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This dissertation attempts to find out what associations exist between dysfunctional parental relationships in the childhood of rapists and the rapists’ violent acts. It also briefly examines the sociocultural effects which nurture such relationships.

Almost every possible type of causation for the crime of rape, covering the areas of biology, sociology, psychology and social psychology, has been studied. However, the effect of parental relationships upon rapists has not received much attention.

Rape, a crime very prevalent in our society today, is now perceived as an acute
expression of men's contempt for and anger against women. The former interpretation of rape as primarily a sexually motivated crime is no longer popular. This dissertation attempts to trace the origin of the rapist's psyche from his dysfunctional parental relationships.

A truly empirical study of rape is almost impossible because of the difficulty in obtaining a random sample of rapists. This situation is brought about for the following reasons. Only a certain percentage of rapes are reported and only a certain percentage of the reported rapists are arrested. Furthermore, only a certain number of arrested rapists are charged with a crime—mainly because of the “unfounding” process by the police—and only a certain number of the charged rapists are finally convicted and incarcerated.

These incarcerated, hard-core rapists are usually the only available subjects for researchers studying rapists. So, truly empirical data based on a random sample is almost impossible to obtain. In addition to this predicament, data of the rapists’ early home environment or their personality development problems are often left out of research. Due to all of the above reasons, good empirical data on rapists' parental relationships are very rare.

Rare data on family relations from a recent FBI survey on 41 serial rapists provided the empirical base for this dissertation. In order to enlarge the sample size for this dissertation, relevant information was extracted from an additional 31 rapists' case histories through content analysis and added to the FBI study. These 31 case histories were drawn from three different sources.

Information about the rapists' dominant parental figures and the rapists' positive and negative parental relationships were extracted and tabulated in three separate tables. Relevant information drawn from one additional source was also incorporated into the tables. These three tables were used to clarify the nature of the rapists' parental relationships.

In addition, 18 case histories selected from the 31 case histories mentioned above were analyzed in order to show, in more detail, the nature of the rapist's negative parental
relationship and its role in the creation of the rapist psyche.

The combined result of the FBI study and the 31 case histories, the analysis of the 18 case histories, and information from other sources suggest a strong correlation between the rapists’ negative parental relationships and their crime of rape. The data on the rapists were compared to survey responses by 41 imprisoned felons, not convicted of a sexual offense, and by 150 male university students. The comparison revealed important differences in the family relations of the rapists and the other two groups.

Our society’s self- abusive, aspiritual cultural tendency was briefly examined as the basic influential force in creating negative parental relationships.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION
RESEARCH SUBJECT

This dissertation is a study of the effect of parental relationships upon rapists and the socio-cultural influences which nurture such relationships.

In recent decades the crime of rape has been studied extensively. A group of feminist scholars has earnestly researched this subject since the early 1970’s (e.g., Brownmiller, 1975; Geis, 1977; Largen, 1985; Russell, 1984; Tong, 1984) and they offer penetrating new insight into the analysis of the very nature of this crime. As a result of these feminists’ efforts, rape is now seen as a violent crime against women through which men try to overcome women in order to experience power. The former interpretation of rape as primarily a sexually motivated crime is no longer popular. Instead, rape is clearly perceived as an acute expression of men’s contempt for and anger against women which is so prevalent in our culture today.

Recent studies have also examined almost every possible type of causation for the crime of rape, covering the areas of biology, sociology, psychology and social psychology. However, the effect of parental relationships upon rapists has still not received much attention. Some scholars studied the effect of childhood sexual abuse on rapists and found a significant correlation between incestuous sexual abuse and the crime of rape (Groth, 1979; Seghorn and Boucher, 1980; and others). But these studies were limited to the effect of sexual abuse on the rapists and did not cover the influences of the broader, more general parental relationship such as level of intimacy, mutual understanding and affection.

Until the early 1970’s, when the feminists began studying rape, researchers had
concentrated on the offenders. During this period some significant studies were undertaken by psychiatrists in tracing the cause of rape to the parental relationship (Karpman, 1951; Lindner, 1955; and others). Most of these psychiatrists were psychoanalytically oriented and their focus was more on the incestuous relationship between the rapists and their mothers. Although their attention was limited to the rapists' personal life and did not include socio-cultural influences, their studies hinted at some important clues for understanding the rapists' motivational problems.

With the advent of rape research by feminist scholars, the focus was shifted from the offenders to the victims. The crime of rape was understood as a violent male crime against women and, consequently, appropriate treatment and rehabilitation programs for the victims have been created and rape laws have been reformed. Yet, the overall study of the crime of rape still reveals some significant problems. Above all, the rate of reported rape incidents is steadily increasing and the rate of recidivism is still high. It is apparent that, for a program of effective prevention of rape to work, the offenders' problems should be thoroughly understood. Only then can effective prevention and rehabilitation programs for the offenders be created.

Feminists made the point clear that men rape to subdue women in order to exert power over them. In general, these men have contempt, anger and hatred for women. This dissertation will trace the origins of these negative feelings of men toward women in their parental relationships and the socio-cultural influences which nurture such relationships.

In recent years the subject of "family dysfunction" has attained much attention. In focusing on rapists' parental relationships, the crime of rape could be seen as an acute expression of "family dysfunction" and the study of the effects of parental relationships upon rapists is timely and meaningful. In this introduction, the definition and prevalence of rape and the main existing theories of causation of rape will be briefly examined.
DEFINITION OF RAPE

In his landmark study of rape, *Patterns in Forcible Rape*, Menachem Amir said:

The term "rape" is so broadly used, so lacking in a uniform classification and definition, that to measure its extent in a given population is almost impossible (Amir, 1971, p.34).

Following is a very brief historical perspective of the definition of rape.

According to an English judge, J.F. Stephen (1886) (a well known legal historian and a codifier of the criminal law), rape, sodomy and bestiality were the only specifically sexual crimes existing in common law for hundreds of years. And among these three crimes, only rape had the notion of violence within its definition. A century ago Stephen described rape as follows:

Another offence, also against the female part of the subjects of the realm, but attended with greater aggravations, even than that of forcible marriage, is the crime of rape, *raptus mulierum*, that is, the carnal knowledge of a woman forcibly and against her will (Stephen, 1886, Vol. 6:89).

The interpretation of carnal knowledge of a woman in this context was limited to the penetration (or attempted penetration) of a man’s penis into a woman’s vagina. It did not include other forms of nonconsenting sexual intimacy (Chapell, 1989).

Stephen used the phrase “forcibly and against her will” to imply the violent component of the crime of rape. However, Stephen suggested that “without her consent” would be a more proper definition for the crime of rape. This idea was later adapted into many statutory formulations of the common-law definition (Chapell, 1989).

New sexual offences, such as indecent assault, incest, and statutory rape, were created by legislative action from the nineteenth century onward. Some established common-law concepts were also modified by this legislative action. Until the 1970’s the classic common-law definition of rape was widely used. An important point to remember is
that, as shown in a pioneering study (Radzinowicz, 1957) at the University of Cambridge, rape was still categorized typically as a sexual rather than a violent crime (Chappell, 1989).

From the 1970’s on, intensive research on rape was done by a group of feminist scholars, including Geis (1977), Largen (1985) and Tong (1984). This new research greatly altered the classical concept of the crime of rape. These feminists viewed rape as another means of social control by men over women; that is, through rape men exerted their power over women to keep the women in their place. The following statement by Brownmiller clearly expressed this point of view:

Man’s discovery that his genitalia could serve as a weapon to generate fear must rank as one of the most important discoveries of prehistorical time, along with the use of fire and the first crude stone axe. From prehistoric times to the present I believe rape has played a critical function. It is nothing more or less than a conscious process of intimidation by which all men keep all women in a state of fear (Brownmiller, 1975, pp.14–15).

So, according to the feminists’ viewpoint, rape was seen more as a violent offence against women rather than as a sexual crime. The feminists also argued that in our male-dominated, sexist society, women are not treated as whole human beings and are left helpless against the crime of rape. They urgently demanded rape law reform to change this situation. This effort in the 1970’s brought massive law reform concerned with rape and related sexual crimes. Chappell says “In the United States alone by 1978, 37 states had revised their rape laws (Chappell et al., 1978), and by 1980 every state had considered and most states had passed some form of rape reform legislation” (Chappell, 1989, p.75).

Similar law reform occurred in other common-law countries; for example, in Australia by the mid–1980s’, in Canada in 1975 and again in 1983, and in New Zealand in 1984. In England, however, this type of reform has remained the subject of inquiry only and has not yet reached the point of legislative action (Chappell, 1989).

The effect of these legislative efforts on the definition of rape is clear. Chappell says:
Increasingly rape is becoming regarded in its legal form as a type of gender-neutral assault that encompasses behavior previously categorized under a number of criminal labels including indecent assault and sodomy (Chappell, 1989, p. 76).

The American Law Institute Model Penal Code Official Draft, 1962 (which is still current in 1989), defines rape as follows:

Section 213.1. Rape and Related Offenses
(1) Rape. A male who has sexual intercourse with a female not his wife is guilty of rape if:
   (a) he compels her to submit by force or by threat of imminent death, serious bodily injury, extreme pain or kidnapping, to be inflicted on anyone; or
   (b) he has substantially impaired her power to appraise or control her conduct by administering or employing without her knowledge drugs, intoxicants or other means for the purpose of preventing resistance; or
   (c) the female is unconscious; or
   (d) the female is less than 10 years old.
Rape is a felony of the second degree unless (i) in the course thereof the actor inflicts serious bodily injury upon anyone, or (ii) the victim was not a voluntary social companion of the actor upon the occasion of the crime and had not previously permitted him sexual liberties, in which cases the offense is a felony of the first degree.
Sexual intercourse includes intercourse per os or per anum, with some penetration however slight; emission is not required.
(2) Gross Sexual Imposition. A male who has sexual intercourse with a female not his wife commits a felony of the third degree if:
   (a) he compels her to submit by any threat that would prevent resistance by a woman of ordinary resolution; or
   (b) he knows that she suffers from a mental disease or defect which renders her incapable of appraising the nature of her conduct; or
   (c) he knows that she is unaware that a sexual act is being committed upon her or that she submits because she mistakenly supposes that he is her husband (Kadish and Schulhofer, 1989, p. 1231).

According to Marsh and others (1982), the reformed rape law of the state of Michigan, which was first implemented in April, 1975, and called the "Michigan Model,"
provides the best example of the new definition of rape. The model adapted the phrase “criminal sexual conduct” instead of the term “rape” and it defined four degrees of criminal assaultive sexual acts according to the seriousness of the offense, the amount of coercion used, the infliction of personal injury, and the age and incapacitation of the victim (Chappell, 1989).

Definition of rape in the Michigan Model did not limit the crime of rape to penetration or attempted penetration. Instead, “The degree structure…removes the disparity between acts of penetration and molestation and describes these acts as a sequence of violent coercive behaviors” (Marsh, et al., 1982. p.20).

The phrase “sequence of violent coercive behaviors” raises certain disputes in dealing with incest and certain forms of child sexual abuse where victims often consent tacitly because of the inherent power relationship between the offenders and victims. Russell (1984) suggested that these crimes should be treated as sexual exploitation rather than sexual violence (Chappell, 1989).

Thus, during the past two decades, the basic perception and interpretation of rape changed from a sexually oriented crime to a violent crime expressed through sexual assault. The classical penetration–centered definition of rape also changed to one that encompasses a wider range of sexual crimes.

The efforts of rape law reform have become visible. As a specific example of this progress, both old and reformed Michigan rape laws are presented below. The current rape laws of Mississippi are also presented as an example of the different level of progress existing among various states. The present rape laws of Alabama, California, Florida, Illinois, New Mexico, New York, Oregon and Washington are included in the appendix. The states chosen represent the demographic regions of the United States.

Michigan Rape Laws (1968):
750.520 Carnal knowledge
Sec. 520. Any person who shall ravish and carnally know any female of the
age of 16 years, or more, by force and against her will, or who shall unlawfully and carnally know and abuse any female under the full age of 16 years, shall be guilty of a felony, punishable by imprisonment in the state prison for life or for any term of years, or if such person was at the time of the said offense a sexually delinquent person, may be punishable by imprisonment in the state prison for an indeterminate term, the minimum of which shall be 1 day and the maximum of which shall be life. Such carnal knowledge shall be deemed complete upon proof of any sexual penetration however slight (Michigan Compiled Laws: Annotated, 1968, Vol.39, p.370).

750.520b. First degree criminal sexual conduct
Sec. 520b. (1) A person is guilty of criminal sexual conduct in the first degree if he or she engages in sexual penetration with another person and if any of the following circumstances exists:
(a) That other person is under 13 years of age.

(b) That other person is at least 13 but less than 16 years of age and any of the following:
   (i) The actor is a member of the same household as the victim.
   (ii) The actor is related to the victim by blood or affinity to the fourth degree.
   (iii) The actor is in a position of authority over the victim and used this authority to coerce the victim to submit.

(c) Sexual penetration occurs under circumstances involving the commission of any other felony.

(d) The actor is aided or abetted by 1 or more other persons and either of the following circumstances exists:
   (i) The actor knows or has reason to know that the victim is mentally incapable, mentally incapacitated, or physically helpless.
   (ii) The actor uses force or coercion to accomplish the sexual penetration. Force or coercion includes but is not limited to any of the circumstances listed in subdivision (f)(i) to (v).

(e) The actor is armed with a weapon or any article used or fashioned in a manner to lead the victim to reasonably believe it to be a weapon.

(f) The actor causes personal injury to the victim and force or coercion is used
to accomplish sexual penetration. Force or coercion includes but is not limited to any of the following circumstances:

(i) When the actor overcomes the victim through the actual application of physical force or physical violence.

(ii) When the actor coerces the victim to submit by threatening to use force or violence on the victim, and the victim believes that the actor has the present ability to execute these threats.

(iii) When the actor coerces the victim to submit by threatening to retaliate in the future against the victim, or any other person, and the victim believes that the actor has the ability to execute this threat. As used in this subdivision, “to retaliate” includes threats of physical punishment, kidnapping, or extortion.

(iv) When the actor engages in the medical treatment or examination of the victim in a manner or for purposes which are medically recognized as unethical or unacceptable.

(v) When the actor, through concealment or by the element of surprise, is able to overcome the victim.

(g) The actor causes personal injury to the victim, and the actor knows or has reason to know that the victim is mentally incapable, mentally incapacitated, or physically helpless.

(h) That other person is mentally incapable, mentally disabled, mentally incapacitated, or physically helpless, and any of the following:

(i) The actor is related to the victim by blood or affinity to the fourth degree.

(ii) The actor is in a position or authority over the victim and used this authority to coerce the victim to submit.

(2) Criminal sexual conduct in the first degree is a felony punishable by imprisonment in the state prison for life or for any term of years (Michigan Compiled Laws: Annotated, 1968, Vol.39, pp.219–220).

Mississippi Rape Laws (1972):

97–3–65. Rape—carnal knowledge of female under twelve years of age, or, being over twelve, against her will.

Every person who shall be convicted of rape, either by carnally and unlawfully knowing a female child under the age of twelve years, or by forcibly ravishing any female of the age of twelve years and upward, or who shall have been convicted of having carnal knowledge of any female above the age of twelve years without her consent, by administering to her any substance or liquid which shall produce such stupor or such imbecility of
mind or weakness of body as to prevent effectual resistance, shall suffer death, unless the jury shall fix the imprisonment in the penitentiary for life, as it may do in case of murder. In all cases where the female is under the age of twelve years it shall not be necessary to prove penetration of the female's private parts where it is shown the private parts of the female have been lacerated or torn in the attempt to have carnal knowledge of her (Mississippi Code: Annotated, 1972, Vol.20, p.636).

So much for the legal definition of rape. How about the clinical view of rape? Groth states:

Actually, from a clinical rather than a legal point of view, it makes more sense to regard rape as any form of forcible sexual assault, whether the assailant intends to effect intercourse or some other type of sexual act. There is sufficient similarity in the factors underlying all types of forcible sexual assault—and in the impact such behavior has on the victim—so that they may be discussed meaningfully under the single term of rape. The defining element in rape is lack of consent. Although, typically, physical force or the threat of physical injury is envisioned in such assaults, the concept of rape can be expanded—and has been in the criminal codes of some states—to encompass those situations in which the position of authority can be used to exploit a person sexually (Groth, 1979, p.3).

Compared with the progress made in general rape law reform, the change has been rather slow in the area of “marital rape exemption” law, which has recently gained much attention. The marital rape exemption laws usually define rape as “the forcible penetration of the body of a woman, not the wife of the perpetrator, and so according to them, rape in marriage is a legal impossibility” (Russell, 1982, p.17).

According to Russell, the origin of this exemption is invariably traced to a pronouncement by Mathew Hale, Chief Justice in England in the 17th century. The pronouncement was published in History of the Pleas of the Crown, in 1736 and it reads as follows:

But 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 up herself in this kind unto the husband which she cannot retract (Russell, 1982, p.17).

Russell interpreted this statement to imply that the sole purpose of marriage was procreation and when women married, they became their husband’s property. Therefore, husbands had the right to sexual intercourse with their wives upon all occasions (Russell, 1982).

Russell also said that the reason for the delay of marital rape exemption law reform is primarily due to resistance by the majority of males in American state legislatures.

In July, 1980, New Jersey, Oregon, and Nebraska were the only states that had totally abolished the marital rape exemption and several other states had partially reformed their laws. However, by the same date, thirteen states (Alabama, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Texas and West Virginia) had changed their marital rape exemption laws for the worse (Russell, 1982).

In these states the new law extended the privilege of rape to men who are living with women without the benefit of legal marriage. In five of the thirteen states (Delaware, Hawaii, Maine, North Dakota and West Virginia), even the condition of “cohabitation” was not a necessary requirement to receive this privilege. Men could rape women who previously had voluntary sexual intercourse with them without fear of legal punishment. Worse yet, in one state (West Virgina), even the “previous sexual intercourse” was not required for men to receive this privilege. Men who rape their “voluntary social companions” could expect certain legal protection for their action (Russell, 1982).

Legal reform in the area of marital rape exemption law does not offer a bright view. However, in 1981 several states, including Maryland, New Hampshire, New York, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania, began taking progressive action toward positive change. (Russell, 1982). Overall, the movement is slowly but steadily increasing.
Thus, the feminists have contributed to the change in the very basic concept of rape from that of the classical notion of a sexually oriented crime to a more male power, aggression oriented crime. At the same time, the classical definition of rape as forcible sexual intercourse has changed to include a wide range of sexual offences. Yet, the evolution of the definition of the crime of rape has not been completed. Ongoing disputes over the various phases of the crime, such as its classification, causes and offender's punishment, along with changing social attitudes toward the crime, will bring inevitable changes to the definition in the future.

PREVALENCE OF RAPE

Chappell states that official statistics, victimization surveys, and research studies in the United States have shown a high level of occurrences of rape and attempted rape in recent decades. However, there is still some debate over the accuracy, reliability, and interpretation of the data from which this conclusion was drawn (Chappell, 1989).

Accurate and reliable information about the prevalence of rape is almost impossible to obtain, partly because of the differences in the definition of rape described in the previous section. Other important reasons are the following: (1) Feldman–Summers and Ashworth (1981) and many others found that only a portion of rape crime is reported to the police. (2) The same studies also reveal that a certain amount of reported rapes are treated as "unfounded" (no crime) by police or recorded as some other form of crime, such as indecent assault. (3) Russell (1984) states that rape victims often hesitate to talk about their experience to strangers. This situation creates difficulties in gaining information about rape through victimization surveys (Chappell, 1989).

Chappell points out the wide variation in the current estimates of the proportion of rapes to attempted rapes reported. For example, McDermott (1979) reports a ratio of about 1 in 2 and Russell (1984) reports a ratio of less than 1 in 12 (Chappell, 1989).
Kilpatrick (1984) has provided the most recent sophisticated victimization research. He and his colleagues interviewed 2004 adult (18 years or over) female residents of a South Carolina county. Out of this group, 9% claimed to have been victims of rape or attempted rape during their lifetimes, 5% claimed to be victims of sexual molestation or attempted sexual molestation, and 1% claimed to be victims of other sexual assaults. This study found that the percentage (26%) of victims reporting any of these forms of sexual assault to the police was low (Chappell, 1989).

The U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics (1992) reviewed data gathered about rape and attempted rape from the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) during the 19-year period from 1973 to 1991. The percent of rape and attempted rape crimes committed during this period reported to the police ranged from 49% in 1973 to 59% in 1991. Young victims (age 12 to 15) and older victims (over age 35) reported the crime more often. In the cases where the offender was a stranger to the victim, and when the victim was a widow, the reporting rate was higher (Chappell, 1989).

Researchers have found a wide range of reasons why some rape victims do not report the crime. Amir (1971) points out that the fear of retaliation from their attacker prevents some rape victims reporting the crime. Some rape victims want to avoid the painful exposure that the process of rape prosecution necessitates. Macdonald (1971) said some victims feel too embarrassed and ashamed to file a report. Katz and Mazur (1979) report that some victims do not want to report a rape because they fear rejection by their husbands and families (Williams, 1984).

Weis and Borges (1973) said some victims may not want to disturb their own family and friends and those close to the rapist by disclosing such unpleasant news. Amir (1971) said some victims simply may not have the time for the court hearing and legal process, especially if they are employed. Or, Ashworth and Feldman–Summers (1978) said some victims doubt if the criminal justice system will efficiently apprehend and punish the rapist. Burgess and Holmstrom (1974) and many others found that it is common for rape victims to
blame themselves. Or they fear they will be blamed by their family, friends, and especially by the police (Williams, 1984).

Amir (1971), Brownmiller (1975) and many others put emphasis on the relationship between the victim and the rapist as an important factor in the decision to report the crime. Fox and Scherl (1972) said if the victim knows her rapist, she may want to protect him from a harsh punishment. Schwendinger and Schwendinger (1980) argue that when the victim knows her rapist, she may blame herself by thinking she invited the action and therefore there is no crime to report. Brownmiller and others said that even though the woman sees herself being raped, she may fear that others will not believe in her claim because she knew the rapist (Williams, 1984).

Katz and Mazur (1979) found that the rape incidents between white men and black women tend to be less reported. Amir (1971) said that rape involving black men and white women is more likely to be reported. Amir also found that when a large age difference exists between rapists and victims, there tend to be more reported cases (Williams, 1984).

Amir and others also point out an important influential factor on rape reporting. They found that the greater the victim’s injuries, the more likely she is to report it. However, MacDermott (1979) found that in the case of rape by strangers, the women were equally likely to report whether they were injured or not (Williams, 1984).

Tables I and II are taken from the 1985 U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, “The Crime of Rape.”
# TABLE I

## REPORTING OF FEMALE RAPES TO POLICE, 1973-82.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Total victimizations</th>
<th>Percent of victimizations that were:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All rapes</td>
<td>1,511,000</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed rape</td>
<td>479,000</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted rape</td>
<td>1,032,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offender's relationship to victim</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger to victim</td>
<td>1,024,000</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstranger to victim</td>
<td>486,000</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,228,000</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>168,000</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>384,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>403,000</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>382,000</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>287,000</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>231,000</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>825,000</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percents do not add to 100 because victimizations are excluded from table if reporting status is unknown.

# Too few cases in the survey sample to obtain statistically reliable data.
TABLE II

REPORTING OF RAPE OF FEMALE VICTIMS TO POLICE AND REASONS FOR NOT REPORTING, 1973-82.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Victims of:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Attempted rape</td>
<td>Completed rape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All victims (1)</td>
<td>1,511,000</td>
<td>1,032,000</td>
<td>479,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape reported to police</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape not reported to police</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of unreported rapes by reason not reported:

- Nothing could be done: 24% (27%) (13%)
- Didn't think it was important: 7 (8)
- Police would not want to be bothered: 9 (10)
- Didn't want to take the time: 2 (2)
- Private or personal matter: 29 (25) (39)
- Didn't want to get involved: 6 (5) (8)
- Afraid of reprisal: 16 (12) (27)
- Reported to someone else: 12 (14) (7)
- Other: 36 (34) (42)

Note: Percentages for reasons not reporting add to more than 100 because some respondents gave more than one reason.

# Too few cases in survey sample to obtain statistically reliable data.

(1) Includes rapes for which reporting status was unknown.

Concerning the “unfounding” process for some reported rape cases, Russell states:

Interpreting trends in the official rape statistics is even more difficult than interpreting the trends in other crimes. This is a direct result of the “unfounding” process, which applies only to rape. According to the FBI, unfounding means “the police established that no forcible rape offense or attempt occurred” (FBI, 1973). What this euphemistic definition actually describes is the process by which rape cases are dismissed by the police as false reports. The basis for, and error rate in these judgements, is unknown and therefore unmeasurable (Russell, 1984, p.29).

In 1978 the FBI discontinued to report unfounded rates in rape cases, which had remained about 18% until then (Chappell, 1989). Russell said that the FBI did not give any reason for its decision to discontinue this reporting. Unfortunately, it was not because the
police have eliminated the unfounding process (Russell, 1984).

The police unfounding process for rape cases is also a shared phenomenon in other countries such as Canada and England. The police unfounding rate for rape in Canada has been even higher than that of the United States; 43% in 1972 but declining to 28% by 1981. In England, Wright (1980) conducted a survey of police records of rape or attempted rape in six counties and found that almost one in four had been dismissed as “no crime” (Chappell, 1989).

Russell (1975) and other researchers found that many rape victims tell no one, particularly no one in their own household, about their rape experiences. Whereas an interviewed adult would know of a family member’s experience of nonsexual assault such as a robbery, he would not know of any rape experience.

In the early 1970’s, the federal government established the National Crime Surveys (NCS) to obtain more accurate incidence rates through wide scale victimization surveys. These surveys were on a nationwide scale and designed and carried out for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) and more recently for the Bureau of Justice Statistics, by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

A NCS study revealed 600 attempted rape cases and not one completed rape case for the entire year of 1970 after personal interviews were conducted with 5,500 household members and at 1,000 business locations in San Jose, California, and its suburbs. This experience led the LEAA to state:

Rape is not only a traumatic experience for the victim, but also the only crime for which the victim can be socially stigmatized. More so than for any other crime, there are strong pressures on the victim not to report the incident to a complete stranger (Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1974, p.12).

Although subsequent National Crime Surveys have been more successful in finding rape victims who are willing to disclose their victimization, the above particular example tells
the real difficulty in any victimization survey (Russell, 1984).

In recent years the crime of rape has gained much public attention. As a result, police, doctors and nurses, and judicial officials have changed their attitudes toward rape victims. More effective treatment and rehabilitation programs have also been offered for rape victims. This situation has encouraged rape victims to report more freely to police or interviewers. Yet the old pattern of non-disclosure still persists and an accurate rate of the crime of rape is still impossible to obtain.

Russell states her concern about the rising rape incidence rate as follows:

Research now shows that both rape and attempted rape occur in epidemic proportions and in a pattern that is escalating over time. Knowledge of the prevalence of these crimes should stimulate strenuous effort to find a truly effective means of preventing rape and other sexual assaults (Russell, 1984, p.65).

Despite all of the difficulties and limitations involved in the research on prevalence of rape, advanced methods of research have been developed in recent decades. However, some important studies show significantly different findings when compared. For instance, Russell’s victimization survey in San Francisco in 1978 found that out of the random sample of 930 women, 18 years and older, interviewed, 41% reported at least one experience of rape or attempted rape (Russell, 1984).

The incidence rate of rape and attempted rape drawn from Russell’s data is approximately 3%, or 2,688 per 100,000 females. This figure is 13 times higher than the incidence rate reported by the Uniform Crime Reports for females of all ages in that city. Russell’s incidence figure is 7 times higher than the incidence rate statistics gathered by the National Crime Survey in San Francisco (victimization survey with data that includes unreported cases to the police) (Russell, 1984).

As mentioned earlier, Kilpatrick’s (1984) victimization study, which is regarded as the most sophisticated research of that type to date, revealed that about 9% of the women in
the sample claimed that they were victims of rape or attempted rape during their lifetime, about 5% claimed to be victims of sexual molestation or attempted sexual molestation, and 1% claimed to be victims of other sexual assaults (Chappell, 1989).

Hindelang and Davis (1977) cite the *Uniform Crime Reports* violent crime index rate for offenses when they discuss the rising rate of rape. In the 40–year period from 1933 to 1973, the general violent crime rate increased 170% while the rate of rape increased 557%. Weiner and Wolfgang (1985) cite the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence (1969) which states that in the years from 1958 to 1968 the entire violent crime rate doubled (from 147.6 to 294.6 per 100,000 population) while the rape rate rose 67% (from 9.3 to 15.5) (Chappell, 1989).

Weiner and Wolfgang further found that between 1969 and 1982 there was a continuing overall growth in violent crime with rape rates increasing 82% from 18.5 to 33.6 per 100,000 population. According to the U.S. Department of Justice (1986), in the early 1980’s these rates decreased, but by 1985 both the violent crime rate and the rate of rape were on the increase again (Chappell, 1989).

Mukherjee (1981) stated that the rising rate of rape and attempted rape is a common phenomenon in many other countries too. However, the United States has much higher rates than any other country. Chappell and Hatch (1986) found that in Canada the rate remains about one–third that of the U.S. The Howard League (1985) found that in England and Wales, the rate rose by 33.7% between 1973 and 1983, and yet it is still only about one–eighteenth that of the U.S. (Chappell, 1989).

Figure 1 (Appendix A) is taken from the 1991 FBI *Uniform Crime Reports* and provides the percent distribution of crime index offenses for 1990. The number of forcible rapes is only 1% of the total crimes in that year.

Table XVII (Appendix A) is also taken from the 1991 FBI *Uniform Crime Reports* and provides the index of crime in the United States from 1981 to 1990. According to the
table, the percent increase for forcible rape offenses during the five year period between 1986 and 1990 was 12.1% and the increase during the ten year period between 1981 and 1990 was 24.3%. The percent increase for forcible rape offenses based on rate per 100,000 inhabitants for the five year period between 1986 and 1990 was 8.7% and the increase for the ten year period between 1981 and 1990 was 14.4%.

The number of violent crimes (murder, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault) increased 22.2% during the five year period between 1986 and 1990 and 33.7% during the ten year period between 1981 and 1990. The rate of increase for violent crimes per 100,000 inhabitants was 18.5% for the five year period between 1986 and 1990 and 23.1% for the ten year period between 1981 and 1990. Therefore, the rate of increase for rape offenses is much less than that for violent crime offenses during the ten year period. The yearly total of forcible rape offenses is about 6% of the yearly total of violent crime offenses for the same ten year period.

The following information about rape prevalence in 1988 is taken from the 1988 FBI Uniform Crime Reports:

**Forcible Rape**

**Definition:**
Forcible rape, as defined in the Program, is the carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will. Assaults or attempts to commit rape by force or threat of force are also included; however, statutory rape (without force) and other sex offenses are excluded.

**Volume:**
During 1988, there were an estimated 92,486 forcible rapes in the Nation. Rape offenses comprised 6 percent of the total violent crimes. Geographically, the Southern States, the region with the largest population, accounted for 37 percent of the forcible rapes reported to law enforcement. Following were the Midwest with 25 percent, the West with 23 percent, and the Northeast with the remainder.

Monthly totals showed the greatest number of forcible rapes was reported
during the summer, with July recording the highest frequency. The lowest
total was registered in December.

Trend:
Compared to the previous year, the 1988 forcible rape volume increased 2
percent nationwide. In the suburban counties and cities collectively, the totals
were up 1 percent. Rural counties recorded a 1 percent decline. City trends
ranged from a 12 percent increase in cities under 10,000 in population to a 4
percent decline in cities 500,000 to 999,999 in population.

Among the geographic regions, the Midwestern States recorded a 4
percent rise; the Southern States, a 3 percent increase; the Northeastern States,
virtually no change; and the Western States, a 2 percent drop.

National trends for 5 and 10 years show that the forcible rape total rose 10
percent over 1984 and 21 percent above 1979.

Rate:
By Uniform Crime Reporting definition, the victims of forcible rape are
always female. In 1988, an estimated 73 of every 100,000 females in the
country were reported rape victims. The 1988 female forcible rape rate
showed no change from 1987, but was 6 percent higher than in 1984.

Female forcible rape rates for 1988 showed there were 83 victims per
100,000 females in MSAs (Metropolitan Statistical Areas), 49 per 100,000
females in cities outside metropolitan areas, and 36 per 100,000 females in
rural counties.

Regionally, the highest female rape rate was in the Western States, which
recorded 81 victims per 100,000 females. Following were the Southern States
with a rate of 78, the Midwestern States with 75, and the Northeastern States
with 57.

Nature:
Of all reported forcible rapes during 1988, 82 percent were rapes by
force. The remainder were attempts or assaults to commit forcible rape. An
increase of more than 2 percent was registered in the number of rapes by
force, while attempts to commit rape decreased 5 percent from the 1987
figures (U.S. Department of Justice, 1989, pp.15–16).

Because of the victims’ unwillingness to report attacks to the police as well as their
hesitation to talk frankly in any victimization survey and the unfounding process by the police,
reliable information about prevalence of rape is almost impossible to obtain. Therefore, there is wide variation in the estimates of rape prevalence and it is difficult to decide which estimate is the most reliable. However, the phenomenon of a high level of occurrence of rape and attempted rape in recent decades seems to be indicated by trends in crime reports and by survey research on potential victims. The effect of the recent increase of dysfunctional family problems may be a contributing causal factor in this phenomenon.

Information on crime and the nation's households is included in the appendix.

EXISTING THEORIES OF RAPE CAUSATION

Duncan Chappell effectively summarized the issue of causation for rape in his article “Sexual Criminal Violence.” The following information is taken from his article.

Geis (1977), Scully and Marolla (1985) state that until the women’s movement became popular in the early 1970s, the literature of rape and rapists was mainly written by psychiatrists. These psychiatrists were strongly influenced by psychoanalytic theory and focused mainly on motivational factors revealed by apprehended rapists (Scully and Marolla, 1985). As a result they explained the crime of rape in terms of uncontrollable impulses, mental illness or disease, momentary losses of control due to unusual circumstances, and victim precipitation. Scully and Marolla further remark that these theories limit the causal factors of rape to the rapist’s personal range and miss the important sociocultural influence that reinforces these men’s violent aggressive crime against women (Chappell, 1989).

Most feminists interpret the real nature of rape as the violence inflicted by men upon women, instead of seeing it as a mere sexual crime. They believe that rape is largely a sociocultural product. Therefore, in order to understand the problem of rape, it has to be examined in the sociocultural context and particularly in the context of power relationships between men and women.

Chappell states:

Traditional socialization encouraged men to associate masculinity with
power, dominance, strength, virility, and superiority, and femininity with submissiveness, passivity, weakness, and inferiority. Males also acquired certain cultural expectations about their sexual needs and access to females to meet these needs. The outcome, according to this feminist perspective, was that rape became an extension of normal male sexual aggression and hostility toward women (Chappell, 1989, p.84).

This feminist approach to the crime of rape has been shared by many researchers for the past two decades. Many significant studies have been done and the causation of rape is well researched. At the same time these studies contributed to raising the public awareness of the problem of rape. Consequently, a change in attitude toward rape victims, more effective rehabilitation programs for both offenders and victims, and rape law reform were all brought about.

So, the causation of rape has been well examined through the feminist’s sociocultural approach as well as the psychiatrist’s psychoanalytic offender-centered approach, and we now have a wealth of rape causation theories. In her book Sexual Exploitation, Diana Russell organized the major theories of rape causation by adapting David Finkelhor’s four-factor model which he used to explain the occurrence of child sexual abuse (Finkelhor, 1981). Russell said that when applied to rape, Finkelhor’s model suggests that there are four types of preconditions that allow rape to occur:

- **Precondition I:** factors creating a predisposition or desire to rape;
- **Precondition II:** factors reducing internal inhibitions against acting out this desire;
- **Precondition III:** factors reducing social inhibitions against acting out this desire;
- **Precondition IV:** factors reducing the potential victim’s ability to resist or avoid rape (Russell, 1984, p.111).

**Precondition I:** factors creating a predisposition or desire to rape

Russell divided Precondition I into six sub-categories:

1. The biological capacity and desire of men to rape.
2. Childhood sexual abuse
histories of sexual offenders. (3) Male sex-role socialization. (4) Effects of exposure to pornography. (5) Effects of exposure to mass media that encourage rape. (6) Rape as a means of social control. A more detailed discussion of each category follows.

1) The biological capacity and desire of men to rape.

Brownmiller (1975) and others argue that rape is made possible because of men's biological capacity to rape and also their greater physical strength to subdue women (Russell, 1984).

Anthropologist Donald Symon argued in *The Evolution of Human Sexuality* that "human males tend to desire no-cost, impersonal copulations, ...and hence that there is a possibility of rape wherever rape entails little or no risk" (Symons, 1979, p.284). Several theorists agree with Symon's theory that men have a biologically determined proclivity to rape. However, most have argued that the effect of socialization and/or the imbalance of structural power between both sexes is largely responsible for this proclivity (Russell, 1984).

2) Childhood sexual abuse histories of sexual offenders.

Contrary to Donald Symon's biologically determined theory, psychologist Nicholas Groth (1979) interprets rape as a symptom of psychological dysfunction, and a sexual offender's early traumatic sexual experience is one significant cause for his psychological dysfunction. Groth's definition of sexual trauma is "any sexual activity witnessed and/or experienced that is emotionally upsetting or disturbing" (Groth, 1979, p.98).

