle nie
    verkrag word nie.

(p) Rape is an expression of an uncontrollable sexual desire.
    Verkragting is 'n uitdrukking van 'n onbeheerbare seksuele drang.

(q) A woman who is raped was probably seductive and was asking
    for it.
    'n Vrou wie verkrag word was waarskynlik verleidelik en
    het daarvoor gevra.

(r) Women like being treated violently.
    Vroue hou daarvan om geweldadig behandel te word.

(s) Rape is violent sex.
    Verkragting is geweldadige seks.

(t) Rape is sexual violence.
    Verkragting is seksuele geweld.

(u) Rape is an act of power.
    Verkragting is 'n magsdaad.
APPENDIX 3: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR POLICE PERSONS

1. **Age/ Ouderdom:**
   
   (a) 18 - 30
   
   (b) 31 - 40
   
   (c) 41 - 50
   
   (d) Older than/ouer as 51

2. **Home language/ Huistaal:**
   
   (a) Afrikaans
   
   (b) English/Engels
   
   (c) Xhosa
   
   (d) Other, specify/Ander spesifiseer

3. **Gender/ Geslag:**
   
   (a) Female/Vroulik
   
   (b) Male/Manlik

4. **Marital status/ Huwelikstatus:**
   
   (a) Married/Getroud
   
   (b) Unmarried, cohabiting with male partner/ Ongetroud, bly saam met man
   
   (c) Unmarried, cohabiting with female partner/ Ongetroud bly saam met vrou
   
   (d) Unmarried, not cohabiting/ Ongetroud, bly nie saam
   
   (e) Divorced/Geskei
   
   (f) Widowed/Wewenaar
5. Religious affiliation/ (If any)
   Kerkverband (Indien enige):

6. Race/
   Ras:
   (a) Black/Swart
   (b) Coloured/Bruin
   (c) Asian/Asiër
   (d) White/Blank

7. What is your rank/
   Wat is u rang ?

8. How long have you been in the service of the South African Police/
   Hoe lank is u al in diens van die Suid-Afrikanse Polisie ?
   ............. Years/Jaar
   ............. Months/Maande

9. How much experience have you had with rape cases/
   Hoeveel ondervinding het u met verkragtingsake ?
   ............. Years/Jare (Approximately/Min of meer)
   ............. Number of cases/Aantal gevalle
                 (Approximately/Min of meer)

10. Do you think you are adequately trained to deal with rape survivors/
     Dink u, u is genoegsaam opgelei om met verkragte persone te werk ?
     (a) Yes/Ja
     (b) Not really/Nie regtig nie
     (c) No/Nee
11. How do you feel about an organisation such as Rape Crisis which deals with rape survivors?
Hoe voel u oor 'n organisasie soos Rape Crisis wat met verkragte persone werk? (Can indicate more than one/Kan meer as een aandui)

(a) They do a good job and provide a necessary service/
Hulle doen goeie werk en lewer 'n diens wat benodig word

(b) I feel positive about them/
Ek voel positief oor hulle

(c) They get in the way and is a hindrance/
Hulle is in die pad en is 'n hindernis

(d) I feel negative about them and prefer not to have contact with them/
Ek voel negatief oor hulle, en verkies om nie met hulle kontak te hê nie

(e) They are unfamiliar to me/Hulle is onbekend aan my

(f) Other comment/Verdere kommentaar

12. What do you think the sentence of a rapist should be?
Wat dink u behoort die vonnis van 'n verkragter te wees?

(a) Death penalty/Doodstraf

(b) Lifelong jail sentence/
Lewenslange tronkstraf

(c) Jail sentence according to the circumstances/
Tronkstraf afhangende van die omstandighede

(d) Psychiatric rehabilitation/
Psigiatriese rehabilitasie

(e) Castration/Kastrasie

(f) Other, specify/Ander, spesifiseer

13. Are you aware of the current changes taking place in terms of rape cases?
Is u bewus van die veranderinge wat tans plaasvind ten opsigte van verkragtingsake?

(a) Yes/Ja

(b) No/Nee
14. What do you think about the current changes taking place in terms of the way in which the police is expected to deal with rape cases?
Wat dink u van die huidige veranderinge wat plaasvind in terme van die manier waarop daar van die polisie verwag word om verkragtingsake te hanteer?

15. Are the changes making your task more or less difficult?
Het die veranderinge u taak vergemaklik, of bemoeilik?

(a) More difficult/Bemoeilik
(b) Less difficult/Vergemaklik
(c) Makes no difference/
Maak geen verskil nie

16. Do you think the changes are to the advantage of the rape survivor?
Dink u die veranderinge is tot voordeel van die verkragte persoon?

(a) Yes, it is to the advantage of the rape survivor/
Ja, dit it tot voordeel van die verkragte persoon
(b) No, it is not to the advantage of the rape survivor/
Nee, dit is nie tot voordeel van die verkragte persoon nie
(c) The changes do not make any difference/
Die veranderinge maak geen verskil nie

17. Which of the two systems do you think is the best way to deal with a rape case?
Watter een van die twee stelsels dink u is die beste om te gebruik?

(a) The "old" system/
Die "ou" stelsel
(b) The changed system/
Die veranderde stelsel
18. In your experience, what are the main difference between the two systems?
Na aanleiding van u ondervinding, wat is die hoofverskille tussen die twee stelsels?

19. Do you think it makes a difference to a rape survivor (the woman), whether the police officer that she deals with is a man or a woman?
Dink u dit maak 'n verskil aan die verkragte vrou of sy kontak met 'n manlike of vroulike polisie-persoon?
(a) Yes, it makes a difference/
Ja, dit maak 'n verskil
(b) No, it does not make a difference/
Nee, dit maak nie 'n verskil nie

20. Does the rape survivor (the woman) have a choice between dealing with a male or female police person to deal with?
Het die verkragte vrou 'n keuse tussen kontak met 'n manlike of vroulike polisie-persoon?
(a) Yes/Ja
(b) No/Nee

21. Do you think rape is a more "serious" offence than for example robbery or murder, should be handled in a different way, and that consequently the changes taking place are justified?
Dink u verkragting is 'n meer ernstige oortreding as byvoorbeeld roof of moord en moet daarom op 'n ander manier hanteer word, en dus is die veranderinge wat plaasvind geregverdig?

22. If the woman knew the man who had raped her, and had previously had sex with him, voluntarily, (on a previous occasion), do you consider it to be "rape"?
Indien die vrou haar verkragter geken het, en voorheen vrywilliglik met hom seks gehad het, sou u dit dan beskou as "verkragting"?
23. If the woman knew the man who had raped her (he was not a stranger), but she had never had sex with him before, do you consider it to be "rape"/
Indien die vrou haar verkragter geken het (hy was nie 'n vreemdeling nie), maar sy het nog nooit voorheen met hom seks gehad nie, sou u dit sien as "verkragting"?

(a) Yes/Ja
(b) No/Nee

Comments/Kommentaar

24. Do you believe that "marital rape" exists (that a husband can rape his wife)/
Glo u dat verkragting binne die huwelik bestaan (dat 'n man sy vrou kan verkrag)?

(a) Yes/Ja
(b) No/Nee

Comments/Kommentaar

25. Is the rapist mostly an unknown person or a known person to the woman/
Is die verkragter meestal bekend of onbekend aan die vrou

(a) An unknown person/
'n Onbekende persoon
(b) A known person/
'n Bekende persoon

26. Where does the actual rape mostly take place/
Waar vind die werklike verkragting meestal plaas?

(a) Within the woman's residence/
Binne die vrou se woonplek
(b) Somewhere outside her residence/
Iewers buite haar woonplek
27. **Does the rapist(s), mostly/**
   
   **Die verkragter meestal:**
   
   (a) **Use physical force or violence/**
   
   **Gebruik fisiese mag of geweld**
   
   (b) **Threaten to use physical force or violence/**
   
   **Dreig om fisiese mag of geweld te gebruik**
   
   (c) **Use a weapon/**
   
   **Gebruik 'n wapen**
   
   (d) **Threaten to use a weapon/**
   
   **Dreig om 'n wapen te gebruik**
   
   (e) **Persuade the woman/**
   
   **Oorreed die vrou**

28. **Is there a relationship between whether the woman knew her rapist, and the amount of force or violence used by him against her/**
   
   **Is daar 'n verband tussen of die vrou haar verkragter geken het, en die mate van mag en geweld wat deur die hom gebruik is?**
   
   (a) **Yes, there is a relationship/**
   
   **Ja, daar is 'n verband**

   (b) **No, there is no relationship/**
   
   **Nee, daar is nie 'n verband nie**

29. **Why do you think women don't report rape to the police/**
   
   **Waarom dink u word verkragting nie by die polisie aangemeld nie?**

   ........................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................