Based on this definition, Groth found that in his study of over 500 sexual offenders, one-third of the offenders (both rapists of adult women and child molesters) had some form of traumatic sexual experience in their early life. Groth pointed out that this rate was significantly higher than the rate (10 percent) of males reporting childhood experiences of sexual abuse in David Finkelhor's survey of college students. Groth also pointed out that the incidence of childhood sexual trauma was the same for both rapists and child molesters.

However, the rapists early sexual victimization experiences were more frequently incestuous
than that of the child molesters, and rapists were also more often abused by females than males (Russell, 1984).

Groth admitted that his study was based on a selected group of sexual offenders who were not a representative random sample. He also did not have a control group available. Yet, he still concluded that the sexual offender’s adult crime “may be in part a repetition and an acting out of a sexual offense he was subjected to as a child” (Groth, 1979, p.102). Groth found that this tendency of duplicating one’s own early victimization in his later offenses is particularly persistent among the child molester (Russell, 1984).

Two other psychologists, Seghorn and Boucher, studied a sample of aggressive and/or recidivist sexual offenders and found that more than 50 percent of their subjects were sexually victimized prior to adolescence (Russell, 1984). Although, like Groth’s study, their sample was not random and they also did not have a control group, they hypothesized that “under specific conditions, men who have been victims of sexual abuse will themselves be at higher risk for committing sexual offenses as adults” (Seghorn and Boucher, 1980, p.706). They also found that “Those men who were molested by a relative were much more likely to have assaulted, brutally and sadistically, adolescent and adult women, while those men who had been molested by nonrelatives were more likely to molest males and less likely to subscribe to one extreme form of aggression” (Seghorn and Boucher, 1980, p.707).

3) Male sex-role socialization.

Russell points out four factors in male sex-role socialization which predispose men to rape. They are the masculinity mystique, fusion of sex and aggression, the virility mystique and the relationship between rape and normative male sexual behavior. Russell states that the base for masculine mystique is our cultural value system which accepts men’s qualities such as aggression, force, power, strength, toughness, dominance, and competitiveness as masculine virtues. Enhanced by this cultural value for masculinity, men strive to win, to be superior, to conquer, and to control in order to express their masculinity and this constitutes
the masculinity mystique.

Russell further states that "sex may be the arena where these notions of masculinity are most intensely played out, particularly by men who feel powerless in the rest of their lives and whose masculinity is threatened by this sense of powerlessness" (Russell, 1984, p.118).

Concerning fusion of sex and aggression, Russell in The Politics of Rape argues as follows:

For many men, it seems, aggression and sex are closely related. The unconscious rationale goes as follows: Being aggressive is masculine; being sexually aggressive is masculine; rape is sexually aggressive behavior; therefore, rape is masculine behavior (Russell, 1975, p.261).

This fusion of sex and aggression is well expressed in war-time rape. In Against Our Will, Brownmiller provided abundant examples of war-time rape and argued that rape of enemy women is commonly considered natural soldierly behavior. Russell argues that this view presumes acceptance of men's capacity to express aggression and hatred through sex (Russell, 1975). She further stated "If men can express their hatred and aggression through war-time rape, it would be remarkable if they could not do it at home too" (Russell, 1984, p.118).

In The Politics of Rape, Russell defines the impact of the masculinity mystique on male sexuality as "the virility mystique" (Russell, 1975). Russell further explains that this mystique dictates that males separate their sexual responsiveness from their needs for love, respect, and affection.

Males are trained from childhood to separate sexual desire from caring, respecting, liking, or loving. One of the consequences of this training is that many men regard women as sexual objects, rather than as full human beings. The virility mystique attaches status to attaining access to (and keeping score of) many women—the more the better. This approach dominates men's perspective on women (Russell, 1984, p.119).

Russell finally quotes a remark made by Norman Mailer in an interview. "It's better
to commit rape than masturbate” (Mailer, 1962, p.20). Russell comments that “with such values to guide men, it is no wonder that so many are strongly tempted to rape, and that so many succumb to the temptation” (Russell, 1984, p.120).

In The Politics of Rape, Russell explicitly expressed her view of the relationship between rape and normative male sexual behavior:

...if one were to see sexual behavior as a continuum with rape at one end and sex liberated from sex–role stereotyping at the other, much of what passes as normal heterosexual intercourse would be seen as close to rape (Russell, 1975, p.261).

Russell also quoted the following passages from other sources to expand on her view:

Rape is simply at the end of the continuum of male–aggressive, female–passive patterns, and an arbitrary line has been drawn to mark it off from the rest of such relationships (Medea and Thompson, 1974, p.11).

Women’s alienation from her own sexuality, man’s resentment at having to purchase sexual fulfillment, the unequal bargaining that trades security for sex—all of these distortions of human sexuality make it inevitable that much sexual contact between men and women will necessarily be coercive in nature (Clark and Lewis, 1977, pp.128–129).

All men are shaped by the same social conditioning…and they are all sexually coercive to some degree—at least, at some point in their lives (Clark and Lewis, 1977, p.145).

Two teams of contemporary researchers conducted studies on this concept of a continuum. Briere, Malamuth and Ceniti (1981) asked 356 subjects whether, if they knew that their actions would never be disclosed to anyone and there would be no punishment, they would commit certain sexual acts, including forcing a female to do something she really didn’t want to do and rape. Sixty percent of the sample answered that under such safe conditions they might use force, or rape, or both (Russell, 1984).
The research by Briere, et al. on the continuum theme found a linear relationship between degree of force/rape inclination and rape–supportive beliefs. These findings validate the view of rape as the end result of an “aggression toward women” continuum instead of viewing rape as a discrete, independent sex crime (Russell, 1984).

4) Effects of exposure to pornography.

Russell said the causal effects of pornography and media violence are difficult to categorize within any one of the four preconditions.

...pornography appears to foster rape fantasies and desires in the men who view it, and therefore should be categorized in Precondition I. However, recent research suggests that pornography also plays a role in overcoming internal barriers against acting out these desires (Precondition II), as well as in eroding external barriers by contributing to the cultural supports for rape (Precondition III). And finally, it seems that pornography may contribute to the undermining of some women’s assertiveness about what sexual acts they do not wish to engage in, and therefore has a place in Precondition IV (Russell, 1984, p.123).

Russell decided that instead of subdividing the effects of pornography, she would deal with the subject under Precondition I.

Philosopher Helen Longino writes:

Pornography is not just the explicit representation or description of sexual behavior, nor even the explicit representation or description of sexual behavior which is degrading and/or abusive to women. Rather, pornography is material that explicitly represents or describes degrading and abusive sexual behavior so as to endorse and/or recommend the behavior as described (Longino, 1980, p.44).

In 1976 Don Smith reported the result of his content analysis of 428 “adults only” paperbacks published between 1968 and 1974. His sample included only books that were easily available to the general American public and excluded books that were usually available exclusively in so–called “adult bookstores” (Russell, 1984).
His report included the following:

- One-fifth of all the sex episodes involved completed rape.
- The number of rapes increased with each year's output of newly published books.
- Of the sex episodes 6 percent involved incestuous rape.
- The focus in the rape scenes was on the victim's fear and terror, which became transformed by the rape into sexual passion. Over 97 percent of the rapes portrayed resulted in orgasm for the victims. In three-quarters of these instances, multiple orgasm was achieved.
- Less than 3 percent of the rapists experienced any negative consequences, and many were rewarded (Russell, 1984, p.130).

Malamuth and Spinner (1980) examined the two best-selling erotic magazines in 1977 and reported that they found sexually violent materials in about 10 percent of the cartoons and close to 5 percent of the pictures (Russell, 1984). They also pointed out that:

> The information conveyed in much of the sexually violent materials is: that women are basically masochistic and in need of male domination.

...A message of female subordination communicated in varied forms may have summative effects in promoting a sexist ideology (Malamuth and Spinner, 1980, p.235).

Russell commented on their findings as follows:

> Such pornography conveys the message that many ordinary men commit rape, and that when they do, they experience not remorse, but sexual, ego, and other gratifications. Consumers of this pornography may come to believe that rape is not a breach of norms. By making rape appear easy to accomplish and easy to get away with, pornography may affect inhibitions based on fear of being caught. Most important, pornography of this kind may inhibit the conscience. If a man can persuade himself that women really like being raped—that they don't really mean "no"—what reason is there for guilt? (Russell, 1984, p.130).

In the Russell survey in San Francisco, 930 women were asked the question "Have you ever been upset by anyone trying to get you to do what they'd seen in pornographic pictures, movies, or books?" About 10 percent of them admitted having such an experience at
least once. Russell decided that since her sample was a random representative one, it is possible to predict that about 10 percent of the women in San Francisco would have had the same kind of experience (Russell, 1984).

The answers from the women in the above survey did not prove that pornography caused the men’s behavior; but the women believed that there was a connection between the two. The significant point is that these women said that they felt they had been personally victimized by pornography (Russell, 1984).

There are other studies done on the effects of exposure to pornography. Out of his study of 120 male undergraduate students, Donnerstein (1980) concluded that “it would be expected that films which depict violence against women, even without sexual content, could act as a stimulus for aggressive acts toward women” (Donnerstein, 1980, p.13).

Feshbach and Malamuth (1978) conducted an experiment using a group of college students and found that even “one exposure to violence in pornography can significantly influence erotic reactions to the portrayal of rape” (Feshbach and Malamuth, 1978, p.116). Malamuth (1981), out of his study with 29 male students, found that exposure to a rape slide–audio show resulted in more violent sexual fantasies (Russell, 1984).

Russell concludes that the effect of pornography tends to undermine, in its viewer’s mind, important socially controlling factors against rape such as the possibility of being caught and apprehended, rape as unacceptable behavior and men’s conscience against the idea of rape (Russell, 1984).

5) Effects of exposure to mass media that encourage rape.

Haskell (1974) stated that recent macho–oriented commercial movies are an expression of men’s counter reaction to the growing strength and demands of women in real life brought on by their liberation movement (Russell, 1984).

In 1969 the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence concluded from its research that media violence can induce aggression in people. However,
one year later, a completely opposite statement was made by the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, which said pornography does not produce any harmful effects (Russell, 1984).

Psychologists Malamuth and Check (1981) used 271 males and females in a field experiment to examine the effects of violent sexuality expressed in feature-length movies in a nonlaboratory setting. The results showed that the male subjects' acceptance of interpersonal violence against women increased significantly, and their acceptance of rape myths also increased to a certain degree. However, the female subjects were less affected by the violent sexual films and were less accepting of interpersonal violence and rape myths than the control group (Russell, 1984).

6) Rape as a means of social control.

Brownmiller's best-known theory is that the function of rape is to keep women subordinate to men. She said:

From prehistoric times to the present, I believe rape has played a critical function. It is nothing more or less than a conscious process of intimidation by which all men keep all women in a state of fear (Brownmiller, 1975, p.15).

Russell interpreted Brownmiller's statement to mean that "all men benefit from the state of fear that affects all women because some men consciously intimidate women by raping them" (Russell, 1984. P.135).

The following quote from a rapist may further explain what the phrase "rape as a means of social control" really means. He said "Listen, anytime any man wants to rape you, he can, and I'm telling you this for your own good" (Rapist; Russell, 1975, p.231).

Precondition II: factors reducing internal inhibitions against acting out the desire to rape

Russell divided Precondition II into five sub-categories:

(1) Cultural values that encourage rape. (2) Irresistible impulse and rape.
(3) Psychopathology and rape. (4) Alcohol consumption and rape. (5) Peer pressure in pair and gang rape.

1) Cultural values that encourage rape.

a. Female sexuality viewed as a commodity.

Interviews by Hite (1981) and Beneke (1982) with rapists or men who express a desire to rape women found that these men are more apt to see female sexuality as a commodity. This is part of our cultural tendency to objectify women (Russell, 1984). Russell further states that “Objectification of people is a key defense mechanism in the facilitation of brutal or inhumane behavior, whether it be torturing those defined as the enemy during a war, or raping women” (Russell, 1984, p.138).

b. Rape as a consequence of a rape–supportive culture.

In the early 1970s feminists like Diana Russell (1975) observed that rape myths are prevalent in this culture. These rape myths include the belief that all women secretly want to be raped and when it happens, they enjoy being raped. Russell claimed these rape myths in our culture make men more ready to rape and make women to blame for the action. Many raped women blame themselves or fear others may blame them; so they never report their rape experience. Moreover, many rapists never perceive their action as rape (Russell, 1984).

Sociologist Burt did a study to test the feminists’ theory that such myths support rape and encourage men to rape. Some of the myths used in the test were: “Any healthy woman can resist a rapist.” “In the majority of rapes, the victim was promiscuous or had a bad reputation.” “If a girl engages in necking or petting and she lets things get out of hand, it is her fault if her partner forces sex on her.” “One reason that women falsely report a rape is that they frequently have a need to call attention to themselves.” (Burt, 1980, pp.217–230). Burt’s study showed that more than half of a representative sample of 598 residents of Minnesota agreed with these and other rape myths.

Burt’s study also indicated that belief in these rape myths formed part of a larger
interrelated structure of beliefs and attitudes that included sex role stereotyping, sexual conservatism, acceptance of interpersonal violence, and beliefs that sexual relationships between men and women are adversarial in nature. She concluded that “these attitudes effectively support rape” (Russell, 1984).

Burt stated the following about the rape causative role of the attitudes measured in her study:

...rapists themselves hold rape–supportive attitudes and use them to excuse or deny their behavior after the fact. Their attitudes may also serve as psychological releasers or neutralizers, allowing potential rapists to turn off social prohibitions against injuring or using others when they want to commit an assault (Burt, 1978, p.5).

Check and Malamuth (1981) found that their research supported Burt’s findings regarding the attitudinal structure of rape myth acceptance. In further research on 126 college students, they found a correlation between the rape myths’ accepting attitudes and rape–supporting reactions to a pornographic depiction of rape, a real rape and predictions about their own likelihood of raping (Russell, 1984).

Koss and other researchers (1981) found that:

...the higher levels of sexual aggression were associated with views of sexual aggression as normal, heterosexual relationships as gameplaying, traditional attitudes toward female sexuality, and the acceptance of rape myths (Koss et al, 1981, p.16).

They concluded that their findings are consistent with the theory that rape–supportive attitudes (1) serve to facilitate the act of rape, and (2) serve as a subsequent justification of the rape (Russell, 1984).

c. Rape as a consequence of subcultural norms.

Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967) pointed out the fact that urban black males make up a high percentage of the violent criminals and that black men and women make up the majority of people victimized by violent crime. They said that the urban ghetto produces a subculture
in which aggressive violence is accepted as normative and natural in everyday life. The cause of this violent subculture is the poverty, unemployment, and lack of options imposed on black people by white society (Russell, 1984).

Brownmiller states:

...that most of those who engage in antisocial, criminal violence (murder, assault, rape and robbery) come from the lower socioeconomic classes.

...There is no doubt that because of centuries of oppression by white people, black people are disproportionately in the lower socioeconomic classes, and hence contribute a disproportionate number of the crimes of violence (Brownmiller, 1975, p.181).

d. Rape as a symptom of a violent culture.

Some theorists (for example, Schwendinger and Schwendinger, 1983) interpret rape as a crime of violence just like homicide, aggravated assault, and robbery which are all caused by unemployment, poverty and marginality. The fact that disproportionately large numbers of black and poor commit violent crimes support this theory (Russell, 1984).

Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967) compared homicides in the United States to that of other nations. They found, in 1960 for example, the homicide rate per 100,000 people in the United States was 4.5; that of West Germany, 1.8; France, 1.7; Australia, 1.5; Canada, 1.4; England, .6; Norway, .5 (Russell, 1984). This substantially higher ratio of violent crime in the United States demonstrates the violent nature of our culture. And when our disproportionately high rate of rape occurrence is compared to that of other nations, the theory of “rape as a symptom of a violent culture” can be well supported.

2) Irresistible impulse and rape.

Marolla and Scully (1979) cited two examples of psychiatric literature on the theory of irresistible impulse as a cause of rape:

Whether it is comparatively mild as in the case of simple assault, or
whether it is severely aggravated assault, it is, as a rule, an expression of an uncontrollable urge, committed without logic or rationale, under the influence of a strong, overpowering drive (Karpman, 1951, p.185).

It is not intended to suggest that all recidivous sex offenders are physically dangerous, but experience shows that some of them are compulsively so, and that most of them are driven by uncontrollable impulsions that do not respond to customary procedures (Reinhardt and Fisher, 1949, p.734).

Marolla and Scully (1979) doubted this theory, based on the following two points: a low recidivism rate for rape (only 3 percent over a 12-year period) and a high rate of premeditated rape (71 percent) (Russell, 1984). They argued that “if the act was impulsive, by definition, the offender should not have been able to delay his response” (Marolla and Scully, 1979, p.304).

3) Psychopathology and rape.

Marolla and Scully depict the psychoanalysts’ disease theory of rape as follows:

Rape is directly or indirectly sexual in nature. It is perpetrated by a perverted or sick individual who often has latent homosexual tendencies. He has experienced an abnormal childhood which has resulted in a sadistic personality. And finally, rape is often an attack on a mother figure and should be considered as symptomatic of inner conflicts which are the real problem (Marolla and Scully, 1979, p.305).

Marolla and Scully view rape as an act primarily of violence or aggression and attempt to disprove the psychoanalytic disease model of rape. Their research that compared rapists with convicts, other sex offenders, and college males has not shown any psychological differences (Russell, 1984).

In their study, Koss and her associates (1981) tried to find out if there were high levels of psychopathology among college students who committed undetected rape. They compared this group to three other groups: a group of students who were aggressive but not so much as the rapists’ group, a group of students whose sexual aggressiveness was low and
a group of students who were not sexually aggressive. The studies showed that there were no differences in the levels of psychopathology among these four groups of students (Russell, 1984).

In his book *Men Who Rape*, Nicholas Groth supports the theory of rapists as sick men. Groth states:

> Although there is a wide variety of individual differences among men who rape, there are certain general characteristics that men who are prone to rape appear to have in common (Groth, 1979, p.106).

He explains these characteristics as follows:

> His overall mood state, then, is dysphoric, characterized by dull depression, underlying feelings of fear and uncertainty and an overwhelming sense of purposelessness. At the root of all this are deep-seated doubts about his adequacy and competency as a person. He lacks a sense of confidence in himself as a man in both sexual and nonsexual areas—a feeling that is often unacknowledged since he exhibits little capacity for self-awareness (Groth, 1979, p.107).

Groth states that 10 percent of these men were in a psychotic state when they committed their offense, and 56 percent suffered from such personality disorders as inadequate, antisocial, passive-aggressive, borderline, etc. (Russell, 1984).

Russell admits that some rapists are mentally ill. However, she points out that Groth’s sample was made up of 500 convicted sexual offenders who were a very unique group. Therefore, his conclusions can not be generalized for the mental health condition of other nonconvicted rapists (Russell, 1984).

4) Alcohol consumption and rape.

Russell mentions that several studies of sex offenders have pointed out the significant role of alcohol in the occurrence of rape. Rada (1978) observed three different alcohol–rape situations: (1) When a rapist is drinking during his offence, he already had a preconceived desire for rape and alcohol triggered his action. (2) Others have the desire to rape only when
they are drinking. (3) In the case of alcoholic rapists, the rape is another indication of their social disorganization secondary to alcoholism. Rada also stated that there has been no proof yet that alcohol causes rape. However, any sex offender’s treatment program should concentrate on his alcohol problem as well as his sexual disfunction (Russell, 1984).

The results of the study on incarcerated sex offenders by Gebhard and others (1965) from the Institute for Sex Research in Indiana show that 54 percent of the rapes of adult women, 37.5 percent of rapes of minors (females 12 to 15 years old), and 76 percent of rapes of children under the age of 12 were alcohol related (Russell, 1984).

5) Peer pressure in pair and gang rape.

Katz and Mazur (1979) state that most of the literature on group rape has focused on the psychological and social dynamics of the offenders. Geis and Chappell (1971) find that most group rapes are committed by young men often as the result of a night of drinking. Amir (1971) states that most group rapes are premeditated. Katz and Mazur also state that some gangs use their gang rape as initiation rites for new members. Russell says that peer group pressure in these situations can be a strong inhibition reducer against rape. Amir also states that peer pressure can be a responsible factor for more violence and sexual perversion in gang rape than individual rape (Russell, 1984).

In Patterns in Forcible Rape Amir described two types of rapists who are under the influence of peer group pressure:

1) Rapists for whom the crime is mainly a role-supportive act, usually in the context of a youth culture. The act is performed for the purpose of maintaining membership in a group, or for sheer sexual gratification. Pathology is absent.

2) Rapists for whom the crime is mainly a role-expressive act. It is performed not so much for the sexual satisfaction as because of participation in the context (within) which it occurred, for example, group rape (Amir, 1971, pp.318–319).
Amir believes that these two types of rapist’s violent behavior are the result of peer group pressure and not from deviant sexuality (Russell, 1984).

Precondition III: factors reducing social inhibitions against acting out the desire to rape

Russell divided Precondition III into three sub-categories:

(1) The power disparity between men and women. (2) Male dominance plus a culture of violence. (3) Ineffectiveness of the institutions of social control.

(1) The power disparity between men and women.

Russell states that “rape, like other violence against and abuse of women by men, is a consequence of the power disparity between the sexes that has existed as long as recorded history” (Russell, 1984, p.153). Clark and Lewis (1977) have a theory of rape which seems to explain the deep seated institutionalized inequalities which enhance male aggression toward women. They said:

Our society is characterized by institutions and practices (and the socialization processes necessary to support them), which consistently and systematically ensure that only men rise to positions of power and authority in the public world, while women remain at home, in the private sphere, under the legal ownership and control of their husbands (Clark and Lewis, 1977, p.176).

Russell says that this power disparity between men and women creates “male entitlement” which leads some men to even believe women enjoy being forced sexually. Russell concludes that “For the problem of rape to be solved, men must give up their monopolization of power in the society as a whole, and in more than token ways” (Russell, 1984, p.155).

(2) Male dominance plus a culture of violence.

Russell refers to social anthropologist Sanday’s research to explain this category. Sanday studied a cross-cultural sample of 186 tribal societies and found that “considerable evidence suggests that rape is an expression of a social ideology of male dominance”
(Sanday, 1979, p.4). In these male dominant societies, women had less power and authority, and were not allowed to participate in public decision making. Men expressed contempt for women. In these societies, fathers did not take care of infants and young children, and fathers and daughters did not have warm, close relationships. Moreover, male violence was glorified and rewarded (Russell, 1984).

Sanday continues with:

In contrast, in rape free societies women participate in all aspects of social life—religion, politics, and economics. Interpersonal relations...are marked by mildness as opposed to the violence which frequently erupts in rape prone societies.

...And in their intergroup relations, these societies tended not to engage in a military complex where warfare is a way of life for males (Sanday, 1979, p.4).

Sanday suggests that male dominance, including male sexual violence, evolved as a response to stress. She states:

When humans perceive an imbalance between resources and population, or when they perceive that their social identity and way of life must be defended, they will place men in the front line to fight for survival. If the struggle for survival is successful, men are rewarded with glory, and male violence becomes a way of life passed on from parent to male child. Programmed for violence and faced with sexual repression, some men turn to rape (Sanday, 1979, p.8).

Russell concludes that the high rape rate in the United States can be explained by Sanday’s discovery that a male dominating culture of violence can produce a rape prone society.

(3) Ineffectiveness of the institutions of social control.

Russell points out that inadequate enforcement of rape laws is one example of the ineffectiveness of the institutions of social control. In the early 1970’s, the women’s movement brought some rape reform legislation. However, feminist attorney Camille
LeGrand (1973), one of the important contributors in this reform, believes that these reformed laws are now often more advanced than the police and courts that administer them (Russell, 1984).

Russell also argues that unjustifiably unfounded cases of reported rape by the police is another example of the ineffectiveness of the institutions of social control. She mentions here the research done by McCahill and others (1979) who found in Philadelphia that the city’s rape victims’ police reports were purposefully lost in the system. This unjustifiably unfounding of reported rape cases along with inadequate rape law enforcement create the impression that rape is a crime which is easy to get away with (Russell, 1984).

Smithyman’s study of undetected rapists found that:

Many of the respondents commented upon how easy it was to plan, execute the rape(s), and avoid the possible negative consequences attendant upon detection. The failure of the rape(s) in which the respondents participated to result in either actual or perceived negative consequences combined with the experience of sexual pleasure and in some cases an enhanced sense of power and achievement suggests that the rapes described by the respondents were in a large measure low cost and relatively rewarding events (Smithyman, 1978, pp.123–124).

Smithyman believes that since rape is perceived as a low-cost, high-reward event, the rapist will repeat his act. Smithyman’s sample revealed that 74 percent of his respondents had raped more than once already and 36 percent had raped four or more times (Russell, 1984).

Russell also cites the failure of the prison system to rehabilitate incarcerated sex offenders as another example of the ineffectiveness of the institutions of social control. Among the literature on prison rape, Donald Tucker, a victim of prison gang rape, wrote:

It may be that the most serious cost of prison rape to society is that it takes nonviolent offenders and turns them into people with a high potential for violence, full of rage and eager to take vengeance on the society which they hold responsible for their utter humiliation and loss of manhood (in Scacco,
Thus, some sex offenders in prison not only suffer from the lack of appropriate rehabilitation programs to improve their behavior but are exposed to the victimization of prison rape which may even turn them into potentially worse criminals.

Precondition IV: factors reducing potential victim's ability to avoid rape

Russell divided Precondition IV into four sub-categories:

1) Socialization of women as victims. (2) Blaming the victims: Victim–precipitation theories. (3) Women's resistance to rape undermined by fear of murder. (4) Other factors.

(1) Socialization of women as victims.

Russell (1975) argues that in our culture women are trained to see themselves as weak and men as strong. This basic notion makes women passive and submissive toward men. Women are also taught to be compassionate, patient, accepting, and dependent. They should not get angry or fight. Moreover, women are expected to be responsible in their relationships with men. All of this cultural conditioning makes women vulnerable to rape. They have very little self-confidence and psychic strength and less physical strength to fight back against rapists (Russell, 1984).

Women who do not conform to traditional femininity also place themselves into a risky situation for rape by a stranger because they then lose the protection of the culture—for instance, living alone, going places without a man, hitch-hiking, etc. Women who enjoy more freedom in their life become more vulnerable to rape (Russell, 1984).

Russell further argues that there are some ways in which women contribute to their own vulnerability to rape. One good example of such behavior is their ambivalence about being treated as sexual objects. Many women respond to the male notion of female attractiveness by using facial makeup or displaying their breasts, legs, or buttocks. This sort of women's behavior enhances men's tendency to separate sexual desire from desires for affection and friendship, which can contribute to the rape problem (Russell, 1984).
Although females are taught to be attractive and submissive, they cannot be sexually promiscuous because it will ruin their reputation. Meanwhile, males are expected to be sexual and even sexually aggressive.

Russell finally concludes that:

... And it is no wonder that there is rape. It is a logical consequence of the lack of symmetry in the way males and females are socialized in this society. Indeed, the remarkable thing is not that rape occurs, but that we have managed for so long to see it as a rare and deviant act. Rape is, in fact, embedded in our cultural norms, a direct result of the clash between the masculine and the feminine mystiques (Russell, 1975, p.274).

(2) Blaming the victim: Victim-precipitation theories.

Albin (1977) argues that Freud’s belief that women are masochistic by nature attributed to the victim-precipitation theory of rape. Amir was the first to apply the notion of victim-precipitation to rape. It describes:

... those rape situations in which the victim actually, or so it was deemed, agreed to sexual relations but retracted before the actual act or did not react strongly enough when the suggestion was made by the offender(s). The term applies also to cases in risky situations marred with sexuality, especially when she uses what could be interpreted as indecency of language and gestures, or constitutes what could be taken as an invitation to sexual relations (Amir, 1971, p.266).

Russell says that Amir’s theory of victim-precipitation is another form of victim blaming. This attitude is brought on by male bias and identification with the rapists. Because of feminist’s criticism, victim blaming is not so popular as it used to be. Yet it still occurs in cases of both rape and child sexual abuse (Russell, 1984).

(3) Women’s resistance to rape undermined by fear of murder.

Many women in a rape situation give up fighting because of the fear of being murdered. One out of every 10 female murder victims in the United States is killed during
rape or other sexual offenses. It is unknown how many rape victims who report the crime or how many who do not (who are in much larger numbers than those that report the crime) submit because of their fear of being killed. Russell estimates that there are many (Russell, 1984).

(4) Other factors contributing to reducing a potential victim’s ability to resist or avoid rape.

a. Women often find it quite difficult to resist to their maximum ability when they are raped by someone they know or trust (such as a friend, date, lover, or husband) and/or someone who has authority over them (such as an employer, doctor, teacher, or priest).

b. More single women than married women are victimized by stranger rape. The younger age of single women and their living alone in neighborhoods where there is no sense of community welfare make them more vulnerable to stranger rape.

c. Eisenhower (1969) reported that the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence found that the victim, the offender, or both are likely to be drinking prior to homicide, assault, and rape. Women alcoholics are especially helpless in defending themselves and are viewed by men as “inviting” by being available, vulnerable “bad” women. Thus, they become extremely vulnerable to rape, both by strangers and intimates.

d. Runaways and women who lack resources and cannot afford a car and/or have to live in high crime areas are particularly vulnerable to rape (Russell, 1984).

Among these existing rape causation theories, male sex–role socialization that comes under “Precondition I: factors creating a predisposition or desire to rape,” seems to be the strongest theory. Human sexual behavior is an important factor that has a great influence on species survival. Every culture group has its own regulations concerning the sex–role of the group members. Most group members tend to conduct their sexual behavior according to these regulations (norms). Therefore, men’s desire to rape in our society could be seen as a product of our cultural male sex–role.
Although most of these existing rape causation theories seem to have a certain validity, the following theories are well researched and seem more convincing. "Childhood sexual abuse histories of sexual offenders" and "effect of exposure to pornography" which belong to Precondition I: factors creating a predisposition or desire to rape. "Cultural values that encourage rape" and "alcohol consumption and rape" which belong to Precondition II: factors reducing internal inhibitions against acting out this desire. "Male dominance plus a culture of violence" and "ineffectiveness of the institutions of social control" which belong to Precondition III: factors reducing social inhibitions against acting out this desire. "Socialization of women as victims" which belongs to Precondition IV: factors reducing the potential victim's ability to resist or avoid rape.

Rapists and their parental relationships is the focus point of this dissertation. Could a negative parental relationship be a causal factor in creating a predisposition or desire to rape by enhancing men's hatred toward their mothers or women in general? Or, could it also be a causal factor that reduces internal inhibitions against acting out the rape desire by failing to provide men with healthy moral guidance which deters sexual aggression?
CHAPTER II
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to find what associations exist between dysfunctional parental relations in the childhood of rapists and the rapist’s violent acts. It will also explore the sociocultural effects which nurture dysfunctional relationships between the parents and their children.

HYPOTHESIS

The hypothesis of this study is that dysfunctional parental relationships can be positively correlated with the acts of rapists. This includes dysfunctional relations between the parents and between the parents and the child.

DIFFICULTIES OF FINDING DATA

A truly empirical study of rape is almost impossible because of the difficulty in obtaining a random sample of rapists. As mentioned in the prevalence of rape section in this paper, only a certain percentage of rape is reported, and only a certain percentage of the reported rapists are arrested. Furthermore, only a certain number of arrested rapists are charged with a crime, partly because of the “unfounding” process by the police; and only a certain number of the charged rapists are finally convicted and incarcerated.

These incarcerated rapists tend to be the more violent and hard core rapists who can not be regarded as a representative sample of rapists in general. However, they are usually the only available subjects for researchers who want to study rapists. So, data about rapists
resulting from truly empirical research based on random samples is impossible to obtain.

In addition to this predicament, the focus point of the study of rape drastically shifted from the offenders to the victims with the advancement of the feminist movement. And when the feminists did study the offenders, their main interest was the sociocultural effect which encourages men to rape women. The study of the rapists’ early home environment or their personality developmental problems were usually left out.

As mentioned earlier, Groth (1979) and others studied the effect of incestuous sexual abuse upon rapists but they did not extend their study to the effect of more general family dysfunctional problems. So, due to all of the above reasons, good empirical data on rapists’ parental relationships is very rare.

THE FBI STUDY

The recent collaborative research on 41 serial rapists conducted by Robert Hazelwood of the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime (NCAVC)—a part of the FBI Behavioral Sciences Services—and Dr. Ann Burgess is one of the very rare research projects which include inquiry into the rapists’ parental relationships.

A brief report on this research, “The Serial Rapist: His Characteristics and Victims,” describes it thus: “the study included interviews with 41 incarcerated serial rapists who had raped at least 10 times and who, as a group, were responsible for 837 sexual assaults and more than 400 attempted rapes” (Hazelwood, 1989, p.11). The sample in this study consisted of 35 white males, 5 black males, and 1 Hispanic male. The age range of the subjects was 23 to 55 years, with a mean age of 35.2 years.

Members of the NCAVC and other selected FBI special agents conducted an open-end, unstructured, 4 to 12 hour interview with each of the 41 subjects. The purpose of the interview was to “step into the mind of the offender, and from this vantage point, fathom the motivations and behavior that characterize the development and execution of their criminal
behavior” (Hazelwood, 1989, p.11). The interview covered the discussion of family and demographic information, education, employment, military history, hobbies and pastimes, marital history, sexual development and pre–offense, offense and post–offense behavior.

The sample in this study is a unique group of incarcerated serial rapists. Therefore, the data from this study may not be generalized for a more undifferentiated group of rapists. However, even with this limitation, the collection of data by FBI agents who received special training by NCAVC guarantees a high level of reliability for the data. Furthermore, there are no other data available to date about rapists’ parental relationships which have been collected by such thorough research methods. For these reasons this FBI data were used as the base for this study.

THE NEED FOR ENLARGING THE SAMPLE SIZE

However, the FBI study sample size was not large—only 41 subjects—and so there was the need for enlarging it. Therefore, content analysis on relevant literature which included information on rapists’ parental relations was conducted and the results were combined with the data of the FBI study in order to enlarge the sample size.

The subjects of the content analysis were extracted from 31 case studies of rapists talking about themselves, including their parental relationships. These 31 cases are from three different sources. The first four cases (Case No.1 to No.4) are from “Rapists Speak for Themselves” an article written by Jack Fremont and extracted from The Politics of Rape by Diana Russell (1975). The next ten cases (Case No.5 to No.14) are from Why Men Rape by Sylvia Levine and Joseph Koening (1982). The last 17 cases (Case No.15 to No.31) are from The Rapist File by Les Sussman and Sally Bordwell (1981).

Fremont interviewed four rapists who responded to his newspaper ads. He said that these rapists “are probably different from many rapists by dint of their class, race, and disposition. They are all white. Three are middle–class. Two were caught and convicted. None approached hitch–hikers” (Russell, 1975, p.243). During his interviews, Fremont
asked questions mainly about their offenses, when and how they committed rape, what type of victims they preferred, how they felt about their offenses and victims, etc. Although the rapists were not directly asked about their parental relations, in answering these questions they revealed some information which suggested the state of their parental relationships and earlier home environment in general.

The ten rapists' talks in *Why Men Rape* are drawn from filmed interviews conducted in 1977–78 in connection with the author's documentary film, "Why Men Rape," produced by the National Film Board of Canada. These ten rapists were all incarcerated and were involved in behavior modification therapy programs in Canadian institutions at the time of their interviews. The interviews must have included questions about the rapists' parental relations because all of the rapists gave more or less information about their parental relations.

The interviews with the next 15 rapists were conducted by two journalists, a man and a woman, who wanted to hear the true voice of rapists. They chose the 15 most interesting cases out of a number of rapist applicants for the interviews. The interviews were carried out in four different prisons where the rapists were then serving time. The first five rapists were interviewed at Green Haven Correctional Facility in upstate New York. The next five were at Louisiana State Penitentiary in Angola, Louisiana, and the last five were at two Illinois prisons, Sheridan Correctional Facility in Sheridan, Illinois, and Manord Correctional Center in Chester, Illinois.

In these interviews, questions about the rapists' parental relationships were asked along with various other questions; and almost every rapist gave some information about his parental relations and earlier home environment. The last two rapists' talks were extracted from letters written by incarcerated rapists to these two journalists.

So, these 31 cases used for enlarging the sample size are as selected as the sample in the FBI study, and some of them are even more unrepresentative. Therefore, just as in the
cases of the FBI study, the data drawn from these 31 cases can not be generalized to the whole population of rapists either. However, for the following two reasons, these cases were used for this study.

One reason is that, as mentioned before, data from a truly representative rapist sample are impossible to obtain. The other important reason is that since these 31 cases were already released to the public, the use of these cases does not raise the question of an ethical problem. When dealing with rapists' parental relationships, protecting the parents' privacy becomes an important ethical issue and use of readily available literature frees the author from this kind of problem.

CONTENT ANALYSIS OF THE RAPISTS' SELF-REPORTS

Purpose and methods

The purpose of the content analysis of the 31 cases of rapists' self-reports is to draw out the information about these 31 rapists' parental relationships and combine the information with the result of the FBI study in order to enlarge the sample size. For this purpose, the content analysis was done based on the approach taken in the FBI study. The same categories of information of the FBI study were also used for the content analysis.

The information categories have two main divisions. The first category is titled "family structure of rapists" and is divided into seven sub-categories: assessment of socioeconomic level of rapist's preadult home, dominant parental figures, quality of relationship to mother or dominant female caretaker, quality of relationship to father or dominant male caretaker, evidence that rapist was physically abused by parents/caretakers, evidence that rapist was psychologically abused by parents/caretakers, and evidence that rapist was sexually abused. Each of these seven sub-categories is divided into several more detailed information categories (Hazelwood, 1989, p.19).