30. **Do you think these are justifiable (valid) reasons for not reporting it/**
   
   **Dink u dit is geregverdigde redes om dit nie aan te meld nie?**

   ........................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................
31. **How often do you find a woman making a false rape charge?**

Hoe gereeld kry u 'n vrou wat 'n vals saak van verkragting maak?

(a) Very often/Baie gereeld

(b) Often/Gereeld

(c) Seldom/Selde

(d) Very seldom/Baie selde

32. **Do you have any experience of male rape?**

Hет u enige ondervinding van manlike verkragting?

(a) Yes/Ja

(b) If "yes", approximately how many cases/
Indien "ja", ongeveer hoeveel gevalle .................

(c) No/Nee

33. **Do you believe that a man can be raped?**

Glo u dat 'n man verkrag kan word?

(a) Yes/Ja

(b) No/Nee

34. **Do you believe there is a difference, in the persons experience, between "rape" and "sodomy"?**

"Rape" and "sodomy" both being forced sexual intercourse against the will of the person/ 
Glo u daar is 'n verskil in terme van die persoon se ervaring daarvan, tussen "verkragting" en "sodomie"?

(a) Yes, there is a difference in experience/ 
Ja, daar is 'n verskil in ervaring

(b) No, there is no difference in experience/ 
Nee, daar is geen verskil in ervaring nie
35. Do you believe the current law to be adequate in distinguishing between "rape" and "sodomy", or do you believe the law should change?
(a) The law is adequate, and need no change/
(b) The law should be changed/

36. In a police investigation into an alleged rape case what constitutes "rapes"? What is needed as proof to show that the woman was raped?

37. What are your ideas on the prevention of rape?

38. Do we need more changes in the way in which we deal with rape cases?
(a) Yes, procedural changes (specify)/
(b) Yes, changes in the law (specify)/
Ja, veranderinge in wetgewing (spesifiseer)
..............................................................................................

(c) Yes, changes in the attitude of people working with rape survivors (specify)/
Ja, veranderinge in die houdings van mense wie met verkragte persone werk (spesifiseer)
..............................................................................................

(d) No, we do not need any changes/
Nee, ons benodig geen veranderinge nie

39. In the course of dealing with a rape case, do you ever come into contact with the district surgeon/
In u hantering van 'n verkragtingsaak, kom u ooit in aanraking met die distriksgeneesheer?

(a) Yes/Ja
(b) No/Nee

40. Are you aware of any complaints that the district surgeon(s) has about how the police deal with rape cases? What are these complaints?/
Is u bewus van enige klagtes van die distriksgeneesheer met betrekking tot die manier waarop die polisie verkragtingsake hanteer? Wat is die klagtes?
..............................................................................................
..............................................................................................

41. Do you have any complaints/comments with regard to the way in which the district surgeon(s) deals with a rape case/
Het u enige klagtes of kommentaar met betrekking tot die manier waarop die distriksgeneesheer met verkragtingsake werk?
..............................................................................................
..............................................................................................
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42. If you do come into contact with the district surgeon, how would you evaluate his or her overall attitude towards rape survivors?

Indien u wel met die distriksgeneesheer in aanraking kom, hoe sal u sy of haar houding, in die algemeen, teenoor verkragte persone evalueer?

(Where 1 is the lowest value, 3 a neutral or average value and 5 the highest value/
Waar 1 die laagste waarde is, 3 'n neutrale of gemiddelde waarde en 5 die hoogste waarde)

INDICATE HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT ALL THE POSSIBILITIES BY ENCIRCLING THE CORRECT NUMBER/
DUI AAN HOE U OOR AL DIE MOOONTLIKHEDE VOEL DEUR DIE KORREKTE NOMMER TE OKRING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Sympathetic/Simpatiek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Inhumane/Onmenslik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Condemnatory/Veroordelend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Professional/Professioneel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Effective/Doeltreffend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Fair/Regverdig</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Unfriendly/Onvriendelijk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Insensitive/Onsensitief</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Neutral/Neutraal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Considerate/Bedagsaam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) Helpful/Behulpsaam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l) Unconcerned/Onbesorg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m) Supportive/Ondersteunend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n) Aloof/Afsydig</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o) Unreasonable/Onredelik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p) Understanding/Begrypend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments/Kommentaar: ..........................................................
43. How would you evaluate the police’s overall attitude towards rape survivors?