The second category is titled "rapists sexual history and current sexual behaviors" and is divided into two sub-categories: childhood or adolescent sexual trauma and adult sexual
behavior. Each of these sub-categories is also divided into more detailed information categories (Hazelwood, 1989, p.21).

Procedure

Rating. There were three raters engaged in the content analysis. Rater #1 was the author of this dissertation, and rater #2 was a male graduate student in psychology with previous clinical training. Rater #3 was a woman who was a college graduate in English literature and had previous research experience. Following instructions given by an experienced supervisor, these three raters independently searched the content of the 31 rapists’ self-reports for the same information presented in the FBI study and rated the information accordingly into relevant categories.

Calculating the reliability of agreement. Based on the results of the rating done by the three raters, the degree of reliability of agreement (Cohen’s Kappa) was calculated and tabulated (Tables III and IV).

In the process of computing Cohen’s Kappa, any random agreement is eliminated. Therefore, Kappa means the ratio of agreement above chance level. As Tables III and IV show, the three raters agreed above chance on their ratings. The following figures are the agreement ratio between each pair of raters over all of the ratings for all 31 cases and all categories:

rater #1 and rater #2.....74%
rater #1 and rater #3.....61%
rater #2 and rater #3.....52%

Thus, the highest degree of agreement was achieved between rater #1 and #2; the next highest agreement was between rater #1 and #3; and the least agreement was between rater #2 and #3. Average agreement of all three raters for all categories of all 31 cases was 62%.

Settling the disagreements. After the reliability of agreement was calculated, the three raters had a conference and discussion, settling the disagreements in their ratings. When
possible, the three raters reached a consensus on the rating to be assigned to the disputed score. If a consensus was not reached, the score was decided by the agreement of at least two of the three raters.

Calculating the rapists' response ratio to each category. The percentage of the 31 rapists' response to each category was calculated according to the consensus of the three raters, and the result was tabulated alongside the result of the FBI study (Tables V and VI).
TABLE III
RELIABILITY OF AGREEMENT AMONG THE THREE Raters: FAMILY STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Percent of reliability of agreement between:</th>
<th>Average percent of reliability of agreement among:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rater #1 and #2</td>
<td>Rater #1 and #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapist’s preadult home</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant parental figures (s)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of relation to mother or dominant female caretaker</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of relation to father or dominant male caretaker</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapist physically abused by parents or caretakers</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapist psychologically abused by parents or caretakers</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapist sexually abused</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IV

RELIABILITY OF AGREEMENT AMONG THE THREE RATERS:
SEXUAL HISTORY AND ADULT SEXUAL BEHAVIOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Percent of reliability of agreement between:</th>
<th>Average percent of reliability of agreement among:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rater #1 and #2</td>
<td>Rater #1 and #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood/adolescent sexual trauma</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult sexual behavior</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total reliability of agreement between rater #1 and #2 = 74%
Total reliability of agreement between rater #1 and #3 = 61%
Total reliability of agreement between rater #2 and #3 = 52%
Average reliability over all raters and all ratings = 62%
Entries in the table are Cohen’s Kappa
TABLE V
RAPIST'S FAMILY STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>FBI Study</th>
<th>Content Analysis</th>
<th>Combined Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  n  %</td>
<td>N  n  %</td>
<td>N  n  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapist's preadult home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantaged</td>
<td>41 7 17%</td>
<td>16 5 31%</td>
<td>57 12 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable, average</td>
<td>41 15 37%</td>
<td>16 3 19%</td>
<td>57 18 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal, self-sufficient</td>
<td>41 11 27%</td>
<td>16 3 19%</td>
<td>57 14 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submarginal</td>
<td>41 8 20%</td>
<td>16 4 25%</td>
<td>57 12 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>41 – –</td>
<td>16 1 6%</td>
<td>57 1 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant parental figure(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>40 20 50%</td>
<td>20 14 70%</td>
<td>60 34 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>40 16 40%</td>
<td>20 5 25%</td>
<td>60 21 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40 4 10%</td>
<td>20 1 5%</td>
<td>60 5 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of relation to mother or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dominant female caretaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm, close</td>
<td>39 14 36%</td>
<td>21 7 33%</td>
<td>60 21 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>39 12 31%</td>
<td>21 5 24%</td>
<td>60 17 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold, distant</td>
<td>39 2 5%</td>
<td>21 2 9%</td>
<td>60 4 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncaring, indifferent</td>
<td>39 4 10%</td>
<td>21 0 0%</td>
<td>60 4 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile, aggressive</td>
<td>39 7 18%</td>
<td>21 7 33%</td>
<td>60 14 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of relation to father or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dominant male caretaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm, close</td>
<td>39 7 18%</td>
<td>20 4 20%</td>
<td>59 11 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>39 10 26%</td>
<td>20 5 25%</td>
<td>59 15 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold, distant</td>
<td>39 12 31%</td>
<td>20 1 5%</td>
<td>59 13 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncaring, indifferent</td>
<td>39 3 8%</td>
<td>20 2 10%</td>
<td>59 5 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile, aggressive</td>
<td>39 7 18%</td>
<td>20 8 40%</td>
<td>59 15 25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE VI

RAPIST'S SEXUAL HISTORY AND CURRENT SEXUAL BEHAVIORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>FBI Study N</th>
<th>Content Analysis N</th>
<th>Combined Results N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapist PHYSICALLY abused by parents/caretakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapist PSYCHOLOGICALLY abused by parents/caretakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapist SEXUALLY abused by parents/caretakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood/adolescent sexual trauma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed sexual violence of others</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed sexual activity of parents</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed disturbing sexual activity of relative or friend</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical injury to sex organs/venereal disease</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple sexual assault</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual stress (e.g. punishment for masturbation)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult sexual behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marked inhibition or aversion to sexual activity</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsive masturbation</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voyeurism (peeping)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fetishism</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-dressing</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscene phone calls</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution (as prostitute or pimp)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual bondage</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collects detective magazines</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collects pornography</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Combining the data sets. The above analysis of the 31 rapist’s responses was combined with the FBI study and the summed results are shown in Tables V and VI. In Tables V and VI, the 41 rapists’ response ratio of the FBI study, the 31 rapists’ response ratio of the content analysis, and the combined ratio of both groups are shown side by side.

As already stated, the 31 rapists’ self-reports for the content analysis were gathered from three different sources. The first four rapists interviewed had responded to the interviewer through a newspaper ad. The next ten rapists interviewed were involved in a prison behavior modification program in Canada at the time of the interviews. The next fifteen men were incarcerated rapists interviewed by the two journalists who chose the most interesting cases. The last two rapist’s talks were submitted in letter form by incarcerated rapists to these same two journalists.

So, these 31 rapists are unlikely to make a representative sample for rapists in general, and data drawn from this sample may not be generalized for the entire rapist population. In addition, the 31 rapists were not asked specific questions for most of the categories. Therefore, information was collected from their spontaneous talk. In the FBI study, all information was gathered from the rapists’ responses to specific questions. These situations limit the validity of comparing the results of both studies or incorporating them. Therefore, caution must be taken when interpreting Tables V and VI.

The 41 rapists were only asked specific questions when eliciting information for two categories, quality of relation to mother or dominant female caretaker and quality of relation to father or dominant male caretaker. Since the 31 rapists in the content analysis spoke spontaneously for most of their interviews and the 41 rapists in the FBI study were asked specifically for all of the information, the overall response ratio in the content analysis was expected to be lower than that of the FBI study.

Tables V and VI show the overall lower response ratio of the content analysis as expected. For these two categories, concerning parental relations which the 31 rapists were specifically asked about, five out of ten sub-categories (50%) showed a lower response ratio.
than the FBI study. For the rest of the categories, 20 out of 31 (65%) showed a lower response ratio than the FBI study. Owing to the larger N of the FBI study, the combined response ratio moved closer to that of the FBI study.

**TABULATING THE RELEVANT DATA**

The most relevant information for this study was extracted from Tables V and VI and tabulated into three separate tables (Tables VII, VIII and IX). These tables show the rapists' response ratios for dominant parental figures, positive parental relationship and negative parental relationship.

For these tables, the ratios of the three categories of cold and distant, uncaring and indifferent, hostile and aggressive were added up and put into one category called negative parental relationship. The category of warm and close is interpreted as a positive parental relationship. The tables also include data about the parental relationships of 36 convicted and incarcerated sexual murderers. These data are taken from the book *Sexual Homicide* (Ressler, 1988).
### TABLE VII
DOMINANT PARENTAL FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>FBI Study</th>
<th>Content Analysis</th>
<th>Sexual Homicide</th>
<th>Combined Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE VIII
POSITIVE PARENTAL RELATIONSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>FBI Study</th>
<th>Content Analysis</th>
<th>Sexual Homicide</th>
<th>Combined Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warm, close relationship to mother or dominant female caretaker</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm, close relationship to father or dominant male caretaker</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE IX
NEGATIVE PARENTAL RELATIONSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>FBI Study</th>
<th>Content Analysis</th>
<th>Sexual Homicide</th>
<th>Combined Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cold, distant relationship to mother or dominant female caretaker</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold, distant relationship to father or dominant male caretaker</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sample studied for *Sexual Homicide* is a unique group of men who committed either a single sexual murder (7 men) or multiple sexual murders (29 men). As in the case of the FBI study of 41 serial rapists, the data collection for this study was conducted by agents from the FBI's Behavioral Science Unit (BSU) and by special agents trained by the BSU. Because of the quality of this research and the author’s view of sexual murder as the most extreme form of rape, the information on these 36 offenders’ parental relationships was included in this study.

**FINDINGS**

For dominant parental figures in all three studies (Table VII), the mother has the highest ratio (from 50% to 70%). The next highest ratio is the father (25% and 40%) and others show a much lower ratio than the mother and father (5% and 10%).

For positive parental relationships (Table VIII) in both the FBI study and the content analysis (no information in the *Sexual Homicide* study), only about one-third of the rapists had warm and close relations with their mother or dominant female caretaker. As little as about one-fifth of the rapists had warm and close relations with their father or dominant male caretaker.

For negative parental relationships in all three studies (Table IX), over one-third of the rapists had negative relationships with their mothers. The ratio of negative relationship to the father or dominant male caretaker is consistently higher than that to the mother or dominant female caretaker.

Is the fact that the father or dominant male caretaker scored a higher ratio in the negative parental relationship and a lower score in the positive parental relationship than the mother or dominant female caretaker suggesting the father’s greater influence over the rapist? In any case, the information in Tables VIII and IX seems to suggest significant correlation between a rapist and his dysfunctional parental relationships.
COMPARISON GROUPS

After review by the University Human Subjects Research Review Committee, the two comparison groups for this study, felons and men university students, were surveyed as follows.

Survey of felons

The felon sample was gathered from two sites:

The Oregon State Correctional Institution (OSCI)

The Columbia River Correctional Institution (Columbia)

OSCI is the main state prison in Oregon. It has a mixed population of felons. Columbia is for felons who are not violent offenders or guilty of the more serious felonies.

The sample from OSCI totals 31 respondents. The survey was done in the prison in 1991. They were given the questionnaire as a group in a session organized by the chief of the Education Programs at OSCI. They all volunteered to answer the survey by answering an advertisement placed in the prison newspaper. None of the 31 respondents had been convicted of a sexual offense. After filling in the survey form, each respondent placed it into a supplied envelope and sealed it before handing it in. The sealed envelopes were sent directly to one of the researchers the next day.

The sample from Columbia totals 10 respondents. The survey was done in the prison in 1992. They were given the questionnaire as a group by a delegation of research assistants from the Community Psychology Group Felon Survey Project. The research assistants handed out the survey forms to the inmates, who had volunteered to attend the session. None of the respondents had been convicted of a sexual offense. After filling in the survey, the respondents placed the forms into a supplied envelope and sealed it before handing it in to the research assistants. The sealed envelopes were carried away by the research team when they left the prison.
Survey of men university students

The sample of men university students totals 168 respondents and was collected by surveys of regular classes in Portland State University (PSU) during the 1990–91 and 1991–92 school years. Members of the research team attended classes where the instructor had agreed to allow the survey to be done. The surveys were handed out and explained. The students were asked to fill in the surveys after class, using the instruction sheet attached, and seal them in the envelope provided. The envelopes could be returned at the next class meeting by dropping them into a collection box provided, or they could be dropped into any Campus Mail deposit on the PSU campus. The envelopes were addressed to be returned to the research project by campus mail. Both men and women were asked to do the survey, but only the men’s responses were used for comparison with the rapists and felons in this study.

Out of these 168 men students, 5 students (3%) admitted to conviction for a felony and 13 students (8%) admitted to forcing sexual activity on another person. After eliminating these 18 students, a total of 150 respondents were used in this study. A more detailed description of the felon and student samples is shown in Table X.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Felons (N = 41)</th>
<th>Students (N = 150)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean age (years)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of ages (years)</td>
<td>20-55</td>
<td>18-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic identity (percent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent’s religion (percent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist/None</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country grew up in (percent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents divorced (percent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age of respondent at divorce (years)</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s occupation (percent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed/Convict</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled/Homemaker</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Manager</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner/CEO</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s occupation (percent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled/Homemaker</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Manager</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner/CEO</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income of respondent’s family of origin (percent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affluent</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparing the groups

The three comparison groups are rapists, felons and men university students. The rapists’ group consists of 41 rapists from the FBI study and 31 rapists from the interviewed case histories for a total of 72. The felons’ group consists of 31 felons from the Oregon State Correctional Institution and 10 felons from the Columbia Minimum Security Prison. None of the felons had been convicted of a sexual offense. The men university students’ group consists of 150 students who did not have a record of sexual aggression or any felony convictions. Comparisons were made between the following groups: Rapists and felons, rapists and students, felons and students.

The data on rapists include the original FBI study data of the 41 rapists and the results of the content analysis done on the 31 interviewed rapists’ case histories. For all of the variables where the two rapists’ groups closely agreed, the numbers of both groups’ data were combined for the comparison. That means that all 72 rapists were compared against the felon and student groups.

For all of the variables where the two groups of rapists did not closely agree, the FBI study data was chosen for the comparison. This was done for two reasons. One reason is that the FBI group is larger, 41 versus 31. The second reason is that the FBI study data are more reliable because the respondents were asked all of the questions by the agents doing their interviews. In the content analysis, the analysts had to assume that if something wasn’t mentioned, it didn’t occur. Agreement of the FBI study and the content analysis interviews on selected variables is shown in Table XI.
TABLE XI
AGREEMENT OF FBI INTERVIEWS OF RAPISTS (FBI) AND CONTENT ANALYSIS OF RAPIST INTERVIEWS (R)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pooled (N = 72)</th>
<th>FBI only (N = 41)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FBI &amp; R agree</td>
<td>FBI &amp; R different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family income (INCOME)</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant parent (BOSS)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's nurturance (MNURT)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's nurturance (FNURT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse when child (BEAT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological abuse when child (FEEL)</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually abused when child (SEXAB)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed sexual violence as child (SEERAP)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbed by sexuality of parent (PSEX)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbed by sexuality of relative/friend (RSEX)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury to genitals in childhood (INJUR)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually attacked by group (ATKGP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punished or ridiculed for sex (PUNSEX)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels alienated from sexuality (NEGSEX)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsive masturbation (CONAN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism (SEEME)</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voyeurism, Peeping (VOYR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fetishism (body or object) (FETISH)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossdressing (XDRESS)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscene phone calls (PHONE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual bondage (BOND)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collects violent sex magazines (MAG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collects pornography (PICT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used or ran prostitute (PROPIMP)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(x) trend to being different
Results of comparison

This dissertation focuses on rapists' parental relationships. Therefore, comparison of the three groups' family structure in four categories is separately tabulated in Tables XII, XIII, XIV and XV. Comparison of the three groups' sexual history and current sexual behaviors is summarized in Table XVI. All analyses are by Chi-square and the significance level set at .05. See Tables XVIII, XIX, XX, and XXI in Appendix A for the values of Chi-square and the degrees of freedom for each variable.

TABLE XII

COMPARISON OF GROUPS ON FAMILY INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rapists</strong> and felons</td>
<td>Significantly different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rapists: from families more evenly distributed from affluent to poor and more often from affluent or poor families than felons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felons: mainly from middle-income families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rapists</strong> and students</td>
<td>Significantly different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rapists: More rapists reported being from wealthy families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students: mainly from upper-middle-income families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Felons and students</strong></td>
<td>Significantly different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felons: more from poor families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students: more from affluent families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Pooled sample of rapists (N = 72)

TABLE XIII

COMPARISON OF GROUPS ON DOMINANT PARENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rapists</strong> and felons</td>
<td>Significantly different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rapists: mother was more often the boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felons: Father was more often the boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rapists</strong> and students</td>
<td>Significantly different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rapists: mother was more often the boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students: Father was more often the boss. Parents were more equally dominant than rapists’ parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Felons and students</strong></td>
<td>Not significantly different</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Pooled sample of rapists (N = 72)
### TABLE XIV

**COMPARISON OF GROUPS ON MOTHER’S NURTURANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapists* and felons</td>
<td>Significantly different Rapists: mothers were less warm, more inconsistent and more violently abusive Felons: mothers were mainly warm or inconsistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapists* and students</td>
<td>Significantly different Students: mothers were much more likely to be warm and loving; no students reported mothers as uncaring or violently abusive, but 30% of the rapists reported them so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felons and students</td>
<td>Significantly different Felons: mothers were more likely to be reported as cold or as violently abusive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Pooled sample of rapists (N = 72)

### TABLE XV

**COMPARISON OF GROUPS ON FATHER’S NURTURANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapists* and felons</td>
<td>Not significantly different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapists* and students</td>
<td>Significantly different Students: fathers were more likely to be warm and much less likely to be uncaring or violently abusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felons and students</td>
<td>Significantly different Felons: fathers were more likely to be reported as cold or as violently abusive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FBI sample of rapists (N = 41)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Rapists/Felons</th>
<th>Groups Rapists/Students</th>
<th>Felons/Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse by parents/caretakers when child*</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
<td>30%/17%</td>
<td>33%/17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological abuse by parents/caretakers when child</td>
<td>75%/50%</td>
<td>75%/20%</td>
<td>50%/20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually abused by parents/caretakers when child</td>
<td>76%/21%</td>
<td>76%/6%</td>
<td>21%/6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed sexual violence as child*</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
<td>19%/8%</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbed by sexuality of parent</td>
<td>44%/15%</td>
<td>44%/8%</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbed by sexuality of relative/friend*</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
<td>20%/6%</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury to genitals in childhood*</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually attacked by group</td>
<td>31%/2%</td>
<td>31%/1%</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punished or ridiculed for sex*</td>
<td>46%/12%</td>
<td>46%/4%</td>
<td>12%/4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels alienated from sexuality*</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsive masturbation</td>
<td>54%/5%</td>
<td>54%/0%</td>
<td>5%/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism*</td>
<td>22%/7%</td>
<td>22%/8%</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voyeurism, Peeping</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fetishism (body or object)</td>
<td>41%/5%</td>
<td>41%/10%</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossdressing</td>
<td>23%/2%</td>
<td>23%/1%</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscene phone calls</td>
<td>38%/5%</td>
<td>38%/3%</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual bondage*</td>
<td>24%/2%</td>
<td>24%/1%</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collects violent sex magazines</td>
<td>28%/5%</td>
<td>28%/3%</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collects pornography</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
<td>33%/13%</td>
<td>27%/13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used or ran prostitute*</td>
<td>N.S.D.</td>
<td>14%/1%</td>
<td>12%/1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Tests for pooled rapists (N = 72). All other variables use only FBI sample of rapists (N = 41)
N.S.D. Not significantly different
Among the comparison groups, the students (non-criminal group) have much better relationships with both parents compared to the rapists and felons (criminal groups). Between the two criminal groups, there is no significant difference in their relationships with their fathers. The rapists' fathers seem to have been more violently abusive than the felons' fathers, but differences do not quite reach significance (Table XV). However, their relationships with their mothers is significantly different from each other. The mothers of the rapists were less warm, more inconsistent and more violently abusive than the mothers of the felons (Table XIV).

Considering the dominant parent category of the three groups, the felons' and students' groups were not significantly different. The father was more often the boss for both groups. However, the mother was more often the boss for the rapists' group (Table XIII). Considering these factors, the three comparison groups seem to suggest some influence from a dominant mother in creating the rapist psyche in men. The nature of this influence, and its interaction with other factors in producing the rapist psyche, is described in the summary of case histories for this kind of family beginning on page 127.

The results of the analysis showing the agreement and disagreement of the FBI and content analysis interview samples appears in Appendix A. The results of the comparisons of the rapists and the felons on selected variables may be found in Appendix A, that of the rapists and students in Appendix A, and that of the felons and the students in Appendix A.

For the rest of this dissertation, eighteen cases from the 31 rapists’ self-reports were selected and the effect of dysfunctional parental relationships on each rapist was analyzed. What sort of dysfunctional parental relationships exist between the parents and between the rapists and their parents? How did the relationships affect the rapist's personality development? As mentioned in the beginning of the introduction, special attention was placed on tracing the origin of rapists’ contempt, anger, and hatred in their parental relationships and the socio-cultural influences which nurture such relationships.
CHAPTER III

CASE HISTORIES

INTRODUCTION

Chapter III of this dissertation consists of eighteen case histories of convicted rapists. The focus point of each case history was to observe and analyze the relationship between the rapist’s parents and the relationship of the rapist with his parents and then to see how these relationships affected the making of the rapist psyche. Among the thirty-one cases that were used for the content analysis earlier in the research design part of this dissertation, only the cases that have enough information for the purpose of the analysis were chosen.

Some of the cases have more information for the relationship analysis than others. Some of these rapists had received effective therapy and had a clear understanding of the effect of their negative parental relationship on their crime. Other rapists did not follow this pattern. Whatever the situation, as much information as possible contained in each case history was utilized for the analysis.

Rape is now understood as a crime of hate against women and rapists are regarded as more or less women haters. In *Men Who Hate Women & The Women Who Love Them*, Susan Forward studied men who hate women and their home background. A brief description of her study follows.

Through years of family counseling Forward discovered a major psychological disorder in men who mistreat their wives and lovers. Since these men’s behavior did not fit into any formally categorized character disorders, she defined these men as “men who hate women” and called them misogynists, a Greek word with _miso_ meaning “to hate” and _gyne_ meaning “women.”
According to Forward, misogynists usually enter into a relationship with their partners with unrealistic expectations; and when their partners fail to meet their expectations, they feel betrayed and turn on their partners. Forward describes this situation in her book as follows:

The typical misogynist expects his partner to be a never-ending source of total, all-giving love, adoration, concern, approval, and nurturing. He enters into a relationship with a woman very much as a hungry, demanding infant does, with the unspoken expectation that she will be totally giving and will meet all his needs.

...It is impossible to live on the pedestal the misogynist places her on, because there’s no margin for error. If she is in a bad mood or displays any behavior that he doesn’t like, he views it as a sign of her deficiency. He hired a goddess, and she isn’t living up to the job requirements. His contempt and disillusionment with her is all the permission he needs to stop expressing his love for her and to begin criticizing, accusing, and blaming (Forward and Torres, 1986, pp.38-39).

The disappointed misogynists want to control their partners through such types of psychological abuse as the implied threats of physical harm, verbal attacks, unrelenting criticism and fault-finding, obscuring responsibility and shifting the blame. In some cases misogynists even try to control their partners through physical violence. They use all of these controlling tactics against their partners in every phase of their life together.

Misogynists become selfish, overly critical and even brutal toward their partners in their sexual relationship. In the financial arena, they often use their earning power as an excuse for their self-centered control over money.

In order to control their partner’s thoughts, feelings and behavior, misogynists limit their partner’s social life. They do not want their partners to associate with people who would bring unfavorable influences. For the same reason they even control their partner’s contact with their own family. Misogynists often fail to relate positively with their own children. They tend to see their children as the competitors of their wife’s attention. In some cases they
unfairly criticize their wives' mothering skills in order to further lessen their partner's self-confidence.

Using all of these tactics, misogynists try to belittle and weaken their partner's self-confidence. They hope that their partners, with less self-confidence, will have more dependency on their men so that the men can control them easily. Forward further explains the underlying psyche behind this misogynistic behavior as follows:

...we find that much of his abusive behavior is a cover-up for his tremendous anxiety about women. He is caught in the conflict between his need for the woman's love and his deep-seated fears of her.

This man needs, as we all do, to feel emotionally taken care of, to be loved, and to feel safe. As adults we fulfill these yearnings through physical intimacy, emotional sharing, and parenting. But the misogynist finds these yearnings terribly frightening. His normal needs to be close to a woman are mixed with fears that she can annihilate him emotionally. He harbors a hidden belief that if he loves a woman, she will then have the power to hurt him, to deprive him, to engulf him, and to abandon him. Once he has invested her with these awesome and mythical powers, she becomes a fearful figure for him.

In an effort to assuage these fears, the misogynist sets out, usually unconsciously, to make the woman in his life less powerful. He operates from the secret belief that if he can strip her of her self-confidence, she will be as dependent on him as he is on her. By making her weak so that she cannot leave him, he calms some of his own fears of being abandoned.

All these intense, conflicting emotions make the misogynist's partner not only an object of love and passion but the focal point of his rage, his panic, his fears, and inevitably his hatred (Forward and Torres, 1986, pp. 99-100).

How does a man become a woman-hater? What makes him a misogynist? Forward answers these questions by examining his family background, mainly in the ways in which his parents related to each other and to him. She states that the most common family backgrounds of the misogynists she treated in her family counseling are either the combination of a tyrannical father and a weak, victim mother or a passive father and a
domineering mother (Forward, 1986).

In a family environment in which the father is a tyrannical misogynist and the mother is the weak victim, the son learns to see men as powerful, women as helpless and the mistreating of women as acceptable. Susan Forward describes this situation as follows:

A man who is raised by a misogynistic father can absorb his father’s contempt for women very early in life. The boy learns that a man must always be in control of women and that the way to get that control is to scare them, hurt them, and demean them. At the same time, he learns that the one sure way to get his father’s approval is to behave as his father does (Forward and Torres, 1986, p.103).

Along with the strong influence of the misogynistic father, the victim mother’s behavior greatly contributes to the son’s contempt toward women. When the weak mother becomes a victim of her tyrannical husband’s abuse, she loses a great deal of psychic vitality. She is not only incapable of protecting her son from his tyrannical father but she also fails to provide the constant maternal loving care and guidance which her son definitely needs for his healthy growth.

Moreover, the disappointment of her own cold, cruel husband makes the weak mother depend on her son for her own emotional security. This can be an overwhelming emotional demand on the young boy. He may be confused and even feel guilty because he cannot fulfill his mother’s wish. Later, in his adulthood, the son reacts to his partner’s emotional needs with disgust, anger and contempt.

The weak mother’s failure to give motherly support severely affects her son’s growth. He cannot develop adequate emotional and mental independence and suffers from his inability to grow as a healthy adult. As he grows he sees women as only helpless, demanding and needy, just like small children. He suffers from loneliness and emptiness and also has a strong contempt for women:

All children yearn to feel safe, protected, and loved by their parents. They also need permission to grow up and become independent people.
Paradoxically, people can become independent adults only when their own dependency needs were met in childhood. If their dependency needs were not met, there is an aching emptiness created inside them, and this feeling is carried into adulthood.

...As an adult he expected women to meet his desperate need to be mothered in a way he never was as a child (Forward and Torres, 1986, pp.106-107).

While a misogynistic father becomes a powerful model for a boy to become a misogynist, a domineering mother also tends to make her son a misogynist by suffocating him with too much control and protection. Forward describes this situation as follows:

...When the mother binds her child to her by overcontrolling him and constantly rescuing him, she sets him up to believe that he cannot survive without a woman. This creates in the boy an enormous sense of dependency. Later on he'll see his partner as having the same power to frustrate him, to withhold love from him, to smother him, and, most important, to make him feel weak, helpless, and dependent.

If a boy has a strong and effective father figure upon whom to model himself, he may develop the confidence to break away from even a very dominating mother, but, as we know, dominating women tend to link up with passive, weak men who can rarely offer their sons any alternative to Mother's rule (Forward and Torres, 1986, p.114).

In his adulthood, the man who has this type of mother views women as a powerful threat to his self-identity of masculinity. He cannot trust women or relax with them; and he suffers from the constant power struggle with his partner.

Besides the tyrannical father/victim mother and dominant mother/passive father situations that are the most common family backgrounds for the making of misogynists, an abusive mother and a rejecting mother can also have strong effects on a boy's future relationship with women.

When a mother terrorizes her son with abuse, coldness and severe punishment, the boy feels helpless, inadequate, and afraid. Yet no matter how cruel the mother is, the boy needs her for his survival. Therefore the boy does not isolate himself from his abusive
mother but instead clings to her desperately seeking her love and comfort. In his adulthood this boy will develop both a deep hatred and an intense hunger for a women’s love.

By her overprotection, a domineering mother does not allow her son to experience the frustration of coping with conflicts. So the boy does not learn how to deal with frustrating situations in his later life. The rejecting mother frustrates her son by being cold and withholding her love from him. In this case the frustration is too overwhelming for the boy to cope with. This boy also never learns to deal with frustrating situations in his adulthood.

The rejecting mother, as well as the domineering mother, badly stunt their son’s normal maturation by robbing them of their chances to learn one of the most important social skills, that of dealing with frustration in conflicting situations.

The rejective mother makes her son feel that his neediness is unacceptable and shameful by punishing his quest for her love and attention. The son feels hurt and vulnerable and becomes defensive. In his later years he may develop a bullying and macho behavior toward women to cover up his vulnerability.

The misogynist whose needs were so sharply denied in his childhood cannot accept his partner’s needs either. He often becomes very insensitive to his partner’s emotional and even physical suffering. Forward summarizes the effects of both abusive and rejecting mothers as follows:

With the rejecting mother as well as with the abusive mother, there is overt cruelty and pain, which color the boy’s entire childhood with neediness, rage, and humiliation. These types of mothers can be seen as clear and direct precursors of misogyny (Forward and Torres, 1986, p.120).

The above description of women haters by Forward suggests that a rapist is indeed an extreme case of women hater. In other words, women haters can be very vulnerable to become rapists. By this reasoning, the classification of the rapist’s parental background which Forward used in her book was adapted to categorize the parental background of the
eighteen case histories in this dissertation.

These classifications were originally: “Tyrannical Father and Weak Mother,” “Domineering Mother and Passive Father,” “Abusive Mother,” and “Rejecting Mother.” “Tyrannical Father and Weak Mother” was changed to “Domineering Father and Passive Mother” for this dissertation in order to counterbalance the “Domineering Mother and Passive Father.”

Included in the eighteen case histories are four cases of “Domineering Father and Passive Mother,” four cases of “Domineering Mother and Passive Father,” three cases of “Abusive Mother,” and three cases of “Rejecting Mother.” The four remaining cases do not belong to any of the above categories but the information contained in these cases suggests that the broken home situation had a strong effect in leading these young men into the crime of rape. Therefore, these four cases were grouped under “Broken Home.”

DOMINEERING FATHER AND PASSIVE MOTHER

Jeff

Jeff committed a date rape when he was 19 years old. He was arrested and incarcerated for his crime. On the night of the rape, Jeff met the girl at a bar and asked her for a date. Jeff had met this girl once before and on this night he just wanted to have a good time with her but ended up raping her.

They drank some beer together and Jeff smoked some dope. Deciding to go to a disco, they first took a taxi to Jeff’s house so that he could get some money and change clothes. However, Jeff had to give up the plan because his father was home at the time and his father never allowed him to bring his friends into the house.

Instead of going to the disco, they walked down the street from Jeff’s home. When they came to a factory, Jeff took the girl to the back of the factory and attempted to have sex with her. She refused, saying that she was a virgin, and ran away. Jeff chased and caught her by tackling her legs and knocking her down. He then took her back to the factory and
raped her.

After the rape, Jeff helped the girl get dressed, combed her hair, put her in a taxi, kissed her good night and paid the taxi fee to the driver. The next day he was arrested at his home by the police.

Jeff’s sexual experiences with girls in earlier years were more normal. When he was 15 or 16 years of age, he enjoyed only necking and petting with his first girlfriend because she did not want to go further than that.

In the following years, Jeff occasionally felt sexual aggression toward girls; but usually the association with them went in a normal fashion. He had consenting sexual intercourse with many girls. He also dated many girls without having sex with them. When some girls said “no”, he could calmly accept it. Why did Jeff, who had previously had rather non-violent, normal sexual relations with girls, end up raping the girl that night. His own description of the rape scene gives us the answer to the question:

When we were in the back of the factory, she had said, “No, no; I’m a virgin.” I just couldn’t understand at that time. Why would she come all the way down the street with me and then behind the factory and then say this?

Now the night of my crime, I viewed it as a game. That’s what I thought in my mind. When she was saying, “No, no, I’m a virgin,” I thought that maybe she’s just playing it out. Things didn’t add up with her coming out with me in behind the factory and then her saying, “No, no, I’m a virgin.” That didn’t add up.

So I proceeded to go on and tried to insert my penis again. Then she said the same thing. Then I said, “Okay, well, I’ll roll a joint and then I’ll lay it into you after.” At that time I had gotten up and I proceeded to stick my hand in my pocket and roll some dope. Then she ran away.

I was scared. I couldn’t understand. I just couldn’t understand it. I know why now but at that time I couldn’t understand it. I went after her because I was scared. I didn’t want her running up the street because I knew my dad was home. I went after her and I couldn’t catch her so I tackled her. I jumped her and I grabbed her leg and she fell flat on her face on the ground.

I was kind of pissed off and I also felt that she was a bit scared or insecure. I said, “Well, what the fuck do you think you’re doing?” And then I
picked her up and I brought her back to where we were sitting originally prior to running away.

I didn’t want her running out into the street because of my father being home. In the first place, there was a bit of rejection all along about me bringing anybody home. I feel that that’s what kind of motivated me to go after her.

I asked her, “Are you that stoned that you don’t know what you’re fucking doing? Is something wrong or what?” And then she didn’t say anything. And then, I asked her the same thing again and she just mumbled something. I slapped her in the head and then I proceeded to have intercourse with her. After that, I helped her get dressed and I got dressed and combed her hair and made sure that she had everything.

We walked away and just at the end of the street where the factory ends, I felt emotional. I had tears and I just didn’t understand. There was still a debate in my mind as to whether I had concern for her or whether I was worried about my own situation, realizing, “Holy fuck, I did something wrong.” And I didn’t understand. I didn’t think I’d committed rape. I figured that maybe if anything, I’d get flack from her parents about slapping her or mistreating her or something along that line (Levine and Koenig, 1982, pp.34–36).

Jeff’s rape was rather situational, not premeditated. His negative relationship with his father seems to have been an important causal factor in bringing on Jeff’s situational rape. When the girl first refused Jeff’s attempt to have sexual intercourse with her, he did not become desperate and he temporarily withdrew, saying, “Okay, well, I’ll roll a joint and then I’ll lay it into you after” (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.35).

However, when the girl ran away, he desperately chased and tackled her to the ground because he was very much afraid that his father would see the girl running in the street and find out what was going on. From then on Jeff’s violent rage seems to have escalated. He took the girl back to the factory and raped her.

It seems very likely that Jeff’s negative feeling toward his father was the main factor triggering his situational rape. Earlier that night Jeff had to give up his plan to stop off at home to get some money and change clothes because of his father’s presence there. Jeff must
have become quite frustrated at that time. And then later at the factory when the girl refused to have sex with Jeff by saying she was virgin, his frustration must have increased.

Finally, after Jeff chased and caught the girl on the street, he seems to have had an intense mixed feeling of fear, anger, resentment and frustration toward his own strict father and also toward the girl who refused to have sex after coming all the way to the back of the factory with him. Jeff was also under the influence of drugs and alcohol at the time.

Out of his fear and rage Jeff aggressively raped the girl. By doing so Jeff seems to have gotten even with his oppressive and aggressive father who never even let Jeff bring his friends home. Jeff said, “...there was a bit of rejection all along about me bringing anybody home. I feel that that's what kind of motivated me to go after her” (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.35).

Although Jeff’s rape was a rather spontaneous happening, his own description about the rape scene and his feelings about the rape and the victim indicate that some character traits of a potential rapist were already deep within him at the time of the rape. These negative character traits include a strong, self-centered attitude and apparent lack of social skills with a consequent alienation from reality and aggression toward others.

Jeff’s immature bully-like attitude toward the girl points out his self-centeredness, lack of social skills and aggression. The fact that he got emotional and was in tears after the rape and did not know whether it was because he was worried about his own situation or concerned for the girl also expresses his strong self-centeredness.

Jeff said he viewed his rape as a game and never admitted to himself that his aggressive sexual offense was rape. He instead thought he might be blamed by the girl’s parents for slapping her or mistreating her or something like that. When he was picked up by the police, he still did not think his offense was rape. He said:

...The police came to my house and as far as I was concerned I thought that they were coming for dope or something like that. Later on, I found I was charged with rape so I had to go to jail for that.
I didn’t believe it. No, I didn’t. It’s not that I didn’t want to. It’s just
that I couldn’t understand. It was shocking (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.36).

The above statement indicates that Jeff’s self-centeredness went as far as the point of apathy and serious alienation from reality.

The roots of Jeff’s negative character traits can be traced back to his poor parental relationships, especially his relationship with his oppressive and aggressive father. Jeff’s father was successful and made a good living. On the other hand he seemed to have had a lot of problems coping at work. Instead of expressing his feelings and problems, he escaped by drinking alcohol and disturbing his family when he got drunk.

Jeff’s parents were never legally married and their relationship was neither stable nor peaceful. The father did not trust the mother and there was a lack of good communication between them. They frequently engaged in physical fighting, with the father beating up the mother.

This disharmony between his parents disturbed Jeff very much and caused a lot of conflict in him. When he witnessed his father beating his mother, he could not say anything or do anything to stop it and this situation made him feel very enervated. He describes this situation:

...I feel that I was pretty perceptive, pretty aware of my feelings and what was going on around me, at an early age. I just couldn’t handle that. I just didn’t have the drive to say, “Don’t do it, I hate you for that, I don’t like it.” I just couldn’t do that. I’d go upstairs and I’d cry. I feel this went on all my life up ’til 19, when I was charged with rape (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.30).

The father was strict with Jeff also. He did not allow Jeff to bring his friends—both male and female—to his home up to the time when Jeff was 18 or 19. There was almost a total lack of communication between the father and the son. Naturally, there was no discussion about sex around the home and Jeff had to learn about the facts of sex by himself in his own way. Jeff felt rejected by and fearful of his unreasonably strict father. Jeff said:
My father was pretty strict and through that I guess there was a lot of fear for me to handle as far as psychology goes. I had a lot of problems with my father and with my parents in those respects. I feel that there was a lot of rejection as far as me being allowed to have friends in the house—girls or males.

It wasn't a father and son relationship. At times he did show concern but I just didn't respect him because of a lot of things that he had done in the past that I still have memories of. I couldn't express my feelings for him, or to him about a lot of things. I think if there had been more of a trust factor or more of a father-son relationship, things would have gone a lot better. But I wasn't comfortable in expressing my problems and just built up and built up and built up a lot of things (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.29).

Jeff's mother was much more lenient toward Jeff and thought that he should be allowed to bring his friends to his own home. However, it seems that she was not strong enough to influence her husband into changing his attitude toward their son. It is quite likely that both parents were too caught up with their problems and had no room in their hearts to lovingly care and guide their own son.

Jeff felt alone and these parental problems were too big for him to handle by himself. He learned to escape from the problems by ignoring what was going on around him. He repressed his own feelings, became defensive and adopted a superiority attitude in order to survive in his harsh environment. Jeff said:

It all affected my personality in the sense that I couldn't relate. I would deny my feelings for a lot of things. I would run away from a lot of feelings. I would never accept that I was to blame. I'd always push it off or just forget. I'd say it never happened (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.31).

I would just run from any problems I had with my father. It got to a point where I was coming home stoned all the time. I wasn't doing anything I was supposed to be doing. I had the world by the ass and I kind of viewed the world as being a patsy and I'm going to do my thing (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.29).
As early as age 15 Jeff had a good paying job with a bright future in an excellent trade; but he could not maintain this job due to his emotional instability. In his daily life Jeff associated with people who took the same kind of attitude toward life as he did. Their relations stayed at the superficial level and Jeff never experienced open and honest human-to-human relationships with any of them.

Moreover, in order to repress his feelings and escape from his problems, Jeff began using drugs. He even participated in three homosexual acts to get money for his drug habit. Through this type of behavior Jeff further degraded himself and lost more self-esteem. Jeff described his superficial association with others as follows:

...We never shared down-to-earth feelings and problems like other people used to get into. I didn't want to get into that because I didn't want to make myself out as having all these problems. I wanted to make myself out as just going along smoothly: "Hey, this guy's got no problems, he's a really cool dude." And that was a downfall (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.32).

So, from his early childhood up till he committed rape at the age of 19, Jeff's home environment was a very unsatisfactory and unhappy one. His parents suffered from their own poor relationship and could not provide adequate loving care to their own son. His father was unreasonably strict with Jeff and rejected him. Jeff never experienced a warm father and son relationship and his self-identity was shaky. As a natural consequence in this case, Jeff could not build any self-esteem. The whole situation was too much for the young boy to handle; so he closed himself up and repressed his feelings toward his parents and the people around him. He isolated himself from the world and never learned normal social skills.

Confined in his own small world, Jeff also became extremely self-centered to the extent that he thought his rape was a game. He was unable to feel any of his victim's emotional pain.

With his lack of social skills, apathy, and alienation from reality, Jeff's mental and
emotional state remained at an immature level, even at the age of 19. At the rape scene he could not control his rage and, overwhelmed by emotion, could not judge his own deed at all. He was not aware of how serious a sexual offense he was committing. He was a bully who used sexual aggression to release his pent up revengeful rage toward his own father.

The fact that Jeff never admitted that his violent sexual assault was rape also tells of his hidden contempt toward women. He despised women to the point that he could not see them as human beings. It was all right for him to take what he wanted from the girl. It could not be a crime of rape. Since his mother could not protect him from his cold, strict father and she could not provide him with spiritual and emotional nutrition to grow up as a healthy young adult, Jeff might have had a deep seated resentment toward her that could have easily turned to contempt.

If Jeff had been raised in a more normal, warm and supportive parental environment where he could openly discuss his own problems and experience a loving and trustful family life, his personality development might have been quite different. He most likely could have learned much better social skills with a clear moral conscience and could have avoided the plunge into such an aggressive crime as rape. Jeff reflected on his own crime as follows:

I feel that things could have been prevented a long way back with regards to privileges pertaining to home and communication problems and me sorting out my own problems before everything came to a falling point. Just dealing with things instead of neglecting my responsibility. Just being more mature overall instead of looking at the world as a negative thing. Like it's a party and I'm going to go out and have my fun. And forming different attitudes toward different people (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.36).

Fortunately, Jeff's imprisonment that followed his crime brought a break to his poor parental relationships. Facing this serious situation (rape and prison) both parties reflected on their own attitude and mutually expressed their own feelings. As a result Jeff became emotionally tied with his parents and this emotional improvement also extended to his brother and girlfriend.
Ray

Ray was 23 years old and serving a ten-year sentence for the crime of simple rape at the time of the interview. After serving two years of the sentence, he went before the parole board in 1980; but parole was denied. He was expecting another parole hearing in 1984.

Ray said that he had raped five women, including acquaintances. He was not particular about the type of woman he chased, but said that he would not rape an elderly woman. He never beat women or threatened them with a weapon. He just forcibly subdued them into having intercourse with him. Since he was a large man, it was easy for him to overpower them. In addition to raping his victims, he forced some of them to perform oral sex on him. He sodomized one and forced his fist into her vagina.

Ray was married for three years and had a son, but this did not stop him from raping. He was violent with his wife (forced his fist into her vagina) and raped her when she would not sexually respond to him. A few of his non-marital rapes were committed after he had fought with his wife. When he got very angry with her, he would get into his car, drive around and look for a victim.

Ray talked about three of his rapes in detail during the interview. He committed his first rape at the age of 18 when he was under the influence of alcohol. He met a woman one evening in a lounge where he was drinking with a friend. They decided to go somewhere else in her car. While driving, he stopped the car alongside the road and asked her to have sex with him. She refused and he proceeded to rape her. He described his state of mind at the time as follows:

...I never met this women before in my life. It was the first time. I was just thinking of having sex with her, but something bounced in my head and said, "Just do it," and I did it.

...It's like an evil thing—like the devil is in my mind and your mind tells you to do it (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.114).
Apparently, Ray’s first rape was done under the influence of alcohol. However, his second rape was premeditated. He picked a 16-year-old girl whom he had seen around town with men he knew. He studied her daily routine and then raped her in an alley where he decided would be the best spot to attack her. He walked away after the rape, leaving the girl lying in the alley.

Ray was convicted for the rape (his last one) of a niece of the local police department’s chief of detectives. The woman’s husband was in the service and she was living alone with her baby. She had invited Ray’s brother to her home and then had sexual relations with him. When Ray heard about her sexual behavior from his brother, he decided to go to bed with her too. He went to her home and knocked on the door. When she opened the door, he forced his way in and took her to the bedroom. He overpowered her and then threatened to kill her and her baby if she did not cooperate. He raped her, forced his fist into her vagina and sodomized her.

Why did Ray become a rapist? When the interviewer asked him this question, he answered as follows:

...let me say how I think it really started is that it happened way back in my childhood. I was—I’d say nine or ten years old. I saw my father do the same thing to my mother. ...He raped her with a Coke bottle. He used his hand on her and this and that. As I’m growin’ up, you know, I still had this on my mind. My father left my mother when I was fourteen, and I’ve been living with her ever since. I guess that’s what started me rapin’. From the violence I saw from my father—what he did to my mother (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, pp.117-118).

...You’d have to be there to really see what happened. He was doin’ this to my mother, and all the agony and everything she was goin’ through—it would stay in my head. ...So when I was old enough and I would go out, I would look for a victim. And when I’d find her I’d do the same things he did—see the expression on their face, all the yells and screams. Never did use a Coke bottle, though. I used my fist (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.118).

Apparently, Ray learned and imitated his father’s sexual aggression toward women
and by doing so, he might have unconsciously sought his father's approval. However, what made Ray rape women was not only the simple imitation of his father's behavior. He had a deep anger toward his aggressive father who violently abused his own wife (Ray's mother). Ray also had a hidden contempt toward his own weak mother who failed to defend herself against her husband's abuse.

The anger and contempt Ray felt toward his parents seems to have been the most significant psychological force which turned him into a rapist. Ray expressed this situation as follows:

...I was angry at my father. Being angry at him, being he was a man, I was angry at men. What I couldn't do to them, I would take it out on a woman (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.118).

...When you start rapin' you don't think. You don't think at all. All you want to do is attack that victim and get it over with. When it's done, you can say that's one more that you raped. It's mostly anger that you feel. What you're doing is taking out that anger on her (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.121).

When Ray was asked why he transferred his anger from men to women, he replied:

It was like he was learnin' me something and I was small and I didn't know any better. He didn't really try to learn me anything better than what I saw. As I grew up with it, it got worse and worse, and I wanted to do it myself. When I was eighteen I had one of my own. That's when I first tried it (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.118).

The above statement tells us that Ray's anger toward his own aggressive father increased as he grew up; and this anger finally found its outlet in the form of rape which was a very familiar behavior that he had learned from his father.

Ray's father left home when Ray was 14 years old and after that Ray lived with his mother. He spoke about his mother as being a gentle woman who would give him anything he needed. However, she was also a weak woman who allowed her husband to badly abuse
her. Being so weak, she probably failed to provide her son with firm spiritual guidance or strong emotional support. It seems as though she could fulfill her son’s material needs but not his spiritual and ethical needs.

So, Ray probably created a hidden contempt toward his weak mother who did not stand up against her husband’s abuse. She failed to nourish her son’s spiritual and ethical needs. Although Ray said that his relationship with his mother was a very close and good one, his hidden contempt toward her and women in general is very clear from listening to his own words. When he was asked how he felt when he saw that his victims were in pain, he frowned and replied, “They was in great pain. I just laughed in their face. I thought it was a joke. It was a good feeling to me” (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.119).

When Ray was asked why it was a good feeling, he said, “Why? I don’t know. I guess it goes back to my childhood, when I’d seen my father do the same thing to my mother” (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.119). Ray learned to express his contempt toward his mother and women in general in the form of rape just as his father had done.

Ray’s definition of rape is as follows:

A rapist is a wild person. He’s sick. He has only one thing on his mind, and that’s a woman. He wants that woman. He wants to have intercourse with her no matter how he gets it or where he gets it. He has something wrong with him, a mental problem where he was brought up like that or something (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.120).

When Ray was asked to describe what it feels like being a rapist, he replied:

You see, you have to be a rapist to know. After your first victim you want to get another one. Maybe she’s better-looking or something like that—the way she walks, the way she smiles and talks or something. It gets easier after the first time. Not only easier, it gets more violent. The second, the third, the fourth, the fifth—if I wouldn’t have stopped when I got caught, I probably would have killed one of them (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.122).
Ray had a very difficult childhood. Both parents failed to provide him with loving parental care or good ethical guidance. Instead, he was exposed to his father’s abnormally brutal aggression toward his (Ray’s) mother. He hated his father and men in general. He despised his mother and women in general. He grew up as a young man full of anger who had few social skills by which to control his own sexual urges. He did not know how to relate with women in a positive manner or know how to use his sexual energy constructively. He never asked women for a date. He just forcibly took what he wanted from them.

At the age of 18, Ray committed his first rape and then kept raping. As his offenses continued, he began to notice that his aggression and violence was escalating. He became afraid that he might end up killing some woman. Therefore, he wanted to get caught before it became too late. It was very fortunate that he was apprehended before he got that far.

Ray said that committing rape had left him with a deep psychological scar. When he began his prison term, he suffered from very low self-esteem. He had not been given any therapy while in prison and so he had to work on his problems by himself. Therefore, over the years of introspection in prison, he had been able to change his attitude and had learned to respect women. He said that he wanted to meet with his rape victims and apologize to them even though he knew it would not help them much. He also said that because of his deep fear of being put back in prison again along with his new attitude of respect toward women, he would never rape again.

Ray seems to be another victim of very poor parental relationships. If he could have had a gentle and loving father and a stronger mother instead of an aggressive father and weak mother, Ray might have grown into a life-loving young man who could enjoy normal relationships with women.

John

John was given a 12-year sentence for participating in a gang rape and an 18-month sentence for hitting a girl in the mouth and putting her in a coma for three weeks. Previous to
these two convictions, he was imprisoned for two years for a crime not explained in the interview. At the time of the interview he had already served at least ten years in reformatories and penitentiaries.

John joined a motorcycle gang when he was 19 years old. Before joining the bike group, he had already forced a number of girls to have sexual intercourse with him. All he ever wanted from these girls was sex, and he never became emotionally involved with any of them. When a girl refused to have sex with him, he just forcibly took it.

John continued these aggressive sexual activities after joining the motorcycle gang. He used his motorcycle to pick girls up and take them to his apartment or an apartment he had borrowed to have sex with them. If the girls refused him, he would threaten or slap them into submission. He had a few dozen of these experiences. During this time period he had an argument with a girl in a motel and hit her in the mouth, putting her into a coma. He was given a sentence of 18–months for this offense.

Although John’s aggressive sexual activities went on for many years, no victim ever reported him to the police. He was finally caught when he participated in a gang rape of a girl committed by some members of the motorcycle group. He was convicted and given a 12–year sentence for gang rape.

At the urging of the group, John suggested a girl who he thought would agree to have sex with the group all at the same time. John picked up a girl who knew and trusted him. The group took the girl to a place in the countryside and proceeded to humiliate, beat, kick, and rape her repeatedly. They further assaulted her by sticking a corn cob into her vagina and a penis in her mouth.

Since John knew and liked the girl, he did not want to rape her at first; but he yielded to group pressure and proceeded to rape her along with the other group members. John at least managed to stop the group from killing the girl when one of the men suggested killing her in order to get rid of the witness to their crime.
Why did John commit rape? In John's case, it is clear that his lack of social skills caused by his strict father was one of the significant contributing factors for his crime. His father was strict and kept him locked up in the house a lot. This situation limited John's socializing experiences and he suffered from it's consequences. John said that his mother was lenient, but it seems that she was not strong enough to change the home situation for her son. Because of his lack of social skills, John could not get along with people, especially women.

John had a very disturbed and unhappy life during his youth. He was never satisfied with his job. He was in constant trouble caused by too much drinking and fighting and having problems with his family or girlfriend. When all of these accumulated problems became overwhelming, John attempted a violent suicide on the street. He poured gasoline over his body and set himself on fire. His neighbors managed to put the fire out, but he spent five months in the hospital recovering from his injuries.

John went to jail for two years sometime after the attempted suicide (The reason for his imprisonment is not explained). He returned to the streets after serving his time. He felt insecure on the streets and so, in order to cover up his insecure feeling, he joined the motorcycle gang to be a "tough guy."

Because of his strict father, John was forced to alienate himself from people and he developed a phobia as well as an inferiority complex toward people, especially women. Consequently, his fear and inferiority complex toward women made him very defensive toward women. This defensiveness further severed his healthy social experiences with women, resulting in his inferiority complex and phobia becoming worse.

John perpetually suffered from this vicious circle in his youth. His dates were always arranged by his sisters or friends because he could not approach women by himself. At dances he could not go up to a girl and ask for a dance for fear of being rejected.

John indeed suffered from the consequences of his lack of social experiences. He
described his desperate, lost feeling that led him to the suicide attempt as follows:

I just couldn’t get along with people. I couldn’t socialize. I felt that everybody was doing better than me. I just felt I couldn’t get along with people anymore—just fed up with everything—the way everything works out there in society and I just wanted to kill myself. You know, I didn’t feel I was good enough for people. I just wanted to end it all (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.69).

John also developed a strong contempt for women, maybe because of his lenient and weak mother who failed to protect him from his strict father. John stated his mixed feelings of fear, inferiority complex and contempt toward women as follows:

I didn’t feel too good about women. I felt that I couldn’t pick them up on my own. I took the lower-class woman and tried to make her look even lower than she really was, you know. Cause what I really wanted was a higher-class woman but I didn’t have the finesse to actually pick these women up. I just didn’t have the social skills for that (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.72).

The following statement by John tells of his deep-seated contempt for women even more clearly:

I used to like putting women down, like beating was just like putting a woman down. I might have thought they were cheap, so I just kicked the shit out of them, you know, if I could, or if I felt like it. I did this quite often (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.71).

So, John suffered from an inferiority complex, phobia and hidden contempt toward women. Significantly, these negative complexes had been built on the very low self-esteem he had for himself. Since his parents could not provide natural and loving parental care to him when he was growing up, he could not learn to see himself as a lovable and respectable human being. Moreover, his father took his social life away which was his other chance to experience positive human relations and nurture his own higher self-esteem.

Because John could not accept himself as a decent human being, he could not see
other people, especially women, as decent human beings. He feared women whom he did not know much about. He also despised women because he saw them as extensions of the image of his own weak mother or as extensions of his own poor self-image. In John’s inner world, no decent human being, male or female, including himself, existed. He said:

I’d say that I went around insulting people a lot and I didn’t actually care for the way I really was inside myself. I wasn’t really proud of myself and so I drank a lot and through drinking, this gave me this false courage and I’d just do anything. I’d take up any dare or do anything just to try and impress the bikers that I was either a tough guy or a nut or wild guy or crazy. A lot of different things they called me, and I thought that they really liked me for these stupid things I was doing, when actually they were probably saying, “What an idiot this guy is,” (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.72).

John also said:

When I did date, when I was younger, I would pick up a girl and if she didn’t come across I would threaten her or slap her face and then tell her she was going to fuck—that was it. But that’s because I didn’t want to go through the soft talk and I just didn’t want to waste time with any come-ons. It took too much time. I wasn’t interested because I didn’t like them as people anyway, and I just went with them just to get laid. Just to say that I laid them (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.77).

These words express John’s psychological state as a rapist—his insensitivity toward himself and others, and the obsession to experience power over women. Considering the mental and emotional state that John was in, it was very natural for him to develop a strong craving for the feeling of power. He joined the biker gang because he wanted to be “somebody,” or a “tough guy,” and he participated in the gang rape in order to further experience power over women.

John’s statements explaining his joining the biker group and what made him take part in the gang rape tell of his strong urge to experience power at the time. He said:

Yeah, I was feeling very insecure and things like this, on the street. I did join a motorcycle gang when I was on the street and the reason I joined
the motorcycle group was I wanted to get these colors on my back. They wear a set of colors and I felt that by wearing these I wouldn’t be a “nobody.” I would be a “somebody” important like, say, a movie star, because everybody looked up to people that were in motorcycle gangs. Maybe they feared them, you know, they feared them and I liked this. I liked pretending that I was a tough guy—actually I’m not, but at the time I thought I was a pretty tough guy. I think the reasons then were because I was actually a very shy, inward person. I couldn’t socialize and I had to prove myself somehow, so I proved myself by just being a tough guy—going around beating people up and playing the fool, you know, when I was younger (Levine and Koenig, 1982, pp. 69–70).

...On these gang splashes the sex part of it wasn’t what I really got off on. What I really responded to, I think, was the different guys participating in sex. That’s what turned me on. I don’t know why (Levine and Koenig, 1982, pp.71–72).

When the group of men exercised brutal sexual violence on the totally defenseless woman, their infantile obsession for power over women must have been greatly satisfied. John’s statement above suggests that he participated in the gang rape without a clear awareness of his own deep-seated hidden craving for power over women.

John did not have any kind of constructive, purposeful life either in or outside the home. Nobody, including his parents, could give him adequate emotional support and he was alone. Consequently, he failed to create healthy self-esteem and suffered from an inferiority complex and phobia toward people, especially toward women. He also developed a strong contempt for women and abused many of them. Finally, he was overwhelmed by a revengeful urge to overpower women and joined in the gang rape.

John seems very much like a victim of poor parental relationships. If his parents could have provided normal, loving parental care, he might have grown up as a young man with the proper social skills, self-confidence and self-esteem. And he might not have had such a desperate urge to overpower women which eventually led him to rape.

John regretted his unfortunate younger days as explained here:
If I would have went and seen a psychiatrist before, I think it would have really helped me, because I had so many—what's been described to me as "phobias" you know. Like I was scared of getting on buses, I was scared of taking taxis and things like this. I was scared of being with crowds of people, I was scared to socialize in any way... (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.79).

In the early days of his prison life, John suffered from threats and mistreatment by his fellow inmates. However, after spending 10 years in reformatories and penitentiaries, he became calmer and acquired good reasoning power. Fortunately, he participated in some effective group therapy programs including the role-play method. He learned proper social skills for communicating with other people and changed his attitude drastically. He looked back on his street life as crazy and expressed the desire to never repeat that mistake again. And to his interviewer he expressed his hope of associating with normal, conscientious people and having good relationships with women in the future.

Sal

Sal was 36 years old and serving a sentence of twenty-five years to life for the crimes of murder and attempted murder at the time of the interview. He had served ten years and will be eligible for parole in 1999.

Sal committed his first rape, which was premeditated, at the early age of 15. He picked a girl from his own public school as his first victim. He followed her, studied her daily routine and watched her through her bedroom window each night for a week.

Sal entered her room one night through the window, knocked her unconscious by hitting her in the face, and tied her hands and feet to the bed. He then just watched her body for awhile. The girl finally regained consciousness and struggled to free herself. Her movements stimulated Sal and he raped her repeatedly throughout the night.

As Sal continued committing the crime of rape, he became progressively more aggressive and sadistic. He began murdering his rape victims when he reached the age of 20.
Later on, he murdered his victims before raping them by stabbing them to death. After killing three or four victims in this manner, he began to kill them in extremely sadistic and inhuman ways.

Sal first hit his victim until she became totally defenseless or unconscious (he knew where and how to hit a woman for this purpose). He then ripped off her clothes, tied her hands and feet and stood her in front of a full length mirror. He would then hold her mouth and stick a knife into her chest while she was still conscious. He became very aroused by seeing his victim’s horrified reaction. He would then continue to stab her or cut open her breasts (Sal liked big-breasted women) while she watched herself being murdered. He became very excited by the flowing blood and raped his dead victim.

Sal told the interviewer that he had raped hundreds of women and murdered 25. He was finally arrested. However, he was never found at the scene of his crime and the police could not tie him to a murder weapon. They could only suspect him of the murders based on his other rape offenses.

Why did Sal become such a cruel and inhuman rapist? What caused him to develop such an extreme psychotic and sadistic character? Sal reveals in the interview that his aggressive father had a significant influence on the development of his negative personality traits.

Sal was born in New York City, the oldest of three children. He had an eighth grade education. He was close to his mother but did not get along with his father. When he got into trouble during childhood, his father would hit him. And when his sister got into trouble, Sal got blamed for that also. His father had a drinking problem. He became violent when he got drunk and Sal was very afraid of him.

Once, when Sal was 14 years old, his father violently attacked him when he was sent out to find his younger sister and came home without her. His father threw a Boy Scout knife at Sal, who was lying in bed at the time. Fortunately the knife blade was not open. But it hit
Sal right in the testicles and he had to spend a few weeks in the hospital.

Sal said that psychologists had told him that his aggressive father was a significant causal factor in his murders. However, Sal's own introspection on the subject is very shallow. When asked what he thought started him to rape, he answered:

It was to break the habit of masturbating. I had chances of looking at a girl, I wanted it from her. That kind drove me to it. I wanted her if she didn't give it to me. I got so mad I wanted to take it (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.64).

When asked if he felt it was his right to take it from her, Sal replied:

Of course it was my right. I felt that way. I figure if you're not going to give it to me, then it's my right to take it. So I took it any way I can (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.64).

The above statements reveal that Sal had never learned the social skills necessary to deal with other people and that he was extremely self-centered. Sal admitted that ever since his younger days he had never gotten along with girls. He did not go out with girls very often. When he did take a girl out and tried to touch her, he was always rejected. As a result of these negative experiences, he made up his mind to just take what he wanted from girls. He describes his own attitude as "I always had one thing in my mind when I was younger—take advantage. You can't get it voluntarily, you have to take it" (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.59).

Sal's only concern during his crimes was to fulfill his own impulsive desires. He had no feeling whatsoever about his victims. He said:

...I found more satisfaction when the girl is completely out. You can take more advantage of her, get all the pleasure you want. Later on, in the 1970s, I killed them even before I fucked them. I would stab them first, kill them, fuck them, and then beat the body with my fists (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.62).
The following conversation between the interviewer and Sal shows his almost insane level of extremely self-centered attitude. The interviewer asks “What made you so hard up that you had to murder to have an orgasm?” Sal calmly replies “To me it was worth it. Because every time I went to see a decent girl, she always refused me. So I took it upon myself to punish them” (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.63).

Sal probably never experienced a normal and warm father and son relationship with his aggressive father. He never learned proper social skills from him. Sal said that he had been close to his mother but apparently she also failed to teach him the very basic concepts of social skills—how not to be self-centered, how to respect other’s needs, etc.

As is the usual case in the family with a tyrannical and aggressive father, Sal’s mother must have been a weak person who could not protect her own son from her brutal husband. She could not give firm ethical guidance to her own son. As a result, Sal must have developed contempt toward his own mother and extended this contempt to women in general. He said:

...I got to despise them. By despising them, you get a girl that doesn’t want it, and you despise girls, so you try and take it away from them. But if you take it from one girl, I found that in certain conditions I enjoy killin’ them (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.59).

Due to the lack of a loving parental relationship and proper social skills, Sal did not have the base on which to develop a normal personality as he grew up. The emotional pain inflicted by his aggressive father must have been unbearable for young Sal. The problem must have been too profound for the young boy to tackle and he shut himself off. He then created a very hard anti-social character which deprived him of normal sexual relationships with women and eventually led him to the crime of rape.

Sal’s normal personality growth was stopped at an early age and he became obsessed with his deep-seated inner anger and the desire for revenge. And then, with his awakening sexual desire, he took his negative feelings out on women, all of whom he despised. He
inflicted both physical and emotional pain on his victims and enjoyed seeing their terrified reactions. This feeling of power over the women gave him great satisfaction. He explained as follows:

Three women, I used to tie their hands behind their back, put them in front of a mirror—one of those hall mirrors—tie ’em in such a way where she can’t use her hands. I’d put her entire front, face and body, against the mirror, squeezing, touching, turning her around—all sorts of things like that (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.63).

These sadistic actions seem to have been done as revenge toward his brutal father who had inflicted such unbearable pain on him in his youth, and also to satisfy his thirst for the feeling of power.

Sal was raised as a Catholic but later converted to the Jewish faith while he was in prison. He said the reason for the conversion was that Jesus Christ stands for only one thing and he does not have power over Almighty God. Sal wanted to have a bigger God.

Sal said that he got along with the other inmates in prison and that prison was a nice place to be. He said that converting to the Jewish creed in prison helped him to understand women more. He realized that women should be understood, loved and cared for but unfortunately he did not have one to love. He also said that he felt sorry for his victims and was trying “to lose the habit of taking it all the time” (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.64).

Although Sal sounded like he had gained quite an understanding on his own self-centered attitude, there was still a lot of confusion in his mind. He said that since he had learned more about women and had educated his mind, he no longer thought of himself as a rapist but as a lover of women. He admitted that he masturbated while thinking about his rape and murder victims. It still gave him great stimulation and satisfaction, but as a lover and not as a rapist. He also said that he would like for a woman to take advantage of him. These confessions reveal that he was still confusing a genuine natural, loving and sharing human relationship with a rather power-oriented and abusive relationship when interacting with
women.

For Sal, it could have been very difficult to truly comprehend such normal human to human affectionate relationships. One usually learns such basic human relationships through loving parental care given to him at an early age. Sal was never given such care. He had never been loved and therefore he did not learn how to love others. He simply could not give others what he had not been given.

Sal came from an incredibly poor home background and spent his entire youth raping and killing numerous women. He was in prison at the age of 36 and thought that he had become a lover instead of a rapist when the memory of his victims gave him stimulation and satisfaction. Even if Sal never rapes again, he will be a perpetual rapist in his heart. He seems to be a true victim of his negative parental relationships.

Summary

Jeff’s father was too strict and did not allow Jeff to bring any friends home. The father was also violent. Jeff was very much disturbed every time his father beat up Jeff’s mother. The parental problem was too much for the young boy to deal with. So, he repressed his feelings and shut himself off from his parents and others.

Jeff had only superficial relationships with people, and by doing so he failed to learn the necessary social skills in order to mature. He became a young bully with no consideration for others. Unfortunately, his weak mother could not help the situation much.

At the age of 19 Jeff committed a date rape out of revengeful anger toward his strict father. When he was apprehended by the police, he did not know why his sexual aggression could be made into the crime of rape.

Ray hated his aggressive father who had raped Ray’s mother with his hand and a Coke bottle. He also despised his gentle but weak mother who put up with her husband’s sexual abuse and failed to give strong moral support to her son. Raised in a poor home
environment, Ray never learned the proper social skills for becoming an adult with a normal moral sense. He did not know how to relate to women. Learning from his aggressive father, he raped his own wife and other women. His raping seems to have been an outburst of his anger toward his unreasonably strict and violent father as well as the imitation of his father’s sexual aggression.

John’s father was too strict and often locked him up in the house. John did not experience enough interaction with people and consequently could not develop good social skills. He instead developed very low self-esteem, a deep inferiority complex and a phobia toward people, especially toward women. One time when John’s inferiority complex became unbearable, he attempted a violent suicide in the street.

John’s gentle but weak mother could not rescue John from the situation and he resented and despised her for it. He craved the feeling of power to make up for his deep inferiority complex and raped many women. At the age of 19 he joined a motorcycle group and used his motorcycle to lure more women. He was finally apprehended after participating in a gang rape of a young woman.

When Sal was 14 years old, his father threw a Boy Scout knife right at Sal’s testicles which resulted in him spending a few weeks in the hospital. Sal’s mother was too weak to protect her son from her aggressive husband or to provide moral guidance to her son. Sal despised his weak mother and women in general.

Raised in an extremely rough home environment, Sal never learned the basic social skills. Instead, he turned into a psychotic, sadistic anti-social character who raped and murdered countless women in a horribly inhuman manner. His sadistic crimes seem to have been done in revenge toward his brutal father. Through sadistic rapes and murders, he inflicted both physical and emotional pain—which he himself suffered from as a child—on his victims and enjoyed the feeling of power which he craved for so much.

All four rapists in the "Domineering Father and Passive Mother" group had a strong revengeful anger against their domineering, strict and often violent fathers. And just as
Forward revealed in her book, *Men Who Hate Women & The Women Who Love Them*, they felt resentment and contempt toward their weak mothers who not only failed to protect them from their domineering fathers but also could not provide maternal moral guidance.

There was no close communication between these four men and their domineering fathers. Their weak mothers could not improve the situation. Overwhelmed by their parental problems, these men learned at an early age to repress their feelings and shut themselves off from their parents and the rest of the world. As a result, they did not experience genuine human–to–human interaction with anyone, and their socialization process and personality development were severely hindered. Because of this situation, they could not establish a base for their healthy, positive self-identity and bitterly suffered from very low self-esteem.

The domineering fathers and passive mothers in these cases did not have harmonious marital relationships. Therefore, they could not provide the model for a natural, healthy human sexual bond for their sons. These young men never received proper sex education at home, school or church. Therefore, as they grew and gained a strong youthful sexual energy, they did not have either the sex knowledge or the social skills to constructively deal with their own sexuality.

With their poor social skills, these young men never learned to understand women as real persons and feared them. Most of them could not approach women with ease or even ask them out for a date. This situation deepened their low self-esteem. In order to compensate for this negative feeling about themselves, they wanted to feel power over women through raping them. They seem to have taken all of their pent–up revengeful anger held against their fathers and directed it toward women—whom they despised as extensions of their weak mothers—and raped them.

According to Forward’s analysis of the case of a misogynist whose parents are a tyrannical father/victim mother (Forward, 1986), these four men might have learned from their fathers to see men as powerful and women as weak. They learned to control women by
scaring, hurting, and demeaning them. By doing so, they probably, consciously or unconsciously, could have been seeking their aggressive fathers’ approval. Phil, who’s father raped his wife, (Phil’s mother) with his hand and a coke bottle, clearly stated that he learned to mistreat women by imitating the way his father treated his mother.

Forward also states that the weak mother’s dependency on her son for her own emotional security makes the son confused and even guilty because he cannot fulfil his mother’s wish (Forward, 1986). Later, in his adulthood, the son reacts to his partner’s emotional needs with disgust, anger, and contempt. This analysis could be very proper in understanding why these men could not become involved with women through love. They instead had to take what they wanted by raping.

DOMINEERING MOTHER AND PASSIVE FATHER

Len

Len forced several girls, all acquaintances of his, to have sexual intercourse with him. In four or five such cases he actually intimidated and threatened the girls into having sex with him. Only the last victim reported the rape. In the interview Len described his last rape that sent him to prison:

...I’d been out drinking quite a bit and that seemed to be my way of feeling comfortable about myself, finding some security. I’d met this girl in a bar and I talked with her for a while and she seemed like a pretty nice girl. Finally, we were out alone driving and we stopped and I was feeling she was all right. I felt comfortable with that. As we started to caress each other I became very angry. I became just lost in that anger. I wanted to have sex and at that time I was defending things all that much more. My desire inside was to really love someone, as compared to just having sex. I was hating the way I was having sex. I just started to feel that this wasn’t real, this caring wasn’t real, and I became more angry than ever before. I wanted to get this over really quick. I wanted to have sex with her. I put my hands on her throat and I threatened her. I said I was going to kill her if she didn’t give in. She did and it was really unsatisfying. It was getting worse. It was over and I drove her home. I didn’t try to hide what I had done (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.48).
When Len came home from work the next day, the police came to the house and charged him with the crime of rape. Why did Len, when there had been an excellent chance for mutually consenting sexual intercourse with this girl, have to rape her? Why, contrary to his desire for having loving relationships with women, did he end up raping her? Why did their caressing evoke such anger in him and make him rush to rape her? Through his talk in the interview, it is easy to trace the root cause of his distrust and anger toward women to his parental relationship.

Len discussed his unhappy parental relationship and his reactionary childhood behavior as follows:

My family gave me everything that a kid would want. You know, clothes, a nice home. I just felt those gifts were more buying than real, genuine caring—which I wanted more than anything. And I destroyed those things. I used them. I'd destroy things that other people owned. I'd be out drinking and I'd just go on a rampage and bust up cars and smash up cars as I was driving. I'd destroy things—just malicious damage. I felt that was a release for me. I'd be off on my own, away from my friends a lot of times when I did this. When I was around people, I wouldn't be myself. I'd be a front. I'd be something that they'd like and then I couldn't maintain that. I'd have to get off on my own and that's when I destroyed a lot of things. I'd take all my hostility out there—I wouldn't show it to any of my friends.

My family tried to help me, but I was pushing away from them. I mistook a lot of trying to keep me straight for disliking me or rejection of me. I'd get most angry at my mother. I'd turn her off. I'd want to treat her bad because she was trying to help me and I didn't see that.

She was forceful. She tried to stop me from going out with my friends and she was questioning what I was doing, what kind of trouble I was getting into and doing a lot of assuming, because I didn't say anything. I hated her. I wanted to kill her. As far back as I can remember, I had that feeling about her. That I wanted her out of my life. She was hitting home at times. When she was off base and said, "Well, you're doing this" and I wasn't, that was further backing for my anger and my dislike of her. I was saying, "I don't want anybody close to me."

I didn't spend that much time, really, with my dad. We shared a few
things together, I felt good about that. I wanted more and I never asked. I had pretty clear ideas about what a “together” family was: to go out and share things, to have good times together, sit down and have serious talks. I just didn’t feel that happened at home and I just got into retaliating against that. And I looked elsewhere—to other people—and I ended up retaliating against them too (Levine and Koenig, 1982, pp.37-38).

Coming from this kind of very unhappy home environment, Len felt uncomfortable and unsafe with people. He felt that he was a little odd and not normal in public school. He could not be himself. When he was with other people, he tried to please them by acting out the way he thought they would like him to be. He avoided any serious interaction with people and kept his relationship with them at a superficial level only.

There had been sexual problems in Len’s family in the past and sex was never discussed openly at home. At school, his peers treated sex as gross, dirty and something to laugh about. Out of fear of exposing his insecurity, Len never discussed sex with his family or other people. He received very little sex education in school and, consequently, never learned the facts of sex or that sex was a very important part of the human experience. Len talked about his attitude toward sex as follows:

When I started going out with girls, it wasn’t really sex that I was thinking of. I just wanted to be around somebody and have a little bit of warmth. Sex seemed to be the thing that I was most afraid of. As I went out with a girl, she was showing me what sex was about. And I really felt unsure of that. I felt that it wasn’t clean, that it was uncomfortable within myself. Though I knew that it was a natural thing to happen, I didn’t feel it was natural within myself. I didn’t talk about that at all. I didn’t say that I feel uncomfortable, that I don’t know what the hell I’m doing. And the more I went out with girls, the more I wanted to prove that I felt comfortable, that it was all right with me and that I was in control of the situation. and I became more fearful, more self-conscious. I felt that I had to put up a bigger front to look comfortable, to look like I was satisfied with sex (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.43).