Hoe sal u in die algemeen die polisie se houding teenoor verkragte persone évalueer?

(Where 1 is the lowest value, 3 a neutral or average value and 5 the highest value/
Waar 1 die laagste waarde is, 3 'n neutrale of gemiddelde waarde en 5 die hoogste waarde)

**INDICATE HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT ALL OF THE POSSIBILITIES BY ENCIRCLING THE CORRECT NUMBER**/

**DUI AAN HOE U OOR AL DIE MOONTLIKHEDE VOEL DEUR DIE KORREKTE NOEMER TE OMKRING**

| (a) Sympathetic/Simpatiek         | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (b) Inhumane/Onmenslik           | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (c) Condemnatory/Veroordeled     | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (d) Professional/Professioneel   | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (e) Effective/Doeltreffend       | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (f) Fair/Regverdig               | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (g) Unfriendly/Onvriendelik      | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (h) Insensitive/Onsensitief      | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (i) Neutral/Neutraal             | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (j) Considerate/Bedagsaam        | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (k) Helpful/Behulpsaam           | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (l) Unconcerned/Onbesorg         | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (m) Supportive/Ondersteunend     | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (n) Aloof/Afsynd                 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (o) Unreasonable/Onredelik       | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (p) Understanding/Begrypend      | 1 2 3 4 5 |

**Comments/Kommentaar:..........................................................**
44. Please indicate how you feel about the following statements/
Dui asseblief aan hoe u oor die volgende stellings voel:

Where/Waar 1 = "disagree strongly"/"verskil sterk"
2 = "disagree"/"verskil"
3 = "agree"/"stem saam"
4 = "agree strongly"/"stem sterk saam"

Fill in the number which corresponds to your reaction, in the open space provided/
Vul die nommer wat met u gevoel ooreenstem in die oop spasie in

(a) If a woman wants to, she can avoid being raped/
As 'n vrou wil, kan sy 'n verkragting vermy

(b) The rapist is usually unknown to the woman/
Die verkragter is gewoonlik onbekend aan die vrou

(c) Rapists are mentally ill/
Verkragters is verstandelike of geestelike siek mense

(d) A woman can "ask" to be raped by the way she dresses/
'n Vrou kan "vra" om verkrag te word deur die manier waarop sy aantrek

(e) A woman can "ask" to be raped through her behaviour (body language)/
'n Vrou kan "vra" om verkrag te word deur haar gedrag of optrede (liggaamstaal)

(f) If a woman goes out alone at night she is "asking" to be raped/
As 'n vrou alleen saans uitgaan, vra sy om verkrag te word

(g) Secretly women actually like being raped/
Vroue hou in die geheim eintlik daarvan om verkrag te word

(h) The rapist is almost never a family member/
Die verkragter is omtrent nooit 'n familielid nie

(i) Only certain "types" of women are raped/
Net sekere "tipes" vroue word verkrag

PLEASE TURN PAGE FOR REST OF QUESTION/
BLAAI ASB. OM VIR RES VAN VRAAG
(j) Women deserve to be raped when they hitchhike, go out alone, talk to unknown men or wear sexy clothes/
Vroue verdien om verkrag te word as hulle ryloop, alleen uitgaan, praat met onbekende mans of "sexy" klere dra

(k) Women usually make false rape reports against innocent men/
Vroue maak gewoonlik vals klagte teen onskuldige mans

(l) A woman who is not ready, cannot be raped/
'n Vrou wie nie gereed is nie, kan nie verkrag word nie

(m) "Nice or good" girls don't get raped/
"Ordentlike" vroue word nie verkrag nie

(n) Rapists are usually non-white men/
Verkragters is gewoonlik nie-blanke mans

(o) If women stay at home where they belong, they won't get raped/
As vroue by die huis bly waar hulle hoort, sal hulle nie verkrag word nie

(p) Rape is an expression of an uncontrollable sexual desire/
Verkragting is 'n uitdrukking van 'n onbeheerbare seksuele drang

(q) A woman who is raped was probably seductive and was asking for it/
'n Vrou wie verkrag word was waarskynlik verleidelik en het daarvoor gevra

(r) Women like being treated violently/
Vroue hou daarvan om geweldadig behandel te word

(s) Rape is violent sex/
Verkragting is geweldadige seks

(t) Rape is sexual violence/
Verkragting is seksuele geweld

(u) Rape is an act of power/
Verkragting is 'n magsdaad