In his first relationship with a girl, Len liked the girl very much and enjoyed being
with her. However, when the girl took the initiative for sexual intimacy, Len could not respond properly because of his lack of sexual knowledge or experience.

At age 16 Len experienced his first sexual intercourse with a girl who had just broken up with her boyfriend. Their relationship did not last long because soon after their affair, the girl went looking for her old boyfriend. Len was deeply hurt from this experience and his old distrust and anger toward women deepened. He described his bitter feelings as follows:

It didn’t change my attitude towards women, it just backed something I was feeling: that I was going to be hurt in relationships, that I was going to be the sucker, that no matter how much I put out, that people don’t love. They pretend to love, and in the end you’re hurt through feeling that way—if you say you do care, or allowing yourself to care (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.45).

Although he was disappointed with his first unfortunate love affair, Len still tried to seek good, loving relationships with women. However, his distrust and anger toward women, learned at an early age, was very stubborn. He could not break through this negative situation to create trusting and loving relationships with women. After attempting several pitiful struggles for good relationships with girls he took out on dates, he was always overcome by his compulsive negative emotion and began raping these girls. He vividly expressed this painful emotional passage in becoming a rapist as follows:

I was still going out with girls and I was taking a little bit of a chance, still saying I’ll try this out, I’ll try to relate to them, I’ll try to see what happens. There was a lot of doubt still. So little hurts ended up being big hurts to me. I blew them way out of proportion so I’d end up being more superficial with people and saying, “I love you” because it seemed like those were the words that people wanted to hear. I wouldn’t admit that I didn’t feel them.

After a number of relationships where I was the one that was going to be hurt all the time, I pushed further and further away from people. I made the relationships more and more superficial and I became more angry. I carried that inside and I showed it in my actions. I treated girls cheaply, that my relationships were just going to be sex and once in a while I threw in a word:
"Well, maybe I care" or "I love you." But without feeling.

I think by my actions they got the understanding that all I wanted was sex. They’d hold on with a hope that I was going to really care in the end. That maybe underneath some of this first part of the relationship, that it’d be sustained by their caring. That’s what I looked for: someone that would give a lot in a relationship. Eventually, that’s how I looked for a person. A person with a lot of feeling, a lot of caring, to carry what I didn’t have. Or what I wasn’t going to give at that time. What I was afraid of.

I got to a point where I was almost feeling like it was going to happen. That I was going to submit to that feeling, that I really do care and I want to be with this person. And I’d become angry. I’d be with someone and having a good time at a bar and we’d be out alone and kissing. Then I did a lot of inward thinking. I was saying: “All I want is sex.” I kept having to back myself, saying to myself, “That’s all I want—sex. I can’t allow myself to care.” I’d become very aggressive. I’d be threatening in a lot of subtle ways, a lot of ways that to me are rape.

When I was becoming angry, I wouldn’t take “no” for an answer. I’d go to any extent. I felt like I had to do that, I had to fulfill my desire at the time to have sex and that would be satisfaction. I felt that I had to have sex at any cost as a reversal of caring. To go as far as I could away from that caring, to cheapen that person, to have them give in to me the way I wanted it instead of my giving in the way they wanted, through love, which I wasn’t able to do. I wouldn’t do that.

I became more angry at these times. I felt that I was losing control, that I had to get this over with and it was a scary feeling within myself. I had to finish it, I had to hurry up and get away from it. And the having sex itself wasn’t very enjoyable. But it seemed like a relief for what I was feeling, a way out of my anger inside, a way out was to give it to somebody else and then run, to leave them.

And I’d half-assed patch that up. I wouldn’t take any precautions to keep myself from getting into trouble for it. I was panicky then and if somebody tried to say no, then I’d really become angry. I’d become more panicky. I’d threaten them physically, that I was going to kill them if they didn’t. I’d let them know how wound up I was inside. It didn’t even seem like I was consciously thinking: “I have to let them know how angry I am right now.” It was just flying out all over the place. There were a lot of subtleties in my actions and my kinetics, that I was going to have sex and that you don’t have any power right now. Without having taken a hold of somebody and strangled them, just for me to show my actions at that time and the way I was looking and my voice, I’m sure it was enough intimidation for
them to give in. For them to feel like: “This guy’s really nuts and I can’t take a chance in fighting that off.”

I was hoping there’d be some comfort. Something down inside that kept saying: “Well, it’d be nice if it was real sex but this is what you’re going to do.”

I don’t think at all that they felt comfortable with it. It was a frightening experience, I think, all the way around. That’s not what I wanted (Levine and Koenig, 1982, pp.45-47).

There was another unfortunate incident that increased Len’s anger and instability and pushed him toward the path of raping. About the same time that Len had his first sexual experience with a girl, he was also sexually abused by a man. Len was drunk at the time and the man took advantage of the situation. This experience made him feel very low and also dubious about his own sexuality.

As Len got older and began abusing women, he thought he probably could relate with men. He wondered if maybe he was homosexual. He tested that theory out and found that it was more repulsive than raping women. As a result, he became more angry and insecure and projected all the negative feelings toward women. He said:

...I wondered, “Am I homosexual?” Maybe I care for guys, maybe I can have a relationship that way. I tested that out and I felt more repulsion from that than I did from getting to the point of raping a girl. That felt more sickening.

So I was, at that point, really lost. I didn’t know where to go. My anger inside, my instability just got heavier. When I was with a girl, I took out all that (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.41).

Len’s parents provided him with all the material goods but not the genuine parental loving care which he really desired. Len hated his domineering mother to the point that he even wanted to kill her. He was not close to his father who was not strong enough to support and guide his son. In this kind of home environment, Len could not establish any self-esteem as a lovable good child. Young Len was starving for some close and loving
relations at home and his self-identity became very shaky. As a result, Len became frustrated and revengeful and began destroying things maliciously. As he grew up he felt that he was somewhat odd—not a normal boy—and avoided serious interaction with people.

During puberty Len could not achieve proper sex knowledge because he could not talk about the subject with his parents or people around him and the sex education classes at school were quite inadequate. Unfortunately, the girl with whom Len had his first sexually intimate relationship betrayed him. Moreover, at about the same time, Len was sexually abused by a man. This experience left him confused about his own sexuality as well as lowering his self-esteem. All of these unfortunate events had a combined effect to strengthen Len’s distrust and anger toward women which was the product of his unhealthy relationship with his domineering mother.

Although Len had a strong desire to have normal, loving relationships with women and worked toward that end, he was always overwhelmed by his deep-seated distrust and anger and ended up raping many women. He could not trust and love women because he could not trust and love his own mother who was the closest woman to him. Instead of trust and love, anger was the main emotion that filled his heart. Len projected this anger for his mother on other women through rape. Len clearly stated this process as follows:

At the time of raping somebody, you feel like that’s all it is, is sex. That you have to have sex. That’s the only answer. Afterwards it feels like you’re taking your anger out on them, that you’ve directed all the problems and what’s happening to you into sex because that’s something that you feel uncomfortable with. And it’s easy to say to somebody, I want to take all my feelings out on you. There’s a putting—it—on—somebody—else satisfaction that you don’t get by busting up property. You’re putting your anger into something that’s a body. Just like you feel it.

I feel a lot of what rape is isn’t so much sexual desire as a person’s feelings about themselves and how that relates to sex. My fears of relating to people turned to sex because it’s a pretty wide area. A sexual role and sex just happen to be the fullest area to let your anger out on, to let your feelings out on (Levine and Koenig, 1982. p.42).
So, rape was the expression of anger toward women for Len. It is very clear in his talk that by raping women he also satisfied his craving for power over women which was the expression of his insecurity.

Len said that when he was young he thought that “Sex was a very sacred thing, that it was something to be shared really personally with someone and it was going to be a very beautiful experience to have that. Just like believing in God” (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.37). It is very pitiful that instead of actualizing his sexual aspiration, Len ended up becoming a rapist. Fortunately, after a few years of hospitalization, Len was able to work out his fears and insecurities. He was then able to relate to men naturally without sex and relate to women with love. The little hurts that happened in relationships did not bother him anymore, and overall, he could feel very comfortable with women (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.49).

Len’s self-analytical reflection on his own rapist psyche helps us to understand how a young boy who hated his domineering mother suffered from the inability to trust and love women and ended up becoming a rapist.

Hal

In the latter part of his first year in college, Hal began peeking into windows at night, hoping to see women undressing or in their bedrooms. Finally, he broke into an apartment one night to rape a girl. However, she was not home at the time. After waiting for a while for the girl to come home and eating her food and drinking her liquor, he gave up and left.

On his second attempt, Hal broke into an apartment in the same building of his first break in. This time he found a girl sleeping in her bed. After waiting for a while to build up his courage, he climbed on top of the girl and woke her up, threatening to kill her if she made any noise. The girl was frightened and began to scream and struggle. During their struggle he accidentally cut her hand with the knife he was holding. This quieted her. Although he tried very hard for three or four hours, he could not rape her. He was not sexually aroused and could not maintain an erection.
Hal's rape attempt failed. When he finally let her go to the bathroom, he gathered up his knife and clothes and ran away. The girl reported the crime right away and he was caught four days later. He confessed his crime immediately to the police and felt great relief afterwards. When he saw the victim in court later, he was greatly ashamed and could not even look her in the eye.

During the rape attempt, Hal was also very ashamed of what he was doing to the girl. In his fantasies, he had always remained hidden and nobody ever knew who he was. But in his actual rape attempt the girl saw him face to face and saw everything he was doing. That made him feel very ashamed of himself. At the same time he was also very much afraid that the girl would be able to recognize him and have him arrested.

Why did Hal attempt rape? In the interview he said:

I think now, the real reason I committed my crime was that I felt very inferior to others. As a child I felt overprotected by my mother, especially. And later, when I grew up I never really stood up to that. I allowed myself to be tied to the apron strings. I felt rotten about myself and by committing rape I took this out on someone I thought was weaker than me, someone I could control (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.28).

The above statement proves that, owing to two years of intensive group therapy, Hal could reflect back and get a good perspective on his own crime and its cause. In the interview he clearly described his poor parental relationships and the subsequent personality development that led him to the crime of attempted rape.

Hal talked about his family background as follows:

I grew up in a rural community. I lived a model life as a child. I never got into any trouble. I did well in school. Our home life was fairly normal. My parents don't drink. They get along. I have five brothers and sisters. We were a religious family. We never talked about sex at home. It was just left out. My parents were embarrassed to talk about that. Other than that, we got along very well as a family. They took good care of the children.

There was some lack of emotion at times. The emotion was there but
we didn’t know how to express it to each other. We didn’t say to each other
that we loved each other.

During my early childhood, I wasn’t very honest with my mother and
father. I presented a perfect picture to them. I resented being disciplined by
them or resented their telling me what to do. My mother was over-protective
or tended to prevent me from doing some things I wanted to do. As I look
back on it now, I never stood up to her to do what I wanted to do.

My father was less protective in that he let me do more what I wanted,
but he was also influenced by my mother (Levine and Koenig, 1982,
pp.18–19).

Hal received good grades through high school but did not enjoy his school life. He
was afraid of other people and stayed away from them. He didn’t have any girlfriends and
had only superficial relationships with boys. He also had a poor image of his body and an
inferiority complex about his physical ability in sports. So, he stayed out of school sports
most of the time and became involved in music and more academic studies, which allowed
him to stay away from people.

Hal started having sexual problems when he was thirteen. He felt guilty about his
sexual desires and could not talk about this problem with his parents or anybody at school.
He began to look at hard core pornography material which contained sadism and rape and
this partly resolved his sexual desires and conflicts. He was too scared to actually proposition
a woman. He masturbated while looking at pornography, using it as an outlet. His high
school sex education was in health classes and was very inadequate. Hal received most of his
sex knowledge from pornographic material.

Hal began dating girls during his last two years of high school mostly because he was
afraid of not being socially acceptable. He liked some girls he took out but he was always too
self-conscious and could not be himself. His self-image was low and he nervously worried
about making a manly enough impression on the girls. When a girl accepted a date with him,
he wondered why. He was also turned down many times by girls and suffered from feeling
rejected.
Hal avoided any type of social life in college. He had part-time and weekend jobs and did not date girls at all. At the same time he escaped into pornography. In the latter part of his freshman year he began peeping into windows. In the beginning he prowled around after dark about once a week. But as time went on, his peeping habit became progressively more compulsive.

In retrospect, Hal tells us how, under his domineering mother and passive father, his negative character traits were developed and how these character traits persistently affected his behavior as he grew up. His parents were religious. His mother was overly protective and a strict disciplinarian. His father was more lenient but also influenced by his wife. So Hal could not really trust him either. Moreover, the whole family did not express their emotions to each other. Raised in this kind of family atmosphere, young Hal resented his parents. But he learned to protect himself by hiding his true feelings and presenting the best picture as a model child.

As Hal denied his own true feelings, he was dishonest to himself as well as to his parents. Because of this self-deception, he did not have a firm base on which to develop his own genuine self-identity. This lack of self-identity made him see himself as a weak person and he suffered from a deep inferiority complex. Consequently, he isolated himself from others. Deprived of proper social contact with others, he severely hindered his own mental and emotional growth. As a result, his self-esteem was never established and his inferiority complex deepened only to bring on more isolation from others.

This vicious cycle of "inferiority complex—isolation—more inferiority complex—more isolation" persisted throughout young Hal's life up to the time of his crime. He isolated himself from others at school. He did not have girlfriends and when he did associate with other boys, they were only shallow affairs. At age 13 he had nobody to talk to about his awakening sexual problems and escaped into hard core pornography which contained sadism and rape. When he dated girls during his later high school years, he still suffered from his
poor self-image and could not really enjoy being with them.

Hal never dated girls in college and totally withdrew into the fantasy world of pornography. He started peeping into windows at night. He eventually lost the desire to study, quit school and got a job. This was all very frustrating. He was going nowhere and had no purpose in life. He was suffering deeply from his inferiority complex then. It was at this point that he finally broke into a girl’s apartment and attempted to rape her.

Hal’s isolation from people, which has its roots in his inferiority complex caused by his poor parental relationship, is the main contributing factor for his crime. He said:

It might have been possible to prevent the way my life turned out, if I’d been able to talk honestly to people and relieve the guilt I felt. Until the time of my crime, I never talked to anyone about my sexual ideas, my fantasies, or what I thought of myself. I kept it all to myself. I wasn’t honest with my parents or any doctor or clergyman. I never talked to anyone ’cause I felt guilty about the things that I was thinking. At the same time, I liked the things I was thinking. I wanted to keep it to myself because it was sort of a private fantasy world (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.27).

In addition to his deep-seated inferiority complex, Hal created an angry and revengeful spirit toward his domineering mother. His peeping habit was apparently a secret revenge on his strict mother. He said:

I felt very adventurous or free, while I was doing this. It was a way of forgetting all my frustrations of the day. It was almost like I was living in a fantasy, like I was a commando, sneaking around at night. I was doing something nobody else wanted me to do. It felt very good. It was something I just couldn’t prevent. It was a compulsion. As I was looking into the windows, I wouldn’t have any sexual release, but later on I would fantasize about it and masturbate when I was back at home (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.21).

Hal’s case is a good example of how an over-protective and domineering mother creates a weak and dependent son with a deep-seated inferiority complex who, in his later years, resents and hates women and attempts revenge by overpowering and controlling them.
Hal’s remark on his own behavior toward his victim during the attempted rape clearly tells us that the real purpose of his crime was his desperate need for experiencing power over women in order to compensate for his inferiority complex and anger. He said:

I think I didn’t talk to her because I wanted to be more than I really was. If I had talked to her, she would have seen me as a pretty weak, fragile guy, where I was trying to pretend to be pretty strong. I wanted to dominate her and rape her, and I couldn’t do that if I showed her the actual guy I was (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.26).

It is also clear that pornography played a significant role in the cause of Hal’s crime. Because of his isolation from his parents and others, he had no chance to discuss sex with anybody. The sex education that he received at school was very superficial and did not help him at all. Throughout his adolescent years and up to the time of his crime, his only sex education source was hard core pornography material.

Hal created an unrealistic fantasy world about sex through reading this pornographic material and became more and more obsessed by it until he finally tried to act out his fantasy by attempting the rape. Hal talked about the effects that pornography had on him as follows:

I think reading some of this pornography did lead up to my crime. It gave me ideas. It helped me to stay away from women, because this was a lot easier. I kept farther and farther away from women. I didn’t know what they actually wanted or liked, and I just had my own warped ideas about them (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.20).

From reading all the pornography and from my warped views on sex, I think I exaggerated a lot in my mind. It was supposed to be a bigger thing than it really is. Up to the time of the crime I never had sex with a woman and it was really something special to me—something that I couldn’t attain. I thought it was going to be a big deal, but when I tried to rape this girl, it didn’t meet up to those expectations at all (Levine and Koenig, 1982, pp.26–27).

Hal never experienced an open and honest human relationship with his parents, other
family members or other people. He was alone and did not have his roots in the real world. His crime may be seen as his desperate attempt to connect himself to others, to the real world. It was very unfortunate that he never learned about natural loving human relations and he had to express his willingness to connect through his revengeful sexual assault.

Fortunately, through two years of fairly intensive group therapy, Hal shared his views about sex with others and found out that they suffered from problems similar to his. This experience made him relaxed with himself and greatly improved his self-image. At the same time he gained a normal view of sex which freed him from his guilt complex about sex and the obsession for power over women through sex. He discovered that there were many other important things in life besides sex and he began to have hopeful feelings about his future (Levine and Koenig, 1982, pp.27–28).

Chris

Chris committed seven crimes of rape and attempted rape before he was arrested and incarcerated. He began raping women after two years of unhappy marriage life.

Chris committed his first rape while he was waiting for his wife to get off work. While driving around to kill some time, he saw a girl get off a bus. He followed her and then raped her. After that he began to rape more women in the same fashion. He was particularly drawn to attractive women. When he saw one on the street or just getting off a bus, he would follow and rape her in a secluded spot. He even raped one woman in freezing cold weather in December.

Most of Chris’s crimes were committed outdoors but in some cases he broke into the houses of his victims. In one such case he broke into a woman’s apartment after watching her through a window. He broke into her bedroom and made some noise. When she came in to check on the noise, he threw a bedspread over her head. The woman panicked and struggled violently against him. When it became very difficult to control her, he threatened her by saying that if she did not cooperate with him, he would harm her two children who
were sleeping in the next bedroom at the time.

The above rape was a very unpleasant experience for Chris. He especially felt real bad about threatening the children's safety in order to get control over the woman. The victim reported the crime and it appeared in the newspaper. Chris learned from the newspaper that the victim had been taken to the hospital and suffered from abrasions as a result of the rape. He was very disturbed by this news.

Chris's last crime happened when he stopped at a cafe for something to eat and saw a girl get out of a car across the street. He followed her into an apartment building and gained access into her apartment by pretending to be a delivery man. The terrorized girl fought so persistently against him that he finally gave up and left without succeeding in raping her. He left his pen, lost in the struggle with the girl, behind in the apartment. The pen had his company's name, address and phone number on it and he was arrested the same day at work. He panicked when he realized he had left the evidence in the apartment; but at the same time he felt relieved that it was finally all over.

Why did Chris rape? In the interview, Chris himself reflected on the cause of his crime as follows:

In the seven years I've been here, I believe I've studied almost every possible avenue as to why I did rape. I think I have a fair understanding of the world I came from. My inability to remain in touch with my feminine side of my personality had a lot to do with why I raped. Not homosexual tendencies, but what I got from my father. My mother was very domineering, called all the shots in the house, seemed to be the aggressor (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.107).

Chris's mother was aggressive and punished Chris abusively. Chris's father was a weak man who not only failed to protect his son but persecuted him unreasonably in order to please his own aggressive wife. Consequently, young Chris was in constant terror. He described this situation as follows:

I was terrorized most of the time, by my mother, and terrorized with
the kind of punishment that would be held over my head until my father came home and administered it. And he would punish me according to how dramatically my mother would lay out the misdeeds that I’d done throughout the day.

I would see my mother as some kind of arresting officer or perhaps even a judge in passing sentence on to my father in the way she would relate it, and my father would take the form of an executioner handing out punishment in efforts to pacify my mother.

I was very anxious all the time. I would be very edgy and almost neurotic, I guess, about what I would do and what I would get into. It would make me feel guilty, as if I hadn’t actually done anything on Monday, but because of what had transpired on Sunday I’d feel guilty about just kind of enjoying myself, or doing whatever I wanted to do (Levine and Koenig, 1982, pp.95–96).

The following episode shows how unreasonable and abusive Chris’s parents were to him. When he was seven or eight years old and as one of their scare tactics, his parents pretended to send him into one of those detention homes for children. His mother packed his suitcase for him and his father drove him in the truck to the institution. A terrified Chris had to walk toward the depressive looking building by himself with his suitcase in the dark. Chris did not remember whether his father had called him back or he had just ran back to the truck. Anyway, he didn’t go to the detention home. The worst part of this incident is that his parents never told him the reason for the punishment. He never knew why he was punished by this kind of cruel scare tactic.

Added to such an aggressive home environment was the strict church teaching about sex that young Chris suffered from. When he was about nine years old, he attended church three or four times a week and two or three times on Sunday. In church he was taught that masturbation was sinful and people should not do it. At that time he was engaging in some forms of sexuality while playing with twin girls in his neighborhood. He undressed the girls and himself and they rolled around on each other. This playing was just out of childish curiosity. However, because of the church teachings, he felt guilty about it.
Raised in this kind of emotionally stressful childhood environment, Chris felt that he had to hide everything from his parents in order to protect himself. He was doing things that he thought he should not be doing and he hid everything from his parents. This situation led him into a constant state of guilt and anxiety. He especially did not know how to handle his childhood sexual curiosity and he suffered.

Chris’s association with girls was pretty normal during his early teenage years. He was attracted to a girl in his school who had big breasts. He never did anything more than neck with her. One night he peeped through a window in her house in an attempt to see her big breasts. At about the same time, when he was thirteen years old, he caught a girl at the community hockey rink. He undressed her from the waist down, took his penis out and laid up against her. However, nothing more happened because neither he nor the girl had enough knowledge about sex. After that incident Chris felt very stupid because he didn’t know what to do.

Later, in his mid-teens, Chris got into the peeping tom habit. The habit started one day when he and another boy were waiting for their friend to finish his paper route. They happened to look into a window and see a man and a woman getting ready for bed. After this initial incident, Chris became obsessed with peeping and started looking into the windows of good-looking school girls in hopes of seeing them naked.

During this period Chris still suffered from guilt and anxiety about his own deeds and about the lack of confidence in asking girls out on dates. At this time he also masturbated while watching sexy scenes in TV movies late at night while everyone else was asleep. When the movies couldn’t arouse him, he went out peeping and masturbated when he got back home.

Chris’s dating situation was also limited by the strict rules of his church. He was told to only go out with girls who belonged to the same religious denomination (Protestant) that he did. He went out with three or four such girls and experienced heavy necking and petting.
with them. But guilt feelings on both sides prevented them from going further with their
lovemaking. He finally met a girl who belonged to the same religious denomination and
whom he felt was God’s chosen girl for him. They were married when he was 24 years old.

Before Chris and his wife were married, they had quite a long courtship, during
which they had sex a couple of times. Both Chris and his wife were virgins when they met.
Chris said that their lack of sex knowledge plus the guilt feelings over their premarital sex
relations, which was against their church’s teachings, made their love life unfulfilled and
unhappy.

When Chris was growing up, there was a time when he shared paperback sex novels
with his peer group. These pulp novels usually contained rape scenes where the woman
would finally get turned on. From this he formed the idea that when he would have sex with
a woman, she would finally respond and he would experience this earth-shattering orgasm.
Since Chris was occupied with a guilt complex about his sexuality and was too insecure to
have sex with girls, he clung to this idea of rape and created his own fantasy world around it.

Chris was very disappointed after having sex with his wife for the first time. It was
not what the church had taught—that sex was the most permanent way in which two people
could express their love for each another. He was also literally disillusioned because sex was
not anything like what he had read in the sex books either. He never attained the tremendous
orgasms described in these books.

Chris’s marital relationship did not satisfy him. Although he tried very hard to satisfy
his wife during sexual intercourse, their sex life was not doing well. So, eventually, he tried
to pick up women who were not in his religious denomination and this made him feel more
guilty.

Chris’s mother never provided her son with genuine motherly love. Chris’s father
also failed to support his son with fatherly love. Nor could he teach his son to love and
respect his mother because a real loving and respectful relationship was lacking between
himself and his wife. It is easy to imagine that Chris’s father might have resented his
aggressive wife and Chris learned that negative feeling from his father. The whole situation prevented Chris from developing a soft feminine character within himself. Instead he developed resentment, anger and contempt toward his own mother and women in general.

Added to this kind of oppressive home environment, the religious teaching through the church made the mind of young Chris more confused and stressed. He was taught that sex should be a base for spiritual union for a man and woman and such acts as masturbation were sinful. For a person to develop spiritual aspiration of any kind, he must first have a positive self-image so that he can accept himself as a good human being. Tormented by his parents, Chris could not create such a positive self-image about himself and was spiritually rootless. The church teachings about sex which emphasized spiritual quality was far from Chris’s reality. He was caught between the religious teachings and his own awakening sexuality and suffered from confusion and a guilt complex. He described this state of his troubled feelings as follows:

I really felt that I had to hide everything from my parents and that I had to just live a lie. I was living kind of a double life, and it really created a lot of anxieties, and at the same time I didn’t know what to do with all the natural puberty-type feelings that were almost compulsive. It just kept me in a constant state of guilt and anxiety. On the one hand, I was told it was wrong and sinful and I shouldn’t be doing it, and on the other hand there was an almost infantile pleasure from doing it—just childish curiosity (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.97).

Another important problem for Chris was that he was alone in dealing with his sexual problems. It was impossible for him to talk about them with his abusive parents. Unfortunately, he did not have any other adults around him with whom to consult about his problems. As he became older, sex books became his main source of sexual information. He became obsessed with rape scenes in the pulp novels and created his own fantasy world around them.

Apparently, Chris’s misconception about sex—created through pornographic
material—had a strong influence in leading him into his rape crimes. He said:

...and I remember that one aspect in these pulp novels was that there always seemed to be a rape scene in them, and at some point during the rape, the woman always seemed to get turned on. That just fixed in my head: if I were to have sex with a woman, at some point she’d really get turned on by it, and I’d have a tremendous orgasm, and perhaps the lights would go out, even the room would shake. And that really stuck in my mind, and I carried that with me for years and years and years. And, because of my own insecurities and the guilt feelings that I was having about my sexuality and about the feelings I was having, I wasn’t assertive with girls and was insecure about asking girls for dates. So, it just seemed kind of natural to act out this fantasy that was in my head, because I kind of regarded it as a reality—that’s what would happen (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.97).

The failure of achieving a happy marriage was another factor which accelerated Chris’s movement down the path toward the crime of rape. He said that his marital failure was mainly due to the sexual ignorance of both he and his wife and their guilt feelings over the premarital sexual relations. However, the true reason for his marital failure goes deeper than that. Problems such as sexual ignorance and guilt feelings about premarital sexual relations could be solved through the aid of proper counseling or other available methods. But there seems to have been a more fundamental and deep-seated problem between Chris and his wife.

Their problem was that Chris and his wife did not share a mutual deep love and respect that naturally ties a husband and wife together. Chris had never received genuine and natural parental love and he had never experienced loving and respectful human relationships outside his family circle. Therefore, Chris had never learned to love and respect others. Above all, because of his parents’ constant abusive punishment, he had a very low self-esteem and could not love and respect himself. This situation made it very difficult for him to open up to his wife and love her.

When Chris married, he must have had a dream to achieve a happy and loving
relationship with his wife, but he failed. He could not give his wife what he had never been
given. He could not create a loving human relationship with his wife because he had never
experienced it himself. Bitterly disappointed, he raped other women in seeking sexual
fulfilment. But he found no pleasure in raping either. He expressed his disillusionment about
rape as follows:

The fact of rape is that I’m taking it by force, and there’s a
double-bind, where I’m taking it by force because she’s not giving anything. At no point during the rape does a woman end up giving you anything of herself. She’s simply submitting to it, and you’re forcing it upon her. So, it’s not reciprocal. It’s just totally out of whack with the fantasy. The fantasy doesn’t become a reality during a rape. It’s not fulfilling at all (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.98).

Chris’s domineering and abusive mother and his weak father implanted in him a low
self-esteem and hostility toward them and others, especially women. He could not create a
normal and loving relationship with women. He failed in his marriage and plunged into
raping only to find out that it did not give him any satisfaction either. He was desperate and
became increasingly aggressive. His capture and imprisonment saved him from committing a
worse crime, murder. Chris himself felt relieved when he was finally caught by the police,
knowing that his life as a rapist was finally over.

Chris read The Hite Report while in prison and it helped him understand the facts of
human sexuality. He said:

I liked the idea in The Hite Report that somehow it kind of relieves pressure from me to be a performer in bed because women aren’t looking for performers. They’re looking for closeness and warmth, and I’ve found, at this point in time, after therapy, that that’s what I want too. I’m not after a big orgasm. I’m just not kind of orgasm-oriented, really. That’s not saying I don’t enjoy it, but that it’s not the kind of high point for me (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.105).

It was very fortunate for Chris that he could lose the rapist psyche and that he was
able to reach such understanding of human sexuality. With his new attitude, it seems possible that he can work toward having constructive and humane relationships with women.

Steve

Steve developed an aggressive rape and sexual killing fantasy in his middle teens. One summer when he was almost 15 years old, he attempted his first rape but could not carry it out. He called a girl over to a change room in order to rape her but when they got there he knew he could not do it. So, he talked with her, hoping that she would consent to make love with him. But the girl became tense and left. He felt very guilty about his behavior afterward.

When Steve was 15 years old, he made his second rape attempt at a track meet. He planned the whole thing well ahead of time and waited at a chosen spot for the chance. When a girl came by, he went up behind her and grabbed her by the waist and mouth. He was planning to pull her into a nearby room, but suddenly he lost all of his drive to rape her and got scared. He ran from the scene and escaped across town by bus. He again bitterly regretted his behavior and swore never to do it again.

However, five months later Steve repeated the same kind of indecent assault which ended up with the same result as the previous two incidents. As soon as he grabbed a girl, he lost all of his sexual desire and ran away with a bad feeling.

After failing these three rape attempts, Steve finally caught a girl to rape. However, instead of raping the girl he ended up killing her. He had a place all staked out this time and waited for a girl to come along. Finally, a girl about 10 years old came by. He thought at first that the girl was too young but he pushed himself to attack her. Once again, after grabbing the girl, his sexual desire was gone. Instead, he became overwhelmed by his long pent up emotional turmoil and beat her to death.

There is no statement saying when Steve actually killed the girl. However, it seems safe to assume that he committed the murder when he was only 15 or 16 years old. What
made him commit such a serious crime at such a young age?

Steve received 23 months of very effective group therapy while serving time in prison. Through the therapy he began to understand himself better. He also began to get a good perspective on his crimes and the reasons why he had committed them. He said:

I understood why I wanted to rape and why I wanted to kill. It was an expression of what I was going through. I was experiencing a lot of turmoil inside and I wanted to get that out and the only way I could express that was by raping or, as it turned out, by killing that girl (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.16).

In the interview Steve clearly described the root cause of his emotional turmoil that finally led him to murder. He began by describing his parental relationships as follows:

My childhood wasn’t good, it wasn’t bad. It was kind of in-between. It’s this thing where I didn’t really feel too much love. I wanted to look for it and I had a drive for it because I just couldn’t feel it. I disliked my mother a lot because I felt that she treated me a little harsher than she needed to. She might have given me a bit more shit than what I needed for maybe one incident or another incident, so that created some dislike and a lot of hurting.

I got along good with my father, but I guess he was a sap in a way. He was really loose-reined on me. My mother was really regimented and my father was really loose-reined. I was sort of caught in between the two different lifestyles; there were a lot of contradictions I didn’t understand. My father was Roman Catholic—a French Roman Catholic—and my mother was a Protestant Canadian. And my mother’s upbringing was really regimented and she was always looking after her brothers and her sister but my father was loose all the time. He was going around doing what he wanted to do.

And so when I was being raised, I would get into trouble and my father would say, “Well, he’s just being a kid.” My mother would say, “No, no, he’s not, he’s not supposed to do that.” so there’d be clashes between my parents and I’d get caught in between. I suppose I didn’t really know exactly which was right and which was wrong. My reaction was that I liked my father because he was loose and I disliked my mother because she was more regimented. I didn’t want to be regimented, I wanted to be free and running around.

I didn’t want to feel as much. I sort of felt a lot of hurt at home. I
denied my feelings, I suppose. I was labelled a psychopath. That’s a person who’s devoid of feelings. I think that’s the right word (Levine and Koenig, 1982, pp.5–6).

Steve said that his life in public school was not so good. Although he did not want to fight, he often ended up fighting. His mother told him that he stole a lot from other children but he was not so sure about that. When he was 12 years old, he had his first crush on a 16-year-old girl. He had very little knowledge of sex then, so their relationship was purely a mutual pre-puberty sexual curiosity.

At the age of 13 or 14, Steve discovered masturbation on his own and began doing it frequently. He felt that masturbation released his frustration and he felt good about it. However, one day his mother caught him smoking in his room, which was forbidden, and said to him, “Aha, I knew you were doing something wrong. Either smoking or masturbating” (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.7).

These critical words from his mother strongly affected Steve and helped in creating his misconception of sex. Steve described this misconception formation as follows:

So right away all kinds of misconceptions start. Smoking’s wrong so that means masturbation’s wrong, and so from there it carried on. Okay, if masturbation is wrong, there’s other wrong things such as sexuality. I was told homosexuality is wrong, so that meant that if I was masturbating I would turn into a homosexual. These sort of misconceptions started creating a lot of frustration, a lot of anger, and drove me to want to have sex with a woman because that seemed to be the only right way to have sex (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.7).

At this same time Steve developed a frustrating drive for love and began to confuse sex and love. Finally, he created the violent sexual fantasy which led to his crimes of rape and murder. He describes this psychological passage as follows:

Also around this time I had a frustrating drive for love. It was going on, this drive here, and then all of a sudden sex comes along and I have this drive for sex all of a sudden. What’s going on?
Like now, I got two drives and so it’s like what do I do? So I got the
two confused and so sex was love and love was sex and I wasn’t too sure of
what was what and I couldn’t have a separation there.

It turned into a thing of violent fantasy. I can’t say when it started but
somewhere around this time I started to develop these misconceptions, have
fantasies with a bit of violence. More and more rape was involved, and now
and then it would be a murder. But I couldn’t really picture myself actually
killing the girl. That part I couldn’t picture. But I could picture myself raping.
The fantasies would usually be violent at the beginning. I’d attack this girl and
it would go on like that and then all of a sudden she would give in and I
would give in and it would be the start of a loving relationship. We’d be
madly in love by the time I finished raping her. I guess I knew that was a
fantasy at the time as well because I knew realistically that wouldn’t happen. I
got love confused in there so what I felt was rejection of love. It got
channeled in through sex (Levine and Koenig, 1982, pp.7–8).

Steve’s deep-seated anger toward women, which had it’s roots in his poor
relationship with his mother, surfaced in his violent sexual fantasy. Out of his anger, he
fantasized about sexually subduing women and even killing them. However, during his first
three rape attempts, he lost his sexual desire and dropped his intention of rape as soon as he
grabbed the girls. And then he was overwhelmed by the guilty feeling about his own
misconduct and could not really face his own underlying anger and frustration that had led
him to the rape attempts. Finally, by the time he had committed murder, he was totally
obsessed with his frustration and anger and wanted to express them through sex. He said:

When I had done that it had gone to a point where it was so
uncontrollable that one day I was looking around for a girl to rape.

...I grabbed her and it was a sexual thing, a bit of a sexual thing
before I grabbed her. As soon as I grabbed her there was none. There was
absolutely no sexual thing. And all of a sudden when I saw I was just facing
that sort of emotional thing, that I had to face it and unfortunately, this girl
was facing it with me and she was getting the blunt end of it.

...It was like I had to push myself to get this sort of feeling out, get it
over with and that’s what I wanted. I just wanted it all over with. I didn’t
want to hurt anybody, but I had to get it over with somehow. That was a
transition. Like the sex was just sort of a channel of it that I found long before

Through Steve’s insightful reflections of his own crimes, it seems clear that the cause of his crimes had it’s basic root in his poor parental relationships. His regimented mother did not give him any tender loving care. His father apparently failed to give him enough fatherly guidance and support. Steve felt rejected and received no love at home and it hurt him very much. The young boy closed himself up in order to survive in his harsh psychological environment and created a psychotic character within himself.

During his critical period of puberty, Steve discovered masturbation. His mother accused him of this habit and reprimanded him for it. This resulted in him creating a distorted view of sex in which he came to believe that sexuality in general along with masturbation was bad. Since he was in a stage of sexual awakening, this misconception was very frustrating for him.

During this same period Steve had a strong desire for love and he consequently got love confused with sex. It was natural for him to have this kind of confusion because he had experienced very little love in his life. He just did not know what love or normal human sexuality really was. He thought that forced sex itself, as a physical contact between both sexes and based on a strong instinctive drive, would unite a man and a woman and bring love between them.

Steve’s confused view of love and sex was mixed up with his long pent-up frustration and anger toward his dominant mother. This combination resulted in his creation of the violent fantasy of rape and murder against women in general. His basic feeling underlying the fantasy was “I desperately need love and sex. If you cannot give them to me, I will just have to take them.” The following statement by Steve expresses how confused and desperate he was when he finally killed the girl:

I guess the only way she could have escaped from being killed is if I hadn’t of been crazy. If she showed me affection, I probably would have
stopped. I don’t know if I could have given her a chance because I was pretty violent at first. The way I was being violent, if she showed affection, I probably wouldn’t have noticed it (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.13).

Because of his poor parental relationship, young Steve could not experience a normal and warm childhood life. Consequently, his inner growth was severed and he suffered for it. He was already very frustrated with and angry at his parents in his early life, especially his regimented mother. During his crucial time of puberty his mother added more serious damage to his awakening sexuality. By doing so she again denied him an important element in his young life. This time, Steve’s frustration and anger burst out into the revengeful aggression of attempted rape and actual murder.

There were several other factors which contributed in pushing Steve into his crimes. One such factor is that unfortunately he received very little sex education at school, basically just a few clinical details. His sex education class excluded female students. He never had a discussion about the subject with a woman or girls of his age. Therefore, his knowledge about sex was very limited and he was very much susceptible to misconceptions.

Although Steve admitted that he was aroused when he looked at pictures of women in men’s magazines such as Penthouse, he didn’t think that pornography influenced him. However, his encounter with pornography could have enforced the young boy’s sexual misconceptions and had some impact on the forming of his violent sexual fantasy.

Another unfortunate factor is that Steve could not develop healthy friendships with his peers because of his closed attitude. He could not openly discuss his problems with his peers nor could he find a girl with which to have a normal sexual relationship. When he heard his peers boasting about their sexual experiences, he felt inadequate because he had never experienced sex. He wanted to prove himself by having sex with girls. All of these negative factors, combined with his poor parental relationship, led Steve into his crimes.

After the murder Steve realized the seriousness of his offence and suffered greatly from remorse. Fortunately, the therapy he received in prison helped him a great deal. As a
result, he came to understand himself and others much better and he began to have some hope for his future life. He said:

...I grew up, in more ways than one. The fantasy part of me has died. This wanting to dominate or get back or release all kinds of feelings, I don't need that anymore. I can talk to people about it. I feel pretty open inside. I could talk to almost anybody, within reason (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.13).

If Steve could have talked openly with his parents in his childhood, his personality development might have been quite different. He probably would not have had to suffer from the severe emotional turmoil which made him kill the girl at his young age. Steve seems to have been the real victim of his poor parental relationship.

Summary

Len was provided with all of the material goods he needed in his life but not the genuine parental care which he so desired. He was frustrated and full of revenge and maliciously destroyed things. He hated his domineering mother so much that he even wanted to kill her. Len's passive father could not support and guide his son and Len had no close feelings toward him.

During his puberty years, Len did not receive any proper sex knowledge because his sex education classes at school were inadequate and there was no family member or friend with which to discuss the subject. He was unfortunately betrayed by his first girlfriend and became more distrustful of women. Len bitterly sought loving relationships with women but he was always overcome by his deep-seated distrust and anger toward them and ended up raping many women.

Hal resented his mother who was overly protective and a strict disciplinarian. He could not trust his father who was more lenient toward him but constantly influenced by Hal's mother. The whole family was not open to each other and consequently Hal learned to
deny his true feelings in order to survive this kind of home environment. This self-deception resulted in a lack of positive self-identity, a deep inferiority complex and consequent isolation from other people. The deprivation of social contact with others hindered his mental and emotional growth. His inferiority complex became worse, causing further alienation from people.

Hal repeated this vicious cycle of "inferiority complex, isolation, more inferiority complex, more isolation" throughout his early life, finally creating a phobia toward people, especially toward women. Young Hal had nobody to talk to about his sexual problems. He escaped into a fantasy world of hard core pornography which promoted sadism and rape. He began peeping into windows at night and finally broke into an apartment and attempted to rape a girl.

Chris's mother was aggressive and forced her husband to abusively punish their son. The domineering, abusive mother and weak father constantly terrorized him. They implanted in him low self-esteem and hostility toward them and others, especially toward women. The teaching of the church made Chris guilty and anxious about his sexual feelings and masturbation habit. But he had no one to talk to about his sexual problems. He also escaped into the world of pornography and learned sexual aggression. He began peeping into windows during his first year of college.

After two years of unhappy married life, Chris started raping women in his search for sexual fulfilment and love. He wanted the love which his aggressive mother had not given him. However, he found it impossible to find this love in rape and became desperate and more aggressive. His arrest and imprisonment saved him from committing the more horrible crime of murder.

Steve's regimented mother did not give him any tender loving care and his passive father did not provide him with any fatherly love or support. Steve felt totally rejected and withdrew from human contact. He created a psychotic character within himself. He did not have any male friends with whom to discuss his problems nor could he find any girls to
Steve received very little sex education at school and his knowledge of this subject was limited. Moreover, his mother confronted him about his masturbation habit and caused him more confusion and guilt feelings about sex. Eventually, his strong desire for a woman’s love, his lack of proper sexual knowledge, and his exposure to pornography led him into developing a very aggressive rape and sex killing fantasy. Steve came to believe that by raping a girl he would achieve a loving relationship with her. He attempted his first rape at the age of 15. After failing three rape attempts, he finally killed a girl.

All of the four rapists who had a domineering mother and a passive father created distrust, resentment, and hatred toward their overly protective and strict (sometimes abusively strict) mothers. They also nurtured a deep distrust toward their passive fathers who could not rescue them from their domineering mothers.

All of these rapists suffered from very low self-esteem caused by the lack of genuine maternal love during their childhood. They were not treated as loveable, descent individuals by their mothers, the closest persons to them in their life. Therefore, they could not establish their own positive self-identity. According to Forward’s analysis of misogynists with domineering mothers (Forward, 1986), these men felt very dependent, weak and helpless. This resulted in very low self-esteem for all of them.

Because of this low self-esteem, these men repressed their feelings and shut themselves off from their parents and other people. They alienated themselves from reality and did not learn the proper social skills in growing up. Their personality growth was limited and this in turn lowered their self-esteem even more. So, they developed into young adults with normal bodies, inferiority complexes and childish personalities filled with anger and resentment.

These men had almost no communication with their domineering mothers and passive fathers and consequently could not discuss the subject of sex at home. Neither could they
discuss the subject with anyone else because they had alienated themselves from everyone around them. They never learned the facts of sex or normal human sexuality. Most of them had guilt feelings about their own sexuality and feared women whose image was the extension of their own domineering mother.

Meanwhile, consciously or unconsciously, they craved women’s love which had never been given to them by their own mothers. There was also the confusion between love and sex. They thought that the act of sex itself would bring a love relationship between a man and woman. Believing in this kind of misconception, they created rape fantasies which were often stimulated by pornography.

Forward states that misogynist sons of domineering mothers suffer from the constant power struggle with their female partners (Forward, 1986). Each of these four men also had a strong urge to overpower women in order to compensate for his deep-seated low self-esteem and inferiority complex toward women. Indeed, each of their rapes seems to have been brought on by a pitiful thirst for love and seems to have been a direct expression of their distrust, resentment, and revengeful anger toward their domineering mothers.

ABUSIVE MOTHER

Phil I

Phil committed three sexual offences and was charged with being a dangerous sexual offender after his third crime. At the time of the interview, he had already served 13 years in prison.

Phil described his first and second offences as follows:

My first sexual offence happened when I had an argument with my mother. It was kind of a highly violent argument between us, and so I just more or less stomped out of the house. And coming along the street, there was a woman coming along, and just outright I saw the anger of my mother’s argument with me—so I just more or less took a violent attack on this woman—just a general complete stranger. And during the attack, my blows
kind of hit her in her private areas of her body and consequently instead of a common assault charge, it was laid down into an indecent assault charge. And out of that sentence I ended up getting a six-month definite, six-month indefinite turn.

And the second one was another argument with my mother. Because of the fact that now that I’d been in jail she was the holier-than-thou mother—“Well, my son’s let me down, given me a bad reputation”—which was one nag after another to the point where we got into a real hefty argument. At that time I got into the fight with her, and dislocated her neck a bit for her. Well, I grabbed her around the neck with my arm and sort of put a headlock on her, just wrenched it, threw a blow at her and pushed her into a chair. I stomped out of the house just to get away from the argument and get away from her, period. Apparently she’s had to wear a collar off and on, to keep her neck in a straight position at times because it gets very painful for her.

I stomped out again, and —same situation, another strange woman walking along—and the violent attitude. This was it. I just took the anger out on this woman. Blows landing in private areas again. At that time there was no intention of sex. I think some of the blows did end up where I was feeling her, maybe accidentally, maybe intentionally. Like I say, it was a blind rage at the time (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.113).

Phil was drunk when he committed his last crime. He broke into a house to get money for more alcohol and ended up attempting to rape and murder a woman. The following passage is Phil’s description of his last assault:

The psychological pressure of being sent to prison for life—or what I call an “indefinite life” because that’s what it actually is—they’ll say “Well, I can’t leave a witness around, I’ve got to kill her,” and that’s it. That’s the way they go.

I had already had two previous offences of indecent assault when I committed my last assault. I was drunk when I committed this one. And still the cold thought on my mind was, “All right, I got a chance to go to life—plus get lashes—just for breaking into a dwelling place after dark. I should get rid of the witness.” And the only intent I had of going into that place at the time was just to see if I could find some money, to go out and do some more boozing up.

I had broke into a house and a woman suddenly appeared on the scene, in the house, and so I decided that rather than do the break and enter,
I'd try to get sexually involved with her. I failed to have intercourse with her, so it dawned on me, well, that this woman can identify me because she spotted me. She turned the light on. From past experience of two other sexual charges, I could end up getting life on a charge of a dangerous sexual offender. So, rather than be left with that charge, I'd rather not leave a witness around to identify me.

So I definitely tried to kill this woman, by beating her to death, and somewhere along through the beating and that, I more or less came to my senses. What really brought my senses was there was a baby there. To leave the baby motherless kind of woke me up to the fact this could be happening to my son, and I just up and left the place. The baby cried and that did it right there. Just completely turned me off. I felt very sick about the whole situation—trying to kill somebody. I wondered what kind of an animal I had turned into (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.111).

It is quite apparent from Phil's talk that his first two crimes of indecent assault were triggered by the quarrels with his abusive mother. Right after each quarrel, he projected his rage on strangers in the street and attacked them.

While committing his third crime, Phil failed to rape the woman because she strongly resisted and he was too drunk to attain an erection. He then tried to beat her to death so that she would not be able to identify him. He finally quit beating on her after he heard her baby's cries. The cries brought him back to his senses and he felt very ashamed of this bad deed afterwards.

There is also another statement by Phil that reveals his remorse for his third assault crime. He said that after seeing the photos of the woman's bruised and battered face later in court, he became sick and wanted to apologize to her.

If Phil felt that much sensitivity about his own bad conduct, how could he even attempt rape and murder? It seems that in addition to his drunken condition, his general angry mood—caused mainly by the poor relationship with his abusive mother—overwhelmed him and pushed him into the crime at that time.

Phil's anger toward his mother must have developed over the years of their poor
relationship. From this deep-seated anger, he developed a hot, violent temper in his youth. When he was 18 years old, he almost killed his sister's boyfriend who had attempted to rape her. Phil tracked him down and they fought. Phil finally grabbed him by the throat and was banging his head on the ground when a couple of people came along and pulled him off. Phil might have killed the man otherwise.

Phil talked about his sexual knowledge and attitude as follows:

In my teenage life, sex was a taboo situation. People just didn't talk about sex as freely as they do now. I learned about it from the guys I used to hang around with. They'd go out on dates and that, and ask me to go along with them, and I was completely lost with strange women. I wouldn't know what to say or how to approach them. It would be hard for me to get involved because I wouldn't know how to go about it, and I felt more like I was the guy sitting out on the fence while everybody else was making the scores and I was making nothing. It would make me feel, "Well, I've got to make out to prove that I'm as good as the next guy," (Levine and Koenig, 1982, pp.113-114).

Phil did not mention his father at all in the interview. It is not clear if his father was a member of the family. However, the above statement suggests that even if his father was there, he was not close enough to Phil for Phil to be comfortable in discussing sex with him. Phil's abusive and hot tempered mother not only deprived her son of loving care, but implanted anger and rage in his mind. There was no father to guide and support young Phil. Having never been loved, Phil never learned to love and respect himself or others.

Phil was also ignorant about the facts of sex. With all of these disadvantages, he was very vulnerable for becoming sexually violent when he grew up and had strong sexual energy. His three sexual offences were very much like the direct expression of his anger toward his mother.

Sex offenders are shunned by other prison inmates. Phil was badly beaten by other inmates during a prison riot, but managed to survive. In spite of this unfortunate experience, he greatly improved his life during the 13 years in prison. Through the treatment program he
received, he learned to understand his problem and to function well with women. At the time of the interview, he was on a work release program (day parole) and worked in the city as a bookkeeper three days a week. He had female bosses but accepted the situation very well. Once a month he got a “resocialization outing” where he went out with a woman for a friendship date under the supervision of an escort.

It was very fortunate that Phil could receive such an effective treatment program and that he was able to improve so much. The following statements show how much his attitude changed under the treatment program:

Through the program I learned that women are more or less something that you put “special” in life, that they’re not to be abused. Like in the man world you can be abusive as you want. It’s the old teaching of life that man is a dominant factor, where today man is really not the dominant factor. There it’s an equal partnership out in society. Female and male factors are equally involved, and I found that with women now I don’t have to be forceful or force my attentions on them. I find that women accept me (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.115).

I won’t rape again because I have my treatment team on hand. If a problem comes up I can come to them. They will advise me how to handle the situation. And rape is the farthest thing from my mind now, because I’m trying to get back the human factor of life instead of the animal instinct. And I think I’ve come this far—that I’ve done very well—out there, on my release, on day parole—that I can handle the situation (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.116).

**Luke**

At age 16, Luke was arrested and charged with six counts of rape and three counts of attempted murder and armed robbery. He was committed to prison as a Sexually Dangerous Person—a classification that calls for intensive psychiatric treatment. Luke said that he raped for two years, two or three times a month. He actually remembered raping 26 women, most of them between twenty and forty years old.
Although his crimes were serious, Luke received preferential treatment from the courts because of his young age and was released from prison after serving only four years. He was returned to prison a year later for committing another rape. This time he was sentenced to ten to twenty years. After serving ten years, he was released on supervision in 1980. Luke was 28 years old at the time of his interview.

Luke described his last rape as follows:

...I didn’t plan on raping. I think it was built-up frustration that finally made me do it. Things weren’t actually going my way. It looked like things was tumblin’ down. The job was no good, I broke up with a woman. When we broke up I thought about it three or four days. I acted like love’s fool.

It was one of those nights I started walkin’. I didn’t plan the rape. I saw this woman, and I can’t even describe to this day how I felt. I remember when I grabbed her she screamed lightly. I told her to shut up, and she said, “All right, just don’t hurt me.” I took her behind this building and made her take off her pants. I raped her, and then I made her give me a blow job. So then somebody came down the stairs on the other side. I made her cross the street, and she still didn’t have her pants on. We went across the street behind this other building, and I committed sodomy on her and raped her again. Then I left.

Somebody must of saw us when we crossed the street. I started runnin’ to a train station, and I was waitin’ for the train. I threw away the jacket I had on, and I threw away the knife. But two cops came over and said they wanted to talk to me. I knew I had fucked up. I didn’t want to go back to the penitentiary, so I tried to bluff my way out. It didn’t work, and they arrested me (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, pp.180-181).

Luke was 20 years old when he committed his last rape. Why did young Luke rape? He said that his raping of women was the result of conflict with his mother. He explained:

I was born in Chicago in 1951. I was raised Catholic. My father worked nights, and my mother was suffering from multiple sclerosis. About 1962 I noticed a change in her personality. I was about twelve. She started talkin’ more and more to me and not getting along with my old man. She started transferrin’ some of this frustration toward me. She was getting on my case and stuff. I was trying to understand what was happening, and then
again, I wasn’t picking up everything. That is what set me in the streets, started me hangin’ out in the streets (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.178).

...A majority of times me and my momma would get into it, or she’d start buggin’ me in some way and I’d leave. And I carried a knife with me always. And I’d just get to walkin’ the streets trying to figure out what was goin’ on. I’d see some woman, and I’d get to looking at her. I’d get relatin’ her to Mom, you know? Here Ma talked all this shit, and I’d get the urge to fix her. So I’d follow the woman along, and the first dark alley or darkest street they come to with nobody around, what I’d do is go threaten her. I’d grab her and make sure they see the knife. And I told them, “If you scream I’ll kill you,” (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.179).

As in the previous case history of Phil, in most of his offenses, Luke went out and assaulted women right after he had been agitated by his abusive mother. He was angry and revengeful toward his mother and released all of these negative emotions onto his victims. He wanted to overpower women by humilitating them just as his mother had done to him. The following statements express this rapist psyche very well:

...In a way it was a thrill for some reason because they were scared. You know—“I gotcha.” They didn’t want to do it, and that’s what really turned me on. I was makin’ them do something they didn’t want to do. Then they got to cryin’. If they cried it was just a bigger kick (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.178).

...That was my goal. It was to humiliate them. That’s what the goals of rapists are—to humiliate. To me it was more like a revenge type of thing. During the rape all I was thinking about was watchin’ them. I remember there was one or two women that seemed like they enjoyed it. They might’ve been faking it and tryin’ to keep me from hurtin’ them. And I really didn’t get as big a thrill out of it. The ones that seemed really frightened is the ones that really turned me on. That’s what I’d need, you know (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.179)?

So, in Luke’s case, just as in Phil’s case, it seems very clear that his poor relationship with his abusive mother was the responsible factor in turning him into committing the crime
of rape.

After each rape, Luke felt bad about what he had done. He knew he was doing something wrong. There was a couple of times when he even wanted to talk with a priest but he never did. He especially felt sorry for his last victim because he saw her afterwards in court and realized what she was going through as a rape victim. She was spending her own money on a lawyer and had to endure painful exposure in front of the people in court.

Having this kind of sensitivity, Luke could have grown out of his rapist psyche if he had received proper treatment. However, it seems that he failed to overcome his sexual aggression. There was no statement about him receiving any kind of treatment. When the interviewer asked Luke if he would rape again after his release, he replied:

Right now I believe I won’t do it anymore. But it might be a combination of tensions and troubles and disappointments—just like a combination to a safe. If they all come together and click at the same time, it just might make me do it again (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.183).

Luke also said:

I raped for two years. If you want to put it on an average, maybe two or three times a month. It seems to me like every time something didn’t go right in the crib, I’d leave and rape someone. It wasn’t like no sexual urge that I gotta have some, cause I got some all the time...with my little ol’ girlfriend. It wasn’t because I couldn’t get sex (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.178).

Anytime I get through—I reach climax—I leave. A couple of women I cursed out while I was having sex with them. I leave, and an hour later—I might not even get home—I’d get to feelin’ bad about it. Like I said, I knew I was doin’ wrong, and I didn’t like the idea I was actually doin’ it, but I felt like I just gotta. There’s one thing I ain’t figured out yet is why, since I have this anger through the home life, why I gotta take it out on women. That I don’t even know (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.180).

Young Luke craved for his mother’s love but did not receive it. The frustration he experienced because of his abusive mother was overwhelming. He never learned to cope
with frustration in life. Instead, he transferred the anger which he felt toward his mother to his victims and tried to get rid of the frustration by raping them. Although he questioned himself why he had to attack other women when he was angry at his own mother, he could not stop doing it.

It is very unfortunate that Luke never received effective therapy. He still held the same rapist psyche at the age of 28 after having served many years in prison. His advice to women who are rape victims clearly shows continued low sensitivity about the real and serious nature of the crime of rape. He said:

...You scream, you might scare him, and you could get hurt. If he’s not up on you, scream and run. But if he’s up on you, don’t fight it. Submit. It’s humiliating, but it’s not as bad as the way everybody is thinking. If you’re not pregnant, stop and think. It’s not all that bad. It’ll be in your mind, as it’ll be in his mind. And he’s sick. All you do is let yourself get sick—“I’m a nervous wreck, and I can’t mess with men anymore.” That’s not cool either. But I don’t think it’s all that bad (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.182).

The interview with Luke was rather brief and there was little information about his father. In any case, it seems clear that his abusive mother played an important role in creating the rapist psyche in young Luke.

Zeke

Zeke was 24 years old at the time of the interview. He had been charged with attempted rape and selling narcotics. He received a five–to–ten–year sentence and, after serving a little more than five years, was paroled.

Zeke began raping when he was 18 years old, committing rape six or seven times between 1970 and 1972. He was a pimp and bought lingerie for his women at women’s clothing stores. He found most of his rape victims in these stores. When he found a favorable woman in the lingerie department, he would approach her. If the woman refused him, he would follow her all day long until she went home. Once in the house, he would approach her again. If she refused him, he would hit her, tie her to a chair or bed and rape
Zeke sodomized his victims in addition to having normal sexual intercourse with them. He described his most vividly remembered rape as follows:

There was a woman I met at the racetrack. She had a real chic outfit on, a clinging dress that was green. And I'd say her ass was as wide as that window.

I was up on the sixth landing, and she was down by the fence. She must have had a filly in the race or something like that. I would look at her from behind, and she looked very pleasing to me. There was no possible way I could've talked to that woman. There were so many people around her. She used to call somebody, and when she did, she'd turn all the way around. And her body was like a model's. Her back was just fantastic. I seen her, and she left in a Rolls-Royce. So I figured she lived somewhere out on Long Island.

So I followed her up to her house, and I seen that she had about three kids—unless one of them was her grandson. I seen two couples leave the house, so I figured that was my time to go in there. But something told me no, there's still someone in there. So I waited a little longer, and a man came out. She kissed him at the doorway, and I'd seen him—he was checking his watch. They was speakin'. He got into the car, and she went back into the house.

Now, the house set off the road a good sixty feet, and she had trees in the front part of the house. I was standin' by one of the trees noticing all this. So when she was goin' back into the house and the car was comin' down the driveway, I worked my way up the side of the house and I wound my way into the back door. I didn't have to use no window or anything—just creep my way through the back door. So I got into the house, and I'm down on the first landin' and comin' through a dining room, and I hear a voice. The voice is calling somebody. At that particular time, being that I'm in the dining room, the voice seemed like it was in the next room. I hid under the table.

At that time I was scared. I didn't know what I was going to do—whether I was going to kill this woman or not. Is there a maid in here, or was that her boyfriend or her son? Maybe her husband was still there and I would have to fight. The noise of her calling stopped, and I creeped my way into the living room. I got behind this sofa chair, and I heard the door slam, and I heard her—which I didn't know at the time—coming down the stairs. Still, I'm not near any window. I'm not moving either. I'm waiting to see if there's anybody else in the house.
She comes into the room, she picks up a book that was on the vanity, and she goes back upstairs. Now I waited for two minutes so I could hear if there was anybody else in the house. And I followed the stairway up, and I don’t know which room it was. Now I had to search the rooms, and I searched two rooms before I found her in the room which as soon as I opened the door she screamed.

She threw the book at me—the one she was reading. Then she came up to me with a pair of scissors. And I knocked her around the room. I don’t remember if I bruised her that bad, but I do remember hitting her repeatedly on the face. She was the most fightingest woman. She gave me a big fight. I hit her with a closed hand, and she hit the back of the bed. She had one of those sturdy beds. I never did want it on the bed, so I tied her to the floor—to the bottom of the bed—and I went from there.

I took her the right way first, then she gave me some head, and then I had to turn her over. I told her I wasn’t going to let her go until I’m satisfied. And she told me she did satisfy me. I said, “No, that was only one time.” She told me her husband was coming back and her daughter was coming.

We’re up on the second floor, and as I was entering her from the back—and I just did about penetrate her—that’s when I heard a car comin’. That’s when I had to get out. And I just got out in time, because as I was goin’ through the kitchen, I heard the front door close. So I had to go all the way to the front of that lawn and come all the way around to get away. That was the time somebody almost caught me.

I was arrested by word of mouth. That rape right there was the attempted rape I’m in for. She said it was attempted rape. I guess she didn’t want to say she was raped.

I was in upstate New York trying to bail my brother out, who was in on drug charges. When I was doing that, this detective from the rape tactics squad of New Rochelle had a warrant for me. When they was doing that, the cops in Manhattan also had a warrant for me on narcotics. And being that narcotics is a more powerful charge than rape—mainly attempted rape—they pushed the rape charge on the side and got me with the drug charge (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, pp.38–40).

Why did Zeke rape? He clearly stated in his interview that his raping of women was revenge for the sexual abuse he suffered in early childhood. Zeke was born in Los Angeles, the oldest of sixteen children. His father was a pimp and his substitute mother was one of his
father’s prostitutes. He never knew his own mother. He was raised by other prostitutes, all of whom made him call them mother.

When Zeke was nine years old, he was maliciously raped by a prostitute who was in her mid-twenties. He described the experience as follows:

Well, we were playing around in a park one day, and I got all dirty and muddy. Her name was Shirley. She wanted to spank me because I got so dirty. So I told her at that time, “You’re not my mother. You have no right to spank me.”

So what she did, she sent me to my room, tied me down. She said, “Now, you know I’m not your mother. You know what I do?” I said, “I have a general idea of what you do. You take care of my father sexually and with money.” She says, “Yes, I do, and now I’m gonna take care of you.”

She got me all aroused and upset and did her thing. And that, I believe—I hate her to today for that. Because if it wasn’t for my bein’ tied down, I probably would have enjoyed it all. But she did what she wanted to do with me.

Well, she had me eat her—which I don’t like—she used my body, she ... she put something in me—in my rectum.

I don’t know. I can’t go back to it. I’m trying to visualize it right now, the way it was. I can’t figure out what it was, but it hurt. Then she got on me...

I tried to fight it at the time. I tried to tear the ropes that she tied me down with. But I couldn’t get away. I ... I don’t want to talk about it.

After that incident she disappeared for awhile. I seen her again when I was fourteen. She was in Saint Louis with another guy, but that guy was working for my father. I guess my father found out something about what she did and he sold her or whatever. I’ve seen her again off and on before going into the joint. I despise her (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, pp.30–31).

Zeke’s home environment was too rough for a young boy. He never knew his real mother and was raised by many prostitutes who worked for his pimping father. These prostitutes told Zeke that his own mother was also a prostitute who roamed the streets. Zeke learned to despise women at a very early age. After being raped at the age of nine by one of these prostitutes, he became angry, hateful and revengeful toward women. He expressed all of this negative feeling, which led him to raping women, as follows:
I was eighteen. Yeah, that's when I enjoyed it. What I really enjoyed was when I tied them down. I tied this girl in a position where she couldn't move. And I just used her. I did everything I wanted to do to her, as Shirley did to me.

Yeah, she struggled because she didn't want to be tied down. I used my masculinity to overpower her—to tie her down secure—and I did what I had to do. I felt at that time it was my rightful payment for what had been done to me. This is why I took it out on her.

I said, "This is what somebody did to me, let me see how you feel, how you like it, being that you're a woman and this is what you did to me." I got gratification from it. I relaxed after I did it. As a matter of fact, I liked them all to struggle after that. Not literally to put bruises on them, but to tie them down and watch them struggle (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.32).

... The pain part of it was the best part. Especially when I sodomized her. All six or seven of them. I had to get pain from entering them from behind. Because I had been entered in that way. It hurt me, and I knew it was going to hurt them (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.33).

When Zeke was asked if his raping satisfied him sexually, he replied:

...It felt good. Yeah, that's one of them. I got one of them. I thought, "I got you back, Shirley. I paid you back for what you did to me." I'd be smiling. I'd be happy that I used a woman. I felt an overall happiness that she's still laying out there tied up on the bed, and she won't come around until a half an hour or so—or until somebody finds her (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.38).

For his victims, Zeke selected women with large thighs and hips—women who were built like Shirley (the woman who raped him). He was so obsessed with his vengeance that he could not think about his victim's situation at all. He believed that his revenging rape was his legitimate right and he had no remorse about it whatsoever. He even said that he wanted to meet with his victims again and tell them, "Let's do it again" (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.40).

Zeke said that he was not a rapist. He was a sodomizer instead who forced women to have sex with him and who taught them anal intercourse, a new experience for them. He also
insisted that his victims had enjoyed the sex with him and had experienced orgasm during the rape.

After each rape, Zeke knocked his victims out because he did not want to hear their pleas of “I am going to tell my husband,” or “I am going to tell the police,” etc. He especially wanted to avoid the plea of, “Please don’t kill me. I’ll do anything for you.” This plea frightened him. When one of his victims said that to him for the first time, he almost killed her in order to eliminate her as a witness.

Zeke described his prison life as follows:

... In here they just put power on me. I got a good crew—that’s eighteen hundred inmates. I could call close to fifteen hundred of them to carry my bags and throw down on someone in a given situation. No one messes with me. The officers, the majority you got in here are brand-new, kids that come out of high school. They don’t know about jailhouse rules—that there’s inmates in here, people in green, that’s entitled to respect (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.41).

Asked if he ever received any psychiatric treatment, Zeke replied as follows:

... On my own, ’cause I kinda got scared one time because I was goin’ to get married. And this girl heard I used to sodomize women, and she said that being I wanted to marry her, to get some psychiatric help. I visited a doctor for eight months. He just took my money, and he didn’t help me. I had to help myself by talking it out, explaining the type of things I went through as I explained it today (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.41).

Zeke apparently never received any treatment during his prison life and his rapist psyche never altered one bit. In prison, he fantasized and masturbated while watching women on TV disco shows. He said:

... I think of how I would do it with these women. Would I tie her up? And being that I’m looking at these magazines with sadomasochism, bondage, I believe that’s my thing. As far as tying a woman down to a chair, bed, anything—to have her tied up and have her say no to me, that’s my thrill
Zeke was to be released from prison the same year of his interview. He said that his plan was to operate a photography and filmmaking studio for pornography. When asked if he would rape again after his release, Zeke replied, “I won’t say I’ll never tie a woman down. I might do it. I might do it again. There’s no tellin’” (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p. 41).

When the interviewer asked Zeke if he would kill his next rape victim to get rid of the witness, he said:

Yeah. I don’t ever consider myself ever living this hell again. This is my first time, and for me to come back again it would have to be for murder. Murder of who I have no thought of yet, but that would be the charge. But to ascertain that thought at this time—I don’t see myself as a murderer (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p. 42).

After all of this conversation, the interviewer asked Zeke whether he believed he was sick and in need of psychiatric care. Zeke formally denied it, saying:

No, I don’t think I’m sick. …Look at all the freaky things happenin’ out there. There’s people making love in discotheques, exhibitionists, people making love on trains and things. That’s sick. People that likes to be watched by hundreds and thousands of people—those people are sick.

What I do and what I’ve done as far as these women are concerned is undercover. They wasn’t into bondage, they wasn’t into anal sex, and I just introduced it to them. That’s the way I see it. For me to go into it again, that’s the way that I’ll probably see it again. Just introducing them into another way of having sex. Being that they’re virgin back there, they’re no longer virgin after that (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p. 42).

Being raped by the substitute mother figure at an early age, Zeke believed he had the absolute right to rape women as his revenge toward them. He never admitted to himself that he was a rapist. Instead, he defined himself as a sodomizer who instructed women in a new form of sex, anal intercourse. He never felt within himself any repulsiveness by his sexual aggression.
It is difficult to imagine that young Zeke ever received any genuine loving care from his pimp father or the prostitutes acting as his substitute mothers. It seems that his character was shaped by and conformed to that rough environment. He had no one to give him moral guidance or to educate him about normal human sexuality. After he was raped, there was nobody or nothing in his home environment to pacify or alter his revengeful anger toward all women. It seems as though it was just the natural course of events for him to become a rapist.

Zeke’s home environment was very unusual. The kind of sexual abuse he experienced was overly vicious. His case is a very extreme one. However, it provides us with a clear picture of why and how a young boy could become a rapist after he has been severely abused by his mother or a substitute mother.

Summary

Phil hated his abusive mother and developed a very hot temper fueled by the rage within him. At the age of 18, he was almost going to kill his sister’s boyfriend in a violent rage when he found out that the man had tried to rape her. Having never been loved, Phil never learned to love and respect himself or others. He had no factual knowledge of sex and could not relate with women at all. He committed two indecent assaults on women, each one coming right after he had a violent argument with his mother. He finally broke into a house with the intent to steal money but ended up attempting to rape and murder the woman occupant. He gained his senses back and did not kill her only because he heard a baby crying in another room.

When Luke became agitated after arguing with his abusive mother, he went out into the streets armed with a knife and raped some strange woman who happened to come by. He had raped 26 women by the time he reached the age of 16. He intensively sought but never received his mother’s love. He was angry with and full of revenge toward his mother and released all of this negative feeling by humiliating his rape victims.
Luke was released from prison after serving four years but returned one year later for committing another rape. He did not plan to rape this time. However, unable to cope with all of the frustration in his life at the time, he attacked a woman whom he randomly met on the street.

Zeke never knew his real mother and was raised by several prostitutes who worked for his pimping father. He was raped by one of these women and consequently became very hateful and revengeful toward her and women in general. He enjoyed inflicting the same kind of pain on his rape victims which he had suffered from when he had been sodomized by this prostitute. Zeke believed that this type of revenging rape was his legitimate right and he consequently had no remorse for his actions. He did not regard himself as a rapist. He instead thought of himself as a sodomizer who taught his victims the pleasures of anal intercourse which was a new experience for them.

Forward states that an abusive mother’s boy feels helpless, inadequate and afraid when his mother terrorizes him with abuse, coldness and severe punishment (Forward, 1986). However, since the boy needs his mother for his survival, he does not isolate himself from his abusive mother. He instead clings to her desperately seeking her love and comfort which he will never get. The boy suffers from overt cruelty and pain during his entire childhood and develops neediness, rage and humiliation. Growing into adulthood, this boy will develop both a deep hatred for women and intense hunger for a woman’s love (Forward, 1986).

In accordance with Forward’s analysis, these three men with abusive mothers (or a substitute mother) starved for a mother’s love and suffered from the feelings of humiliation and rage in their childhood. They never received a mother’s tender love and attention. So, they could not perceive themselves as lovable, descent children and suffered from low self-esteem. They isolated themselves and did not have good social interaction with other people. Their personality growth had been hindered and they became men filled with
child-like uncontrollable rage.

These men never had a chance to learn about normal human sexuality at home, school or elsewhere and were ignorant about the facts of sex. Besides craving motherly love in their adult life, they also developed a strong revengeful anger toward their own mothers and women in general. Their rapes seem to have been the direct expression of this revengeful anger. Phil and Luke had gone right out and attacked women immediately after having arguments with their mothers. Zeke was so obsessed by revenge that he never felt any remorse over his crimes.

What kind of relationships did these men have with their fathers? Phil did not mention his father at all in his interview. It is not clear that his father was even in the family. Luke said that his father was in the family and worked at night. But he never mentioned anything about his relationship with his father. The father’s night job might have prevented close interaction between father and son. Zeke also never mentioned anything about his relationship with his father. All he said was that his father was a pimp who had many prostitutes working for him.

REJECTING MOTHER

Tom

Tom, age 30, was charged with battery and attempted rape and sentenced to four to ten years in prison. After serving three years and two months of his sentence, he was paroled. The interviewer visited Tom’s home where he was living with his wife. Tom grew up in Chicago, served in the Army, and had a previous marriage, which lasted three years. He described his two assaults as follows:

I was coming home from work, and I seen the woman. I don’t know what attracted me to her or what...I don’t know what it was. But I looked at my watch, and I noticed the time. And I went home. The next day I was going home the same way, and I got to watching for the woman going into the apartment. And I looked at the time, and I noticed it was earlier than
yesterday. So I parked, and I got out of the car, and I went to see if she would be by. As she came by I went into the hallway. I pulled a knife, and I put it at her throat.

She struggled a minute or two, and she hit the door buzzer twice. Luckily nobody came down, and she seen that she couldn’t get away. She said she didn’t have no money. I started to feel around her, and she said, “I’ll give you what you want if you put the knife away.” So I put the knife away. She took off her panties. She didn’t want to lay down. I told her to stoop down, and she stooped down, and I more or less kicked her feet gently from underneath her. And she was down, and I got on top of her. I got her, got up, and left.

Like I say, what attracted me to her I don’t know. Afterwards, the reason I got busted, the reason they busted me—I went back. I thought it was an easy score. She went down easy, no fighting, no resistance—not that much fighting, not that much resistance. She gave in to me right away. I thought it was easy. I thought she liked it. So I went back to see if I could get it again, and the cops got me.

The second one I raped, I also got her in the hall with the knife up against her throat, and she froze. And I started to feel her up. She broke away and started screaming, and I ran out. The first one, if she would have been able to break away and start screaming, I probably would have run out. That would have deterred me. But like I say, she went down easy (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, pp. 187-188).

Asked if he would have used the knife, Tom said no. He thought that he could not have even hit her. He said that he always got his victims in the hallway and used the knife to scare and subdue them. He did it this way because he did not have the courage to drag a woman into an alley or car.

Why did Tom rape? He explained as follows:

After I went to Stateville, I got involved in group therapy. Through that I found out the reason I was doing it was proving to the men in my family that I was more of a man than they were, and proving to the women that I wouldn’t be henpecked like the men were. You see, my whole family—my father would go out, and he’d work eight hours, nine hours a day, and he’d come home and clean the house, he’d do the dishes, he’d do the wash, he’d do the ironing. He had to, because if he didn’t do it, it wouldn’t get done.

My uncle, I used to see him bust his ass in the shop and go home and
sit down to a nice hot meal. He’d get halfway through with it and have to get up to take his mother–in–law someplace because she had to go someplace. And she would never ask. She says, “Well, I’m going here or I’m going there.” And he would get up from the table, take her, and then come back to finish his supper. The supper is cold by that time.

It was my younger childhood that actually made me do what I did in getting back at them. I remember my older sister—she’s a year older than I am—when she hit sixteen she had a driver’s permit. Before three months had gone by she had a license. When I hit sixteen I had to argue, beg, plead, fight, anything I could do to get my license. Two days before I went into the service I finally got my license. I was over in Germany for two years. I didn’t see my family for two years. I wrote home, and I tell them I want to come home for Christmas and need a little help with the money. They can’t afford to send any money at that time. I got home, and my little sister got every damn thing she wanted. Yet my mother kept telling everybody she wanted a son just like her husband (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, pp.186–187).

Tom’s mother favored his sister and rejected him. Tom’s rapes seem to have been an expression of his resentment, anger and revenge toward his mother and sister. He must have felt that his rapes were his righteous revenge toward his rejecting and unfair mother. He never felt any remorse about his crimes or victims. He said:

For myself I actually didn’t feel any remorse about it or anything. I felt remorse to the point where it ruined my marriage with my first wife. After I had done it and I was busted for it, then I realized how bad I hurt my wife. After I found out why I did it, I still felt real bad about it because by getting back at my family I hurt my wife worse—something I didn’t want to do. I didn’t want to hurt her in any way. That was the only remorse I had about the crimes themselves.

I didn’t feel anything. I looked back when I seen the woman when I was going to court. She wasn’t hurt. I know I didn’t beat her. I know I didn’t cut her. I know she made love before, because she had a child—I found out afterwards. There was nothing mentally. I know she wasn’t hurt, so I didn’t actually feel any remorse in that way (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.189).

Tom’s interview was short and there was very little information presented. However, the brief talk with Tom suggests that his rejecting mother was the main cause for his crime of
rape. Fortunately, he received treatment which helped him to grow out of his immature rapist psyche. He said:

Through therapy I found out what my problem was. I found out how to handle it or cope with it—whatever you want to say. I realize that nowadays women are closer to their mother. I don’t know. I don’t blame women in general for what I did. Some women are domineering, but I think it’s more or less the man who should put his foot down. The man is supposed to be the man. If he acts the man, the woman won’t be domineering (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.187).

When Tom was asked if he would rape again, he replied:

I had a chance since I’ve been out. I was going over to a store in the neighborhood, and I had my car parked half a block away from it. And coming back, there was a young woman—the way I like them dressed and everything, you know? And she went into the hallway, and I helped her open the door. And it flashed back in my mind what happened. And I just looked at her, and she said thank you, and I said you’re welcome and turned around and walked away. The urge wasn’t there. Nothing was there. I seen how she dressed, and it didn’t dawn on me at the time.

Later on that night, when I came home and I was all by myself, it entered my mind again. And I thought, hey, that was a beautiful setup. And I didn’t even think about doing it. Another thing...I used to carry a knife ever since I was nine years old. Since I’ve been out of the joint I haven’t even considered carrying a knife. I don’t need them. I don’t need the crutch (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, pp.190–191).

Tom said that when he came out of prison, his friends—who knew about his problem—warmly accepted him. It seems that Tom had a very good chance of being able to adjust to a normal social life. When the interviewer thanked him at the end of their meeting, Tom replied:

It’s hard. I don’t refuse to talk about it, because it happened. No matter what I do, I can’t forget it. I have to live with it. And if I can’t talk about it, I can’t live with it. I know what a hellhole prison is. I know what it’s like to wake up in the morning and know that I’m going to be back in that cell
at night. I don’t know if I’ll be in one piece, if I’m going to be attacked by
guys for being a rapist, or what. I don’t want to go through that
again... (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.191).

Phil II

Phil, age 42, was out on parole after serving nine years of a fifteen–to–twenty–year
sentence on five counts of rape, kidnapping and aggravated assault. He described his earlier
sexual offences, rapes and subsequent arrest as follows:

...I found myself wandering around the streets naked at night looking
in homes for a naked woman. And then I started breaking in homes. There
was one woman in the neighborhood, I broke in with the intent of raping her,
and I got all the way over to the bed and pulled the sheet back, and she was
lying there naked. I panicked and ran away. I went back to the same woman
again, only this time she woke up as I was leaving and knew someone was in
the house, and she called the police. That was about six months apart.

Then that situation finally degenerated, and one night I was coming
home from school feeling really depressed. I had been drinking a lot—the
drinking thing, you use that as a justification for a thing you know you’re
going to do all along anyway....So I started roaming the streets in the old
neighborhood where I used to live in Cicero, and I found a girl walking the
streets, and I attacked her. She screamed and I ran off. That happened again
about six months later, the same way (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981,

...I’d be coming home in the evening, and all of a sudden I’m not
going home, and I’d spend the rest of the evening driving around and maybe
attack two or three girls. I only succeeded in picking up five girls. Each time
the behavior was the same. I’d pick them up by gunpoint, put them in the car,
blindfold them with tape, gag ’em and tie their hands, and I’d take ’em back
to the house, to the bedroom which my wife and I had used. I’d act out this
whole conflict situation I had with my wife, and this was a surrogate
substitute. Of course she didn’t respond, and it was just me aggressing on
her.

I didn’t hurt any of the girls other than psychologically. But I did
some pretty bizarre things—stick Coke bottles up them, and that kind of
stuff....This is the thing. It was a sexual aggression. But there was no
violence on my part. I didn’t want to hurt the women—I wanted the women
to love me is what it was. But of course it was impossible under those circumstances. But that's the kind of state of mind I was in.

So this happened five times, and the fifth time I picked up two girls simultaneously and took 'em back to the house and tied 'em down to the bed. I shaved their pubic hair and did all sorts of acting-out behavior. And after the fifth time they finally had enough information on me to pick me up on the basis of the description of the car. I was going out to see a customer in Naperville, Illinois, and I guess they had a bulletin on me. The cops stopped me and arrested me.

The funny thing about this is the state of mind I was in. I had read about this and seen my picture in the paper—you know, they'd drawn a sketch of me. I wanted to be caught. There's no question about it. I just ignored that and continued to go about my daily affairs, driving around—and I had a bright yellow car, you couldn't miss it....And out-of-state license plates—I mean, really...(Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.169).

Why did Phil rape? When the interviewer asked him about the reasons for his rapes, he replied:

...Oh, a whole lifetime. It's just living, really. It's not easy—that's why it's taken so long to think it all out. From what I've gotten out of my analysis, a lot of things have emerged. How pivotal this is depends on how you approach it, I suppose. I was raped myself when I was nine years old. I never told Mother about it. It left me with very strong feelings of shame and guilt and difficulty in relating to women. Instead of trying to seek any relationships with them in the real world, I would retreat into my fantasies. Even at the earliest stage, I can remember doing that.

The primary problem, as I see it, is a failure to ever learn to love and how to love. That stemmed from a blocked love relationship with my mother at a very early age. It wasn't that my mother didn't love me; Mother never knew how to express the love to me. She was just never able to do it....

So I grew up with tremendous feelings of inferiority in this area, tremendous feelings of not being able to relate to women. Of course, when I reached puberty I was sexually attracted to them. But it was a thing where I was attracted to them and there was fear at the same time. I knew a number of girls when I was young, but I never had any satisfactory relationship with any girls. They all turned sour, every single one of them....Never had a satisfactory sexual relationship. In fact, I never had a sexual relationship until I was married—and then it wasn't satisfactory. It never has been.
I might say that to this day I’ve never had a loving sexual relationship with any woman. Looking back at my life, I can see a number of elements running through it because of this blocked relationship with my mother. I grew up continually seeking love from a woman but always not being able to relate to them in a manner which would allow them to reciprocate. So I just began to retreat more and more within myself and my own fantasy world (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.164).

Phil’s mother never expressed her love to her son and young Phil was starving for love. He was also raped by someone when he was nine years old. This incident left a deep emotional scar and strong feelings of shame and guilt. He had difficulty in relating to women as he grew up. Also, while still young, he suffered from very strong guilt feeling about his masturbation habit because of his being Catholic. These sexual conflicts resulted in some bizarre behavior—he would run naked through his neighborhood at night when he was very young.

When Phil was nineteen years old, he wanted to be a musician and began studying piano in music school. The Korean War soon broke out and he would have been drafted if he had stayed in music school. He did not want to be drafted and go to war. So, he changed schools and became an engineering major, which had always been his parents’ wish.

Phil was also involved in a love relationship with a seventeen year old girl at this time. They were both serious about the relationship and had strong mutual sexual desires. However, both being Catholic, they did not have sexual relations. This affair finally ended when Phil went into the service. Phil suffered from lingering, strong guilt feelings over the whole affair for years to come.

Phil met and married a woman while stationed in England. At that time, his wife had just gone through her second unfortunate love affair and was looking for an escape. Meanwhile, Phil was looking for a sex partner. From the very beginning, this hasty marriage lacked the firm base needed for a true loving bond.

Phil and his new wife came back to the states, moved in with his parents, and began
experiencing marital problems. His mother and wife disliked each other from the very beginning and there were constant daily conflicts between them. Phil always took his mother’s side and blamed his wife in each situation.

Phil’s wife finally had a nervous breakdown and was hospitalized. After receiving treatment and therapy, she returned to England and had more problems with her parents there. Meanwhile, Phil was working days and studying nights for his engineering degree. He also got a contract to do some field engineering. When he completed this job, his wife returned from England and re-joined him. They began living with Phil’s parents again and had a daughter at this time.

The conflict between Phil’s mother and wife continued. His wife was taking care of the house and his mother constantly dictated to her. His wife began breaking down again, started drinking and taking pills, and threatening suicide.

One day Phil’s wife attempted suicide by taking an overdose of sleeping pills. Phil wanted to call the hospital but his mother stopped him, saying that she did not want any police coming to her home. So, Phil just sat by his wife’s bedside all night long and she finally recovered by herself.

The whole situation got worse. Phil continued to work during the day and go to school at night. He was having a lot of pressure at work and the family conflicts became unbearable. It was at this time that he committed his first sexual offenses. As described in an earlier quote, he twice broke into a neighbor’s house with the intent to rape her and attacked two women on the street.

Phil got a new job in another state and was finally able to take his family out of his parent’s home. His marital relationship was much better during the first three or four years of his new job and life. He did not commit any more crimes. However, his job began to degenerate and he again became very anxious and insecure.

Phil finally quit his job and returned to his parent’s home by himself to work in his
father's business. He missed his family and suffered from loneliness. His parents took a vacation several months later and left the business and home in his care. The pressure of all that responsibility and being totally alone was too much for him. His insecurity mounted. He lost control of himself again and this time committed the five rapes quoted above.

Phil felt rejection from his mother who could not openly express love to her son. Being rejected, he could not attain a self-image as a lovable, respectable child and suffered from the lack of self-esteem and self-confidence. Thus, he suffered from a deep inferiority complex and never learned to love himself or others.

To make the situation worse, Phil was raped when he was nine years old and suffered from shame and guilt feelings. Being a Catholic, he also suffered deep guilt feelings about his masturbation habit. At the age of nineteen, he fell in love with a girl but could never have a sexual relationship with her, leaving him feeling very bitter.

Phil married his wife on the basis of sexual need and could not create a deep understanding and constructive marital relationship. He had never experienced love in all of his life, and he was desperately seeking it. He was attached to his mother and could not separate himself from her because he kept seeking her love. This situation brought more negative consequences into his marital relationship. He was also suffering from blocked communication with his wife. Through his rapes, he acted out all of these conflicts.

Phil picked young girls like Catherine, who was the only girl he had ever had any serious emotional involvement with, and raped them in the same bed where he had slept with his wife. He said:

All of these girls were young, in the area of about fifteen to twenty. I was thirty-seven when I was doing all this. A lot of what I was doing I think was not only acting out a conflict with my wife and, of course, with my mother, but with this girl Catherine that I had known at age seventeen. That had been my very first strong relationship with a woman, the most intimate level I've ever reached with a woman. And because that thing had been left unresolved, I think a lot of this acting out that was going on was trying to relive that situation with Catherine. I think that was part of the reason I picked
girls in this age bracket, because I used to deliberately look for women in this age category (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.171).

Although Phil did not openly express his negative feelings toward his mother and his wife, his rapes seem to have been the projection of resentment and anger he had toward these two closest women to him. His inner hostility toward women is very clear in the manner in which he treated his victims. When the interviewer asked Phil what he talked about to his victims, he replied:

Very little verbal contact. There was some. There was no attempt to kiss the girls or to relate to them as human beings or as individuals. That’s not where I was at. I was using them strictly as a sex object in which to act out all these conflicts and blocked relationships with my wife. Mainly in the sexual area, but not completely. There was a communication problem with my wife. We were never able to communicate. That’s the theme that’s been running through all of this. I’ve never been able to effectively communicate until this therapeutic breakthrough. I just couldn’t bring myself to do that. I just couldn’t talk about it. In fact, my brother-in-laws, one’s an attorney, and the other’s a psychiatrist—they said, “Goddamn, Phil, why the hell didn’t you talk to me about this?” I says, “Well, I couldn’t.” And at that time I couldn’t (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.170).

Phil grew up as a man with a discontented, loveless and rootless soul. He was extremely vulnerable to the stresses in life. He lost his self-control and committed all of these sexual offences when he was burdened with pressures from family problems and stress at work. He described his state of mind that existed when he finally began to drive down streets looking for victims as follows:

...This is when it hit me and I came to find the whole responsibility of the business on my shoulders all of a sudden. The sense of loss I was feeling for not having anyone—I was on my own totally, and I couldn’t handle that sense of insecurity. The awareness was just too much.

So I began driving down streets, and I wasn’t really in control of myself at all. My subconscious mind was in control. It was just my needs finally taking over. I don’t know how many girls I attempted to pick up at the
point of a gun...I looked at that very carefully. There was never any serious intent on my part of ever using that gun. But the fact was that it was loaded, and I could have if I panicked. There was a real danger there, there was no question about it (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, pp.168-169).

Fortunately, Phil received effective therapy during his prison term. This therapy greatly changed his attitude. When the interviewer asked him if he would rape again when he was released, he replied:

No, I’ve blown that. In fact, the title of this book I’m writing is titled Ex-Rapist. See, what I had to do in this therapy is relive that whole doggone relationship problem with a woman, a significant female. In this case it was my mother. I can now accept trying to relate with a woman and risk rejection. All my life I’ve had rejection from everyone, and I couldn’t handle it. Now I know what I want out of life. I’ve turned my priorities around, and now I’m seeking love and loving relationships with people. I want only honest relationships with people. No more forcing, no more phoniness, no more fear over having to expose myself and become vulnerable—especially to a woman. That’s what I had to do over there, allow myself to become vulnerable and to feel hurt if there was to be hurt. And there was hurt associated with it, and it was difficult to handle it. But I handled it. I went through it (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.173).

Phil was normally a man of gentle nature. He did not really want to hurt women. However, when life’s pressures mounted, he seems to have been overcome by the deep-seated rage created by his poor relationship with his rejecting mother and he raped women. After committing the five rapes, he was scared of his own uncontrollable, escalating aggression. He did not try to escape from the police and he felt very relieved when he was finally caught.

It was very fortunate that Phil was apprehended before plunging into a worse crime and that he could straighten himself out through the therapy received in prison.

Amos

Amos, age 27, was given a sentence of ten to twenty-five years in prison for the
crime of first degree rape. After serving six years of his sentence, he was conditionally released.

At age seven, Amos was already having sexual encounters. At age twelve, he committed his first rape. He committed twenty or more rapes before he was finally apprehended. Although he raped women in a very violent manner, he never used weapons to harm them. He used a knife only to threaten them by running it’s blade across their necks.

Amos’s first rape victim was his own sister. She resisted his advances but he overpowered and raped her. This offense sent him to reform school for eighteen months when he was twelve years old. When he was thirteen years old, he raped a school teacher. He described this rape scene and it’s consequences as follows:

The rape took place in school. Another fellow that I used to hang with, he was feelin’ up a girl in class, and I was smackin’ at him. And the teacher turned around and caught me in motion. She says, “Get out of here.” She raised her voice at me, right? When she did that, I jumped up and I looked at her and said, “I’m gonna kill you.” Just like that I went off on her. And in the process of me going off on her, she said, “Amos, leave me alone.” And she was backin’ off. I threw her down the stairs, and I told everyone to get out of the class. Behind the desk I threw her down. I ripped off her bra—everything—and as I was raping her I kept saying in her ear, “I hate you, I hate you, you remind me of my mother.” I kept saying this constantly in her ear.

...After I had sexual intercourse with her, I got up, looked at her, and I was gonna hit her, but I didn’t. And then I just walked out of the room. The cops came to my mother’s house that afternoon and said, “We have to take him.” They put me in a detention home. They said, “Well, we can’t send him upstate because he’s too emotional at this time to actually deal with other people,” (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.74).

Amos described one rape he committed while still very young as follows:

...This one particular case when I was young I seen this girl. She was fourteen. She had a body that was tremendous. She had a woman’s body at age fourteen. ...I saw her comin’ from school—I just happened to be around school that day—and I saw her and said I want her. But I wanted her to love
me. I didn’t want to rape. I really dug her. I was really into her.

I was kinda shy with words to actually express myself to her, comin’ from a man’s point of view to a woman—my emotional feelings or whatever. I think that’s because of the fact that my mother gave me a set pattern of rejection. In the event she rejected me when I approached her, said, “Get lost, I don’t want to bother with you.”

I waited to the day of the prom. I didn’t go to the dance or nothin’, I just waited outside. When she came out I knocked her boyfriend out, threw her in the car. I had an assistant this trip. He’s dead now. He got caught in the act in a bedroom and got killed. He had the car, and I threw her in the back seat. I gagged her, and we took off to the mountains. And we raped her, we sodomized her, and we did everything to her (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, pp.74-75).

Why did Amos begin raping at such an early age and then continue to rape? Amos explained the motive behind the rape of his own sister. It was revenge toward his mother who always rejected him when he asked her for something. He said:

...I think overall why I raped my sister and continued to rape people was 'cause of the fact that I guess I was lonely and I wanted attention. I wanted a mother image, right, 'cause I hated my own mother—someone else I could have loved 'cause she would have treated me nice, spoiled me and did what I wanted her to do (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.69).

Amos’s second victim, the school teacher, was very much like his mother and he hated her. He said:

She was every bit the image of my mother. “Amos, you gotta do this; Amos you gotta do that”—I couldn’t stand her. I used to humiliate her. I used to come to school, I used to hit her in the ass with paper clips because I hated her, man. But she used to pass me every trip, but I just couldn’t stand her—you know, her ways, the way she would carry herself, her conduct—and she had a very strange look. It made me paranoid. I didn’t like it. She would look at me, she would squinch her eyes like if to say, “I’m waitin’ for you to do something wrong.” It was like a testin’ thing. This is when I was thirteen (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, pp.73-74).
When the interviewer asked Amos how he felt when he threatened his victims by running a knife across their necks, he replied:

...Gratification, cause I actually thought it was my mother. I never wanted to have sex with my mother, I wanted to kill her. I really hate her to this day (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.75).

The above statements show that Amos’s rapes were revenge toward his rejecting mother. Amos talks about this more as follows:

...The women I raped, I had it in my mind that it was the image of my mother. The slightest little thing, the slightest little thing that triggered a nerve in me and a spark in my mind, was reflected in my mother, and I would rape. Say, for instance, if I was sitting down with a lady and we’re speaking. And she says something derogatory to me. I see more or less an image of my mother. I see my mother in her place. Mentally. It’s a picture. When I get her alone I rape her. And when she asks me why I done it, I tell her, “Because you remind me of my mother, and I hate my mother—I don’t want you like that,” (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, pp.70–71).

...I don’t think I really just chose people to rape them. It just came if the person was like my mother, I would rape ’em. It was a thing where I got to get this (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.71).

Amos was born into a poor family. When he was three weeks old, he was abandoned in a carriage in the street. A man found him and took him to a local hospital. Nobody claimed Amos. After a period of time the man who had found him went to the authorities and adopted him. He took Amos in and raised him as his son.

At age seven Amos was reunited with his real mother and family. His foster father agreed to give up custody. The life with his foster father had been comfortable and full of love but life with his own family was very miserable. He was mentally and physically abused by the adult family members (excluding his real father who he never knew). At age nine, he became involved with crime and spent most of his youth either in reform school or prison. He described the situation as follows:
As soon as I met my immediate family, it seemed as if something was taken from me. The gift that I was gifted with was drained from me because I was being humiliated. I was beat by anything they could get their hands on, because I would rebel. I used to tell them, "Don't hit me, talk to me." I was very sarcastic and very open about how I felt. I dealt with my own feelings at that time. I think my uncle thought, "I'm gonna have hell with this young man, so I'm gonna straighten him out now," (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.70).

...I’m exposed to the street gangs, I’m exposed to the slang of the street, the fast girls at school, the drugs—the whole scene. That’s my world because that’s what I chose. I felt I had friends in that world at that particular time. At that particular time I was also out for anything I could do to get attention from my mother. I guess the rapin’ of my sister was to get my mother’s attention (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.70).

As Amos grew older, he was introduced to swinging bars and singles bars. He learned to use and manipulate people, and began forcing girls into prostitution. To make these girls obey him, he would tie them up, leave them in the house for three or four days, and have sex with them during this period. He even forced minors into prostitution. He got arrested for white slavery and pimping when he was eighteen years old.

Being abandoned while still just a tiny infant must have left a deep scar on Amos’s soul. He must have felt that he had been rejected by his own mother in a very harsh and disgraceful manner. He probably did not feel like a very loveable and respectable person after being treated that way by his own mother at the beginning of his life. Thus, he must have suffered from a rootless feeling and from the lack of self-esteem.

Young Amos desperately sought his mother’s attention but never got it. He developed a deep hatred for her to the point of even wanting to kill her. At age twelve he raped his own sister as revenge toward his rejecting mother and continued raping many other women based on the same motivation. Amos said that since childhood he had been treated for various nervous disorders. He was also examined by several psychiatrists when he was first sent to
reform school. However, he received no more treatment after that.

At the time of the interview, Amos was soon to be conditionally released from prison. He said that there was still no mutual understanding between his family and himself, that they were not speaking to each other, and that he still really hated his mother. Unfortunately, Amos was still carrying his rapist psyche after serving six years in prison and was soon to be conditionally released.

There is one bit of good news. Amos was studying in prison and hoped to obtain a college degree before being released. The interviewer said that Amos had been nervous during the interview because he was scheduled to take college exams shortly thereafter.

**Summary**

Tom held deep anger for his mother who had always favored his sister and rejected him. His rapes were revenge against his rejecting mother. Tom never felt guilt or remorse for his crimes or victims.

Phil was raped at the age of nine and suffered from the feeling of shame and guilt. His mother was incapable of expressing her love toward him and he felt rejected. Although he continuously sought love, he could not learn to love or how to be loved. He could not relate to women and suffered from a deep inferiority complex. The failure of his sex-oriented marriage increased his inferiority complex problem. His rape seems to have been the expression of the resentment and anger he felt toward his rejecting mother and his wife, both of whom he could not communicate with. His rape was also an acting out of his unfinished first love which was never consummated.

Amos was abandoned in the street when he was three weeks old. When he was finally reunited with his family, his mother constantly rejected him. He craved her attention and love but received neither. He got to the point of hating his mother so much that he wanted to kill her. He raped his sister and many other women who reminded him of his mother. Like Tom, his rapes seem to have been revenge against his rejecting mother whom
he really hated.

These three men with rejecting mothers felt deep resentment and hatred for their mothers. Because of their loveless and rejecting mothers, they could not learn to love or learn how to be loved. They could not relate to women in a positive manner, although they intensively sought a woman’s love in their hearts. They suffered from low self-esteem and exercised revengeful sexual aggression in the form of rape to compensate for their inferiority complexes.

Forward’s analysis fits these three men’s cases very well. A rejecting mother’s son feels hurt and vulnerable when deprived of her attention and love and becomes defensive (Forward, 1986). He may develop bullying and macho behavior toward women to cover up this vulnerability.

Being denied his mother’s love during childhood, a man often becomes very insensitive to his partner’s emotional and physical suffering. So, by causing rage and humiliation in her son by inflicting emotional suffering and pain, the rejecting mother, just like the abusive mother, can be seen as a clear and direct precursor of misogyny.

Forward also states that a rejecting mother frustrates her son by being cold and withholding her love from him (Forward, 1986). In this case the frustration is too overwhelming for the boy to cope with and he never learns to deal with frustration in difficult situations in his adult life. Phil’s case is a good example of Forward’s analysis. He committed rape during a period of time when he was alone without his wife and parents and he was totally responsible for the family business.

What about these men’s fathers? Amos never knew his father. Both Tom’s father and Phil’s father seem to have been passive men who could not rescue their sons from their rejecting mothers.
Dave

Dave, age 25, served two years of a five-year sentence for attempted forcible rape and was paroled in 1979. He described his first rape as follows:

I guess it all started with this chick in Texas. She was a prick-teaser....I raped her just like the chick in Abbeville, but this time I got my enjoyment out of it....She’d go so far with a dude, and she’d shut him off right there. I was dealin’ some drugs, and I met her at a party. I turned her on to some mescaline and stuff like that, and I met her brothers and all that. So I talked her into taking me home. Before this I busted a wine bottle and had the neck. So when we started drivin’ I brought up the question let’s go get a lid, and she said yeah. I said I knew a place on such and such a road.

So we started ditty-bopping out there, and I pulled over to the side of the road. She says, “What you doing?” And then I put the bottle up to her throat, and she was scared. And she didn’t give me no trouble or nothing, and I took her out there. And she got to enjoyin’ it and never did cry. She ate me first, and then I screwed her and she played with my ass. About all that came out of that was a fight with her brothers (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.128).

It is not clear how many more rapes Dave committed after this initial offence and up to when he was finally caught for attempted forcible rape. He described his last offence as follows:

It was one of my girlfriend’s best friends, this woman I had raped. My girlfriend had left the bar early that night, and her girlfriend came lookin’ for her at this bar where I hung around. This was in Abbeville, Louisiana.

And so I told her my girlfriend went home, and she stayed at the bar drinkin’.

So I had a lot of money on me—about four hundred dollars—so I was buyin’ the rounds at the bar and all that. And I had bought some Valiums and some other drugs. My girlfriend’s about three hundred pounds, and she gets those diet pills, you know, so I always have those. So it gets about two o’clock and the bar’s closin’, so we had to leave. That’s when I told her I’d take her home....

I’m sidetrackin’. I’m gonna have to go back into the story a little bit more. See, I always looked at her in a lustful way. Did stuff for her when my
chick should have seen through it, but she didn’t. I bought her pizzas and carried her to the store. I never went through that with my own girlfriend.

So while we was at the bar I kept throwin’ these pills in her beer, and she never did notice it. I guess I was tryin’ to knock her out or get her head really spaced out. So we started walkin’ home, and I put my arm around her, and I was doin’ things in my head about her. I guess I was tryin’ a slick con on her—I don’t know. So instead of me takin’ her home, I went and took her to the dump where I used to drive a dump truck at. And I couldn’t raise a hardon ’cause of that speed. I’d been takin’ it so long that it messed up my body....

So she says, “Quit now, and I won’t call rape. If you keep on I’m gonna call it rape.” I didn’t tear no clothes or I didn’t hit her—I only hit a couple of chicks in my life. I thought somehow that maybe I’d build something inside, so I busted a bottle. I didn’t have to have the bottle, because I done had all her clothes off without bustin’ the bottle, but I guess I was doin’ something with my male ego. It didn’t work. It still didn’t work. So I held it to her throat and got on top of her, and it still didn’t work. So I threw it way out in a field maybe ten or fifteen feet away. The cops never did find it....

I’m the one who ratted on myself. She left town two days after it happened. But anyway, I ate her and tried to get her to suck me off, but she wouldn’t do it. It kinda made me mad, but I wasn’t gonna make her physically do something—because, like I say, my mother didn’t bring me up that way to hurt a woman. I can turn around and kill a man a hell of a lot quicker.

...She was shuck-shuck—cryin’. You know what I mean? By shuck-shuck—she was cryin’ a little bit. That’s what I couldn’t figure out, ’cause usually when a girl’s getting eaten she’s diggin’ it. But this chick wasn’t diggin’ it. She says, “Please stop, please stop. What am I going to say to Hilda?” Hilda’s my girlfriend.

My mind was so spaced out that I just acted like she was a rag doll. I talked to her every now and then...and she kept on sayin’, “Take me home, take me home.” And finally I told her, “Here’s the goddamn truck. Get in it and leave. Just get in it and leave. I don’t care how I make it back.” But she wouldn’t do that.

...It was peculiar as hell to me. When I told her that, it broke us up, and I went to the truck....Dope don’t fall back on rape or nothing like that. I don’t think it does, because if a person’s gonna rape somebody, he’s got it in his head. He’s gonna do it, or it’s planned out. And I had planned this rape
out in my head, but I never...fulfilled it. Because to me somebody that rapes a girl is the lowest thing on God's green earth (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, pp.124-126).

After the rape, Dave felt so bad about what he had done that he wanted to kill himself. He took the girl home, handed her a hundred dollars to give to his girlfriend, and told her he was going to kill himself.

Soon after leaving the girl's house, Dave ran a stoplight and the police began chasing him. He crossed a bridge and, with suicide on his mind, quickly turned his truck around in the middle of the road. The police car stopped on the bridge. Dave then ran his truck off the bridge and into the river. He survived the crash, escaped into the water and hid himself next to the bridge pilings. At dawn he climbed up to the road and escaped, leaving the police searching for him in the river.

Dave walked home to his rented room. When he reached home, the landlady told him that the police were looking for him and that she had tried to cover up for him. When the police came searching for him again, he surrendered to them right away because he did not want to involve his landlady. At the police station the effect of the drugs finally wore off. He felt very ashamed of his crime and confessed everything to the police.

Dave hated himself for doing this bad deed. He wanted to kill himself after the attempted rape of his girlfriend's friend. He was also disgusted with being a perpetual rapist and attempted suicide twice while in prison. If he was so unhappy about his offences, why did he rape? When asked for the reason, he said that he really didn't know why. He did say that he was attracted to women's large breasts and this triggered his desire to rape. He said:


In another statement on the same topic, Dave said:
...what burns me up sometimes about chicks is dick-teasers. They lead a man on and then shut him off right there. I guess that's what made me just go ahead and forcibly take it. My mother raised me different. She raised me to respect my elders and stuff like that. I wouldn't have normally done that if I wasn't drunk and all speeded up (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.124).

Dave explained his home environment as follows:

I grew up in the country, in Texas, and from seven to fourteen I lived in the city. My parents, they didn't get along too well, and my dad, he was an alcoholic, and he was pussy-whipped....He and my mom had a few falling-outs, and they ended up getting a divorce. I had a younger brother than me, and my mom had to take care of him. My father wasn't payin' no child support or nothin', so I told her I'd make it on my own at fourteen....

So I left home, and I've been on my own ever since. And I went and worked around horses and livestock, and from there I went into the service. So I came back out of the service in '73—I only stayed in the service maybe a year and a month, 'cause they wouldn't let me stay overseas. They wanted to send me back to Norfolk, Virginia. I didn't like that place, so I got out on a drug exemption. 'Cause I've done some drugs in my time. And from then on I've been hitchhiking around, more or less (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.124).

Young Dave had to leave home to make his own living because his divorced parents failed to support him. How did this broken home situation affect his personality development and cause him to become a rapist?

Life was too hard on young Dave after he left home to make his own living at age fourteen. He did not attend high school and therefore missed the chance to mingle with girls of his own age in a normal social setting. In his tough life, he probably never had a chance to learn about normal human sexuality anywhere. His parents failed to provide a model situation of a healthy and loving sexual bond for him. So, young Dave had no base for his own healthy, normal sexual development.

Dave's alcoholic father failed to support his son both financially and morally. Because of the poor relationship with his father, Dave must have suffered from lonely,
helpless, and insecure feelings which brought him very low self-esteem and consequent lack of good communication with others, including women.

How was Dave’s relationship with his mother? When the interviewer asked him if he would rape again after his release from prison, he replied:

> It depends on what kind of crowd I hang around with. If I get back in that dope crowd and my mind starts gettin’ spaced out again, I know I will. But if I stay back home—East Texas—where I can stay around my mom and look after my mom shuck—shuck, she’ll snap me back to reality (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.129).

These words express Dave’s loving and respectful feelings toward his mother. He also expressed his affection and respect for his mother in an earlier quote by saying that he would not hurt his victims because his mother had taught him to respect people. However, it is also possible that young Dave developed an unconscious resentment and anger toward his mother because she did not keep him with her.

To indicate his hidden resentment and anger toward his mother and women in general, Dave expressed his intolerance toward dick-teasing women. He also talked about feeling very powerful when he raped. He said:

> ...I felt like I had everything in the world. I could do what I wanted. When you rape these women—I really can’t explain it—it makes your male ego really souped up. Like if you had Superman powers, you know? But after it was over I felt ashamed of myself that I did enjoy it (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, pp.128–129).

Dave never received therapy and could not develop an insight in seeing through his own rapist psyche. His mother complex remained hidden to him. However, it seems clear that his unconscious anger toward his own mother, which extended to all women in general, and his lack of good communication skills with women (both caused by his broken home situation) were the main forces leading Dave into the crime of rape. A pitiful fact is that Dave sought his mother’s warm breast in his victims—he was attracted and stimulated by women
with large breasts.

As Dave mentioned, he probably would have never raped if he had been near his mother. Unfortunately, the broken home situation took this precious deterrent for the crime of rape—the loving bond with his mother—away from him. Hopefully, Dave returned home to live near his mother and did not repeat his crime.

Quentin

Quentin, age 33, was sentenced to seven-and-a-half-years in prison for simple rape. After serving five years, he went before the parole board and was denied parole. He described his first rape as follows:

...This is when I was a freshman in college—Memphis State University. The lady was an economics teacher. I played tennis with her, and this is how the relationship evolved. Her husband quit playing doubles with us, and I was seeing one of these Mrs. Robinson things coming on. ...Her complete understanding was that I was nothing more than a nice-guy student. I was having all these fantasies that this was going to be my older-woman-all-through-college type thing. What happened was that I was in a fraternity at the time, and they had a rush week. She had brought a friend of her husband’s over to the fraternity house. There was some drinking involved, and we left in her car and went to a place called Overton Park. This is when I started telling her all these feelings that I had towards her. And it completely blew her mind. She had no idea that this was goin’ on. I forced myself on her, started kissin’ her. The force involved was holding her back. And then, after awhile, my belief now is that she knew she was about to be raped. That is why she just completely submitted to it.

...She went home, told her husband, and he came over and said he was going to castrate me, beat my balls off and all this kind of stuff. One of the fraternity brothers at the house had to restrain him. And they called the cops. Her husband explained to them what the situation was, and they went to her house, took a statement, and came back and arrested me (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.138).

The victim did not file charges against Quentin. However, this experience did deter
him from raping again for seven years. He described another one of his rapes as follows:

...The crime that I’m here on was that I met a girl at a disco. She said that she’d seen me there before and noticed me. And when she said that I immediately knew that this was going to be another jump-in-the-sack situation. As it turned out, her hesitancy brought the rape on. At one point there was an agreement that we were going to have sex. But then it seemed—I don’t know—like we both sobered up and she became aware of where she was at, who she was with, and that I wasn’t her fiancé.

She came from a very religious, moral background, and she snapped and went completely cold. And when she went that, I went the complete reverse. She’s a very small woman. She’s about five foot three and weighed about one hundred and ten pounds. I’m six one and weigh two hundred and five pounds, so it was no problem at all in respect to forcing her.

Her bra was off—I’d taken that off. I’d had some foreplay with her. It just consisted of taking her pantyhose and underwear off and laying on top of her. At one point she did scream, and I raised up off her and looked at her. She started crying. That’s when the rape was committed.

...The sexual thing was in mind, and that was the whole thing. I felt that if I could get inside her physically and start my performance, that would circumvent whatever problems we had. As it turned out, it just multiplied them....

Afterwards I had a lot of remorse. In fact, immediately after we were even talking about it. And she had more sense about her than I did. This may sound petty, but I was crying. It wasn’t so much a forgive-me thing as that I had snapped to what had happened—the act itself constituted a rape.

...That’s when I first knew I could commit the act. There was no power involved. I felt like a little kid that just got his hand slapped (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, pp.137–138).

Why did Quentin rape? He recognized that at least one of his two rapes was done out of his feeling of sexual inadequacy. He said:

...In respect to the period of time I was being raised by my mother, there was a lot of suppression about masturbation due to the fact that we had an extremely heavy background in the Protestant church. It was frowned upon. For instance, if you jacked off you’re going to hell. I was confronted with that so many times that the few times as a child that I did masturbate I was looking for death—a car to run over me, that type of thing. I’m sure it
had an effect somewhere. When I got to the point where I could talk a girl into going to bed, it built this macho idea. I had to be the best just from an inadequacy thing, to prove to myself that I wasn’t (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.141).

In discussing his home background, Quentin mentioned how his relationship with his mother and her female co-workers whom she brought to the house was another source for raising his rapist psyche. He said:

My father’s a retired lieutenant colonel in the Air Force. I have a brother with a degree, a sister with a degree; my mother’s older sister is a psychologist here in the state of Louisiana. There’s a heavy educational background throughout the whole family on both sides. Financially, we’re very stable on my father’s side. On my mother’s side, they’ve always worked for a living, that kind of thing. Everything they’ve got they’ve had to struggle for, but now they’re reaping the benefits in their elder age or whatever....

I think the problem developed when I was eleven years old and my parents were divorced. I went with my mother and younger brother.... The situation with my mother and I was an overprotection thing at first—I could say a six–year period throughout the later part of elementary school, all through junior high school and the freshman year in high school.

I think she was trying to shelter a lot of things that my dad had done within the marriage that was being brought to my attention by other family members—that is, drinking, and he had numerous women friends. He was a pilot and had all these super affairs all over the country. This was always being brought up. I idolized my dad. I thought it was pretty far–out to be able to have all these women all over the country and still be able to maintain the family image that he did for so many years prior to the divorce.

...It had its effects in so much as when I was in high school or even freshman year in college, there was a lot of frustration that developed because of the relationship that I had with my mother and the people she would bring to the house. It would be a lot of secretaries she worked with, women that would be anywhere from about six to twelve years older than I. And there was a lot of kidding—you know, “If he was a little older...” and that kind of stuff. It built a lot of fantasies up. I think this is where the rapist thing started developing (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, pp.135–136).

When asked by the interviewer in what ways was his mother overprotective, Quentin
replied:

...Staying away from the wrong side of town, that kind of stuff. This was one of her biggest objections was hanging around with the wrong kind of crowd. And the right girl, that was brought in a couple of times. I had a crush on a girl who got pregnant from the preacher’s son of the church we attended. And there was a question that I might have been involved in it. That was really, I think, the only ill feeling I had toward my mother was the suppression of that. Because I really had a crush on this girl (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.136).

When the interviewer asked Quentin if his resentment toward his own protective mother was a contributing factor in his becoming a rapist, he denied it by saying:

...Not so much that it brought anything to the surface. If anything, I think it brought a compassion for the victim because of the protection that my mother had given me for so many years (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.136).

When the interviewer asked Quentin if he had ever entertained any violent feelings toward women, he denied having such feelings and mentioned one more strong motive for becoming a rapist. He said:

...None. Not so much in a physical thing where I’m going to chop her head off or shoot ‘em or cut ‘em. As far as the rape thing, the frustration that I released was in the sexual act itself. I had this image of being the Don Juan when I would be with a woman. I figured if I could overpower her sexually, then plus my sexual gratification, I was accomplishing an ego thing where they’d want to see me again (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.136).

Quentin also said that he enjoyed the feeling of extreme power during his raping. But when he made love to a woman under normal circumstances when there was mutual consent, he felt that it was more of an act.

All of this information suggests several factors in the development of Quentin’s rapist psyche. First of all, young Quentin suffered from a strong guilt complex about his masturbation habit, due to his religious teaching. This created the feeling of sexual
inadequacy. He felt very insecure about his sexuality and tried to prove his manliness and sexual prowess through rape.

Quentin’s overprotective mother added to her son’s sexual insecurity by interfering in his serious love affair. Although he did not consciously feel anger or resentment toward his mother, he might have nurtured a subconscious revenge toward her and women in general. This situation might have strengthened his desire to prove his sexual power through rape.

The sexual teasing by his mother’s female friends triggered sexual fantasies in Quentin’s mind, which in turn developed into fantasies of sexual aggression. He wanted to be a Don Juan and sexually overpower women in his rape.

Quentin’s mother became more overprotective after her divorce. It could have been a natural process stemming from the fact that the responsibility of raising her son was solely on her shoulders.

Quentin admired his father, a retired Air Force pilot, who was able to have many women friends and still maintain a family image. If young Quentin could have lived with his father, his life might have turned out differently. His father could have helped him with his feelings of sexual inadequacy and insecurity and kept him from becoming a rapist. Considering these factors, Quentin’s case can be seen as the victimized result of a broken home.

Quentin was an intelligent man. He was a self-taught legal expert in prison who helped his fellow inmates review their legal briefs and write letters to their attorneys. His nickname was “Lawyer” and he was respected by the inmates. He was also working through the district attorney’s office in Baton Rouge on a program to educate women on rape. He even had an offer to work with the Southern Prisoner Coalition in organizing some prison reform committees.

Unfortunately, there was no therapy program available for Quentin in prison. He tried to deal with his own problems by himself. When the interviewer asked him about his general
attitude toward women, he replied:

...For so many years it was a necessity to have one. I've always had a half a dozen close relationships with females, and generally it was always the most beautiful thing I could find on campus or wherever it might have been. But now there will be a lot of curtailing of the four-hundred-a-year type thing—you know, the in and out of bed with everybody. I think a relationship will probably have a hell of a lot more meaning in it now. And more so in what can you do besides screw a chick—that kind of thing (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.140).

Carl

Carl began to molest, abuse and rape women while he was a student in college and continued to do so after finishing school. None of his victims protested or reported the crimes against them and his aggression toward women escalated. After his last rape, he finally realized that his own sexual aggression was becoming uncontrollable. He was frightened by what he had become and turned himself into the police after this last rape. He described the situation as follows:

So then you may want to quit; but you can't. The last crime I did, the one I went to the police about, I was out of control. I was. I wanted to quit. I tried to stop and I went a month without molesting anybody or bothering anybody. In that day I molested five or eight women and I went home. I masturbated to my collection of pornography two or three times. I was so exhausted I fell asleep. I got up. I went out and did a robbery. In the middle of the robbery I was turning my car around to go get the stuff out of the snowbank. I saw a girl from a distance. I followed her. Even following her, I didn't want to rape her. My mind was warped. I thought I’d do no harm by knocking her out and then molesting her and then getting away, maybe even robbing her. I thought that would do her no harm. That's how twisted my mind had got. But then I did pick her up. I threw her over a fence. When I saw her afraid of me, I saw the fear in her eyes, the old thing takes over again, with the power, and I raped her. I had no intent. I had nothing. It just was spontaneous. So, when you want to stop, you can't.

I know at the time I was committing rape I was lost. I was wandering the streets at night, forgetting where my car was. I was climbing balconies in
high-rise apartments and staring in windows under the pretence of doing robberies. At times I did rob when the opportunity presented itself, but really I was more interested in looking in people's windows at them. I was so crazy. I know I was crazy. I worked with emotionally disturbed children at the same time all this was happening and I knew I was crazy but I kept kidding myself that I could stop it, that it was a game. I could stop it. But when the last rape happened, I was out of control and I knew it, and I went to the police. But I told my girlfriend first. I might not have gone to the police except when I told her, it was easy to tell the whole rest of the world, once I told her (Levine and Koenig, 1982, pp.56-57).

Why did Carl become sexually aggressive and rape women? He said:

- When I was raping I was maniacal and I was a monster. I would not shave. I would not clean my mouth. I would wear clothes that everybody despised. The whole thing is disgusting. It's a disgusting thing I was doing, because I couldn't have my father. I had to disgust my father. I had to disgust me. I had to show how disgusted I was with me and so I had to do the worst thing I could think of and it was rape. So that's what's behind rape... (Levine and Koenig, 1982, pp.58-59).

Carl also described the development of his rapist psyche during his youth as follows:

- Sex fantasies started when I was just a boy of 16 and my first sex fantasy was to have all the Playboy magazines to thumb through until I could ejaculate and guarantee an ejaculation. These fantasies laid dormant because I had a good adolescence and a good college education and all of that took my time and my energy. And also I met a girl and I did have intercourse. So things kind of went fairly normal with the exceptions I've mentioned already. Whenever I felt isolated, the fantasies would come. It was that fantasy of having all those magazines that actually came true, a long time later, when I was 28 or so. Then I started to get very lonely, very isolated, into things I didn't want to be into and a lot of pressure on me, and I got into living out all the fantasies I had, and my fantasies progressed worse and worse until I was fantasizing about rape. I never fantasized about rape-murder until after I was in prison and had no future whatsoever. That's when I fantasized about rape-murder. I certainly fantasized about hurting women, though, before I ever hurt anybody. I certainly fantasized about rape for at least a year before I raped.
I did break and enter into sex shops and stole magazines so that that's where I got my huge collection of pornography, real pornography with a lot of cock-sucking and a lot of dominance. I felt like a rotten creep, I felt like a diddler, a child molester. The worse word you can think of. I felt that way. And I felt that way for ages before I ever did anything.

People talk about a sex drive. I don't think a sex drive drove me to do things. I think that I was feeling so rotten, so low, and such a creep and I had so many secrets from everybody about myself that I got caught up in a lot of fantasy. My mind was on sex, women, rape, Peeping Tom (which I was busy at) and all those kinds of things. I was really into it: pornography, stag movies, splicing, fooling around with the projector, constantly doing photography myself and not being able to control myself doing that. Not that I did any harm. I just embarrassed myself time after time. So I felt so rotten that the only comfort I could have in life was escaping into fantasy. As I fantasized I masturbated until I think I built up a sex drive. The hormone in your system that controls your sex, I built that up out of necessity because I was constantly masturbating, maybe five or eight times a day.

And I had a girlfriend but I wasn't sharing my life with her. I was isolated from her. So we had sex. We'd have it two or three times in a night and then I'd drive her to work and five minutes after I drove her to work I'd be all excited about the girl that works with her.

I had trouble with a sex drive but I think I brought that on by the activity of my brain, not the other way around. I don't think sex drive drives a guy to have his mind on sex all the time. I think that because you're on sex all the time, because you're feeling so rotten about yourself, that's why you're doing that and that's where you feel comfortable: dominating in your fantasies. Well, when you dominate in the fantasy, then you end up masturbating all the time and that builds your sex drive up (Levine and Koenig, 1982, pp.55-56).

Carl briefly described his broken home environment as follows:

My father and mother divorced when I was six or seven and I wasn't exactly aware of all that happened to me there. I repressed, forgot, and have no mental images of either parent as a child. I don't have very many. I have some bad ones about them throwing dishes at each other and yelling and screaming, but I don't have any fond memories of childhood whatsoever (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.50).

After his parent's divorce, Carl lived with his mother who later remarried. Carl did
not see his father for many years. When he did finally meet his father again, at his grandmother’s funeral, his father did not even recognize him, thinking he was Carl’s older brother.

Carl was in college at that time. He met his father’s new young wife and they became good friends, spending some good times together. Even though Carl always treated her with respect as his father’s wife, his father did not approve of this close relationship and shut him out.

Carl visited his father once more, bringing him a gift on Christmas. But he felt his father just did not want anything to do with him, so he left. That same night Carl visited and stayed with a woman he had met previously. This woman was extremely masochistic and Carl took advantage of the situation to abuse her. He said, “I went to her and I abused her although I didn’t hurt her. I made hate to her,” (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.51).

Carl then broke into a woman’s apartment on the very next day. He would have gotten into a lot of trouble but he was lucky. The woman was nice and treated him well, keeping him from abusing or raping her. This experience kept him from further sexual offences for months.

Throughout his college life, Carl had only casual sexual relationships with many women. He abused some of them and forced some of them to have sex with him. This behavior continued after his graduation and during the time he was a physical education teacher. He got a job one summer as a lifeguard and continued to have many relationships with women on a strictly sexual basis. During this period he craved a serious and lasting relationship with just one woman, but he did not succeed in this endeavor. During the following winter, when he became very lonely while living in an isolated province, Carl began to molest women and finally ended up raping one.

Carl apparently suffered from very low self-esteem and in order to compensate for his inferiority complex, he attempted to dominate women through rape. What planted such
low self-esteem in Carl? He did not mention anything about his mother except that his parents divorced when he was six or seven years old. However, Carl’s words, “…I don’t have any fond memories of childhood whatsoever,” (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.50) suggest that both parents could not provide real, loving care to him.

Carl said that his teenage life with his stepfather was hard. His stepfather had his own problems and put down Carl’s real father as well as Carl and his brother. So, Carl could not experience a normal, loving parent-child relationship with either his own parents or his stepfather. Because of this loveless life from childhood on, he could not establish a normal self-identity as a lovable and decent human being and suffered from low self-esteem.

Carl’s stepfather was Catholic and young Carl got deeply involved with Catholicism. As a result of his beliefs, he had strong guilt feelings over any kind of sexual feelings, especially about masturbation during his adolescence. As he grew up, he could not create normal, loving relationships with women because of his sexual inadequacy and lack of self-confidence.

Carl consequently escaped into his fantasy world through pornography and ended up becoming a rapist. As he continued to abuse and rape women, his self-esteem became lower. This resulted in him wanting to dominate women through rape even more. This vicious circle continued until his sexual aggression became uncontrollable to the point he became afraid of himself and finally went to the police.

Carl disgusted his real father who rejected him when he really needed a father’s support in his youth. As Carl said, this negative feeling toward his father triggered his raping. Indeed, his rapist psyche seems to have had its roots deep in his upbringing where he lacked warm, loving parental care—the result of parental discord and finally a broken home.

Fortunately, Carl received effective therapy which greatly improved his attitude. His parents even participated in some of his therapy programs and he was able to solve his old communication problems with them. He said:
It is working. It has worked. I wouldn’t rape again, I know that. I’ve been put so much in touch with what I really did and the reasons why. I’ve become somebody rather than a rapist or rather than a jock or rather than any of my problems. I’m me and I know that. I’ve discovered a lot of good things about me. I’ve discovered acceptance with other people and things that I never had: communication (Levine and Koenig, 1982, p.63).

Julio

Julio, age 24, was sentenced to five to ten years for forcible rape, kidnapping in the first degree and sodomy in the first degree. He served six years of his sentence and had a parole hearing in 1980. He was denied parole.

Julio’s family was very poor and broke up when he was a young boy. When he was eleven years old he left home and began taking care of himself. He became a pimp and began raping women at the age of fourteen. In the following statement, he discusses his home background, how he became a rapist and how he felt about his rapes:

I was born and raised on the Lower East Side of New York....I was brought up like people in most underprivileged families who live in the ghetto—struggling to survive. You had to be strong, because most of the weak fall by the wayside. So I started burglary, robberies, gang fights—that resulted in drugs. I started using amphetamines, drinking alcohol. I got hooked and from there started going to various drug programs.

We were a family of four. I have a brother; he also went through the same. I also attended school. I went all the way to about the tenth grade. My school was good. I always enjoyed that. Because of conditions—family problems— that made me change my course of life.

...My father was an alcoholic. He came down with cirrhosis of the liver. After he’d been drinking there’d be a lot of arguments in the family. Of course my family was very strict. They didn’t understand us kids because we was young and had the desire to explore things like drugs. It caused a break in the family. The family broke up and left me without a home. So I slept in certain places with friends, and there were times when I didn’t have anywhere to sleep at all. I had no other choice but to resort to crime to survive—just to be able to eat. I had several arrests for possession of narcotics, a few burglaries, robberies.
...I was eleven. I’ve been on my own ever since then. I haven’t lived with my family since I was eleven years old. Even to this day I’m not in contact with them. I don’t know where they are. They tried the best they could, but it was always something beyond their control—I had to leave. ...You see what happened, because I had no home, had no family, I used to go into the metropolitan cities. And most of these cities, they had like peep shows, massage parlors, prostitutes. I found the only possible ways of me maintaining income would be for me to reside in those cities, because the opportunities are greater in terms of money.

While stayin’ down there I’d frequent a lot of bars, and I met an old fella. He took a liking to me. He started tellin’ me it would be good for me to be a pimp because I’d be able to maintain money. At that age I was young, and I didn’t understand it. I’d seen him gettin’ money, so I was after the same thing. I became what you refer to as a pimp. So that started my exploits of women.

...This old man, he told me one of the best ways to maintain women was to seduce them and rape them. Take them into small rooms and things like that and let them stay for long periods of time—to forcefully introduce sexual intercourse as a means for them to submit. So I continued to do this. After, I’d say, about eight months, I found a different change in my personality. It wasn’t so much that I was in it for the game or the enjoyment of the game. I found that I actually liked it when I’d force a woman to have sexual intercourse.

To this day here,...I think I got a pretty clear picture of the things that motivated me. I feel very infatuated just watching those cunts’ facial features—the contours of her face when I’m forcefully taking her rather than having her grab me and say, “Hey, I’m hot. I want to have sexual intercourse.” I feel very fascinated just to watch facial features, the contours of the face. This is what turned me on.

...It wasn’t a machismo, chauvinistic type of thing. I just enjoyed the fact that it was done by force, and I liked to notice the expressions on their face. I felt that just certain ways that their face was patterned in the process of screwing, that they were submitting and enjoying it—it excited me (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, pp.45–47).

There is almost no need to ask, “Why did Julio rape?” At a very young age, Julio endured poverty, a broken home and homelessness. He finally entered a world of crime in order to survive. He learned to be tough to survive and rape for him might have been a tough
sex life in his tough life.

Most of his rape victims' attitude in dealing with their victimization was ambiguous and this made him feel even freer about his sexual aggression. For instance, when he raped a fifteen-year-old girl, she didn't press charges by herself. But later on her mother made her press charges against him.

There was a woman who was tied up and raped by Julio. She complained about it at first but later asked him to do the same thing again. She finally pressed charges after he left her and became involved with another woman. Through these experiences, Julio believed that women wanted to be raped. Being a handsome young man, he asked himself:

Was it the fact that they consented to it after I reached orgasm? Was it the fact that my appearance—I can't exactly pinpoint it. But I'm trying to figure out to this day, was the fact that they enjoyed it at the end due to my makeup? Was it part of my appearance? I haven't really found the answer. I've stumbled over some things. I don't know in truth if that is what it is (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.51).

Julio worshiped the old pimp because he made a lot of money by listening to him. The old man taught him how to control women by abusing and hurting them through raping and sodomizing. He also taught Julio how to enjoy the victims' facial expressions by raping several women in front of Julio. Young Julio earnestly followed his teacher's instructions and enjoyed all of the sexual aggression he exercised. However, he never used weapons against his victims. Although he always carried a knife or gun, he never had to use them because he managed to subdue the women by yelling or using harsh words.

There is no indication of any remorse over his offences in Julio's statements. There is also no mention of Julio receiving therapy in prison. However, he seemed to have greatly changed his attitude during his prison life to the point that he even wanted to meet with his victims and apologize to them. When the interviewer asked him how he felt about women in general, he replied:
...My attitude has changed completely. The nature of a woman in my opinion is to produce—production, procreate, extension of the family. My attitude now is that I don’t think I’m superior. I’m not scornful. I understand now that they have their own opinions, their own attitudes about certain things. I appreciate the differences because I think that I grow behind that. But there was a time where I couldn’t be comfortable with a woman and just sit down and speak with her, because I always thought I was better than they are. The way I was influenced, the pimp was always better than the woman. At no time did he show weakness.

I can say that now I can cry—now when I speak to a woman I can show them my real side. At one time I couldn’t do that. I had that barrier. They was always wrong. Today they have a voice with me—not so much because of women’s liberation, but I found out just being yourself, I’m growing even today. That’ll never stop (Sussman and Bordwell, 1981, p.54).

Having been so impoverished and involved in criminal activity as a young boy, Julio must have suffered from low self-esteem and an inferiority complex. He also might have been angry at his parents and resented them because they could not provide him with a normal, warm home life. He said that when he learned sexual aggression from the old pimp, he found himself liking it. Thinking about what he went through, it is understandable for him to have enjoyed the feeling of power by sexually overpowering women.

Julio was indeed a victim of a poor and broken home and learned to be tough in order to survive at an early age. It was very fortunate that he was caught before he killed any of his victims. He himself said that he might have ended up killing someone because at the time of his arrest he was really going strong on raping.

Summary

When Dave was 14 years old, he left home and made his own living after his parents divorced and could no longer support him. Dave’s alcoholic father failed to support his son both financially and morally. Dave had affection and respect for his mother but he also had hidden resentment and anger toward her because of her inability to take care of him at home.

Dave’s parents did not have a stable marriage and a normal, harmonious sexual
union. He did not have a chance to experience any type of loving bond with women during the difficult time of his youth. He never learned about normal human sexuality. Because of his desperate desire for a woman’s love and his hidden anger toward his mother, he began raping women. If his home had not been broken and he could have stayed with his mother, he probably would have avoided becoming a rapist.

Quentin’s parents divorced when he was eleven years old. He stayed with his mother, who became very overprotective toward him after the divorce and she was raising him by herself. She even interfered with one of his love affairs. Because of his strong church teachings, Quentin also suffered from the feeling of sexual inadequacy and guilt about his masturbation habit.

Quentin created hidden resentment toward his mother and fantasized as being a Don Juan in order to prove his manliness. When he became a freshman in college, he began to act out his fantasy by raping women.

Quentin admired his father. If his home had not been broken up and he could have had his father to help him with his problems while growing up, he probably would have avoided becoming a rapist.

When Carl was six or seven years old, his parents divorced. Carl had no fond memories of his childhood life. After his parent’s divorce, he lived with his mother. When she remarried, Carl did not have a good relationship with his stepfather either. While Carl was attending college, he had a chance to meet with his father whom he had not seen for years. He attempted to approach his father at this time and have some meaningful relationship with him. However, his father didn’t even remember him, mistaking him instead for his brother. Carl really felt rejected after this experience.

Carl’s loveless home life and the lack of fatherly guidance and support caused his low self-esteem and consequent isolation from the world. Carl also suffered from a strong guilt feeling over his own sexuality, especially his masturbation habit. This was due to the
Catholic church teachings introduced by his stepfather. He finally escaped into the violent sexual fantasy world of pornography. And although he wanted to have a loving relationship with a woman, he ended up molesting and raping several women. The breakup of his home which took his father away seems to be one of the major causes that led Carl into the crime of rape.

Julio’s family was very poor and broke up when he was a small boy. At the age of eleven he left home and began taking care of himself. He lived in the large cities and became involved with drugs, alcohol, and crime in order to survive. He learned pimping from an old pimp who befriended him. He raped many women and made them work for him as prostitutes.

The broken home situation threw Julio into the tough life of the streets at an early age. He developed into a psychotic character, abusing and raping many women as a matter of course. He enjoyed raping women and felt no remorse at all for his bad deeds. He seems to have been a real victim of the broken home situation.

The effects of the broken home situation on these four men’s lives varied. Dave and Julio had to leave home and make their own living at an early age because their divorced parents could not support them. Quentin and Carl lived with their mothers after their parent’s divorce. However, the psychological effects that their broken home situation brought on them were very similar. Because of the lack of parental love and guidance, all of them could not develop well balanced personalities and suffered from the resulting poor social skills and low self-esteem.

These men resented their parents who could not provide them with a warm and loving home. None of them had a chance to learn about a stable marriage with a normal loving sexual bond either through their parents or anybody else. Some of them suffered from guilt feelings about their masturbation habit. They all were starving for love as they grew up but could not relate with women through love. Rape seems to have almost been the inevitable result for these men.
SUMMARY OF CASE HISTORIES

The purpose for the analysis of the eighteen case histories was to see what kind of dysfunctional relationships can exist between each rapist’s parents as well as those between the rapists and their parents.

Among the eighteen rapists, four came from a domineering father and passive mother environment, four from a domineering mother and passive father environment, three from an abusive mother environment, three from a rejecting mother environment, and four from a broken home environment.

However, regardless of the type of family background, all eighteen rapists shared several common problems. These problems were:

1. Disharmony between their parents.
2. Negative feelings toward their parents.
3. Suffering from low self-esteem and an inferiority complex, which led to a compensating desire for power.
4. Lack of adequate knowledge about human sexuality.
5. Receiving no help with their problems from their parents at home or anyone outside of the home.

Domineering fathers abused their wives emotionally, physically and even sexually in some cases. Subdued by their husbands, these wives became helpless and could not support their sons against their aggressive husbands. Domineering mothers were also domineering wives toward their passive husbands. These passive husbands were influenced by their aggressive wives and could not rescue their sons from these domineering mothers. In some cases, the mother made her husband punish their son unreasonably harshly. There was no open, harmonious and loving relationship between these parents.

In the cases of abusive mothers there is very little information about the fathers and
the parental relationship is not clear. However, it is easy to imagine that abusive mothers were also abusive wives. In the cases of rejecting mothers, one rapist never knew his father. The fathers of the other two rapists in this category seem to have been passive men who were influenced by their wives and could not rescue their sons from their rejecting mothers. These parents also did not have mutually respectful and loving relationships.

In three of the four broken-home cases, the husbands had drinking problems. In one case, in addition to a drinking problem, the husband had extra-marital affairs. In all cases, the parents in this category failed to achieve a loving relationship and the marriages ended in divorce.

So, most of the 18 rapists’ parents did not have peaceful, harmonious relationships. Their marriages were filled with problems, hate and discontent, causing negative effects on their children. These parents, struggling with their troubled marriages, could not provide loving care and guidance to their children and failed to establish a trustful, loving relationship with them. As a result, their sons acquired negative feelings such as resentment, distrust, contempt and vengeful anger or hatred toward them.

The four rapists with domineering fathers and passive mothers had a strong vengeful anger toward their domineering, strict and often violent fathers. They also resented and despised their gentle but weak mothers who not only failed to protect them from their domineering fathers but also failed to provide maternal moral guidance for them.

The four rapists who had domineering mothers and passive fathers craved their mothers’ love but never got it. They distrusted, resented and hated their overly protective and too strict mothers. They also felt a deep distrust toward their passive fathers who could not protect them from their domineering mothers.

The three rapists with abusive mothers never had their desire for a mother’s love fulfilled. Instead, they had only vengeful hatred toward their abusive mothers (a substitute mother in one case). There was not enough information available on the relationships of these men with their fathers.
The three rapists with rejecting mothers also felt deep resentment and hatred toward their cold, unloving mothers. One never knew his father. The other two rapists’ fathers seem to have been passive men who could not help and support their sons with their rejecting mothers. The available information suggests that these men resented and distrusted their weak fathers.

The four rapists who came from broken homes resented their parents because they did not provide their children with a warm and loving home. It is clear that most of the eighteen rapists had very negative feelings toward both of their parents.

There was a total lack of normal parental loving care and guidance given to these eighteen rapists. Because of this poor parental relationship, these men suffered from low self-esteem and consequent inferiority complexes since their early childhood. To compensate for these problems they had a desire for the feeling of power. How did the lack of parental loving care and guidance lead these men to this negative psyche? There is a pattern that runs through all eighteen cases concerning the formation of this psyche.

First of all, these men could not perceive themselves as lovable, decent human beings because they had never been treated that way by their own parents. They did not know who they were and felt totally lost. They did not have a firm base on which to build self-esteem, the necessary foundation for creating a positive personality. This situation was too difficult and harsh for the young boys to tackle. So, they repressed their true feelings and shut themselves off from their parents and others in their early age. They had only superficial relationships with people and never experienced any serious human-to-human involvement.

These men could not learn the proper social skills and, as they grew up, they alienated themselves further from the real world. Consequently, they developed inferiority complexes and came to fear people, especially women. This situation in turn contributed to less confidence and esteem. Ultimately, as they continued to suffer from their deep-seated low self-esteem and inferiority complex, they began to develop a strong craving for the
feeling of power.

Because of their poor parental relationships and severed social experiences, all of these rapists never had a chance to learn about normal, healthy human sexuality. Their parents, who had their own marital problems, could not provide their sons with a model for normal, healthy, loving human sexual bonds. In one extreme situation, a domineering father set an example of sexual aggression by raping his own wife.

These men could not even discuss the subject of sex at home because of their communication gap with their parents. In addition to this situation, sex education taught at their schools was basically clinically oriented and, in most cases, failed to teach the wholesomeness of human sexuality as an important element in human life. Therefore, they never learned about sex in the context of human sexuality, which has a significant role in a person’s personality growth as well as in his social life. To them, sex meant an untamed, totally self-centered and irresistibly strong biological desire which they could use to feel power over women.

Some of these men suffered from the feeling of sexual inadequacy, especially with their masturbation habit. In some cases, strict church teachings added more confusion and guilt feelings over their awakening sexual desire or masturbation habit. The sons of domineering, abusive or rejective mothers craved their mother’s love so much that they got love and sex confused. Often misled by pornography, these men created rape fantasies in which they gained women’s love by raping them.

These problems were too large a burden for the young boys to cope with by themselves and they desperately needed someone to consult. Unfortunately, they did not have anyone to discuss their problems with, either at home or elsewhere. Because of their distrust toward and isolation from their parents and others at an early age, these boys could not easily approach people for help. There was no one near them who sensed their problems or offered help. Consequently, all of these young boys carried their problems within
themselves until all of the pent-up anger and rage burst out in the physical act of rape.

Analysis of the eighteen case histories can be summarized as follows. Most of the parents of the eighteen rapists were troubled with their own problems and could not provide normal loving parental care and guidance to their sons. The sons suffered from various negative feelings toward their parents and developed low self-esteem, deep inferiority complexes, isolation, lack of social skills and an ultimate craving for a compensating power experience. The sons did not have adequate knowledge about human sexuality and suffered from sexual misconceptions and guilt complexes about their own sexuality or masturbation habits. Yet, these sons had no one to turn to for help with their problems.

Overwhelmed by their problems, these young men found the outlet for their pent up emotions through the crime of rape. Some of them became rapists in their early teens. They were so caught up with their own vengeful anger that, at the time of their crime, most of them could not think of their victims' feelings at all. Many of them could not perceive their own sexual aggression as a wrongful deed. Some of them even killed or attempted to kill their victims. Others became afraid of their own escalating aggression—fearing that they might kill their victims—and felt relieved when arrested.

Fortunately, many of these men received effective therapy while confined in prison and were able to improve themselves. However, those who did not receive any therapy left prison with their problems unsolved. Most likely, these men could be strong candidates for recidivism.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

The hypothesis of this study, as stated in Chapter II, is that "dysfunctional parental relationships can be correlated with the acts of rapists." This includes dysfunctional relationships between the parents and between the parents and the child.

In the research design of this study, the ratio of both positive and negative parental relationships among the three groups of convicted rapists is shown in Tables VIII and IX. Assuming that the parent-child relationship should ideally be warm and close, Table VIII shows a remarkably low ratio of such positive parental relationships: only 36% of the subjects in the FBI study and 33% of the subjects in the content analysis (averaging 35%) had warm, close relationships with their mother or dominant female caretaker; and only 18% of the subjects in the FBI study and 20% of the subjects in the content analysis (averaging 19%) had such relationships with their father or dominant caretaker.

On the other hand, the ratio of negative parental relationships with both parents among the three groups in Table IX is high: 33% in the FBI study, 42% in the content analysis and 44% in the sexual homicide category (averaging 40%) with mother or dominant female caretaker; and 57% in the FBI study, 55% in the content analysis and 72% in the sexual homicide category (averaging 61%) with father or dominant male caretaker.

Along with this statistical evidence of the high ratio of negative parental relationships among the three groups of rapists, the resulting analysis of the eighteen case histories suggests a strong correlation between dysfunctional family relationships and the acts of rapists. In spite of the differences in their individual characteristics and home backgrounds, all of the eighteen rapists shared common problems and followed the same pattern in creating
their rapist psyche. This suggests that a negative parental relationship may play a strong part in the making of a rapist.

The subjects in these three groups are all convicted, hard-core rapists and are not a representative sample of rapists in general. Moreover, the analyzed eighteen case histories are the only cases which have enough information worthwhile to analyze among the thirty-one case histories that are used for the content analysis. Therefore, the bias in the sampling of the case histories became worse by choosing these eighteen case histories. Thus, the conclusion should be stated as "dysfunctional parental relationships seem to correlate with the acts of rapists, at least among some of the convicted hard core-rapists."

The high ratio of negative relations with the father or dominant male caretaker of the three groups of rapists, compared to their relations with their mother or dominant female caretaker, suggests the father's stronger influence in making their son's rapist psyche. However, among the eighteen case histories, most of the rapists had a negative relationship with both of their parents. This situation could be the result of the biased sampling of the eighteen case histories.

All of the three rapist groups showed a higher ratio of the mother as the dominant parental figure compared with the father or others: 50% in the FBI study, 70% in the content analysis, and 66% in the sexual homicide category, for an average of 62% (Table VII). Out of the eighteen case histories, eleven cases apparently had the mother as the dominant figure in their households. This makes the high ratio of 61%, but it is 9% less than the ratio of the content analysis from which these eighteen case histories were drawn. This phenomenon is also the result of the biased sampling of the eighteen case histories.

The study of the three comparison groups—rapists, felons with no sexual offense convictions, and men university students with no record of sexual aggression or any felony convictions—suggests two significant factors (Tables XIII, XIV and XV).

One factor is that a positive parental relationship may be a strong deterrent against the
development of criminals, including rapists; and that a negative parental relationship may contribute to the development of criminals. The students had warm, caring and less abusive parents while the rapists and felons had rather cold and abusive parents.

Another factor is that the mother could be more influential than the father in the making of a rapist. Between the two criminal groups, the rapists had colder, more abusive mothers than the felons while there was no significant difference in their fathers’ nurturance. Also, the mother was the dominant parent in the rapists’ group while the father was dominant in the other two groups.

So, the study of the comparison groups also seems to suggest that, beside the other factors leading to rape summarized on pages 1 and 2, there is a correlation between a poor, dysfunctional parental relationship and the acts of rapists. However, considering the results of other studies, the question remains as to who is more influential in the making of a rapist, the mother or the father?

Contrary to the comparison group study, Diana Scully’s research of rapists and felons finds fathers as the responsible figure in creating rapists. In Understanding Sexual Violence, Scully states that the female-dominated household situation is not responsible for the making of a rapist. It was the fathers, she said, with whom both rapists and felons had problems (Scully, 1990).

Among the rapists in Scully’s study, 51 percent had been abandoned by their fathers by the age of 18 years. Forty-one percent said that their mother was the closest family member, but only 13 percent said that their father was closest (Scully, 1990). Eighty-three percent of the rapists described their relationship with their mother as close or very close, but only 44 percent described their relationship with their father in that manner (Scully, 1990).

This difference between the two studies may be the result of the difference in sampling. The majority of both felons and rapists in the comparison groups of this study are white males: 85% white and 7.5% black in the felon group; and 85% white and 12% black in
the rapist group of the FBI study. The ethnic identity of the rapists in the 31 case histories used for this study is not clear. However, the circumstantial evidence reveals that whites far outnumber blacks.

Meanwhile, a larger proportion of blacks are in Scully's samples: 49% white and 51% black in the felon group and 46% white and 54% black in the rapist group. Many studies (e.g. Moynihan, 1965) have shown a high ratio of the father's absence among black families. The result of Scully's study may be reflecting this fact.

Who is really more responsible for the making of a rapist, father or mother? The statistical evidence from the FBI study, content analysis of the 31 case histories, Sexual Homicide and Understanding Sexual Violence studies suggest that the father would be the one. Contrary to the above four surveys, the comparison groups in this study are hinting that the mother could be the one. However, the analysis of the 18 case histories in this study strongly suggest that most rapists suffered from very poor relationships with both parents (e.g. see Summary of Case Histories, pp.186-187).

In addition to the information about parental relationships, the study of the comparison groups provides some more interesting results. The comparison between the rapists' group and the students' group showed a much higher ratio than that between the felons' group and the students' group on the following variables: sexually abused in childhood, witnessed sexual violence as child, disturbed by sexuality of parent, sexually attacked by a group of people and punished or ridiculed for sex. This situation could be interpreted as these variables being strong factors in the making of a rapist psyche.

The same phenomenon is also seen with the following variables: Compulsive masturbation, exhibitionism, fetishism, crossdressing, obscene phone calls, practicing sexual bondage, and collecting violent sex magazines. This situation suggests that these deviant sexual behaviors could be seen as warning signs in detecting a possible rapist psyche in a person, although it is not clear why that is the case.

What really is a dysfunctional family? What is the essential nature of family
dysfunctionality that is revealed in the eighteen case histories? In most of the eighteen case histories, the parents suffered from the lack of a fundamental positive relationship based on mutual trust, love, and respect.

These parents with a disharmonious relationship could not raise their children with mutual trust, love, and respect either. After all, they could not give their children what they did not have in themselves. And this situation caused their children to lack the foundation for a positive self-image and self-esteem which provides the necessary base for a healthy social life and personality development.

None of these eighteen rapists ever experienced a good social life and consequently formed bully-like, extremely self-centered, antisocial characteristics. When they committed rape, they could not consider their victim's situation. They were so overwhelmed by their own need for the feeling of power that they could not think about the devastating harm they would impose on their victims.

Throughout the long history of the human race, we have survived and thrived up to this day because of our high level of cooperative sociability. Our social nature had been playing a definite role for our survival and it is now deeply ingrained into our humanity. Without experiencing a good social life, we cannot fully develop our personality and become normal adult human beings.

We all need to have genuine trust toward others in order to have positive social interactions. Without this trust, we cannot easily open ourselves to each other and our relationships stay only at the superficial level. We can never experience deep human-to-human relationships. Our social life will be impoverished and our personality growth will be stunted.

In his developmental theory, Erik Erikson, a practicing psychoanalyst, emphasizes the importance of learning trust at an early age for healthy personality development. He created a model of developmental process through which all normal individuals will pass.
the model (theoretical speculations based on observations), Erikson divides human life into eight developmental stages. He sees each stage of life as bringing a different crisis that an individual must confront and attempt to solve. The individual's degree of success in each crisis determines how well he can deal with the next crisis (Gardner, 1982).

Erikson believes that all infants experience a profound tension between feelings of trust and of mistrust and this tension should be resolved during their first two years (Gardner, 1982). In order to secure the feeling of trust, an infant must experience a normal attachment bond with his mother in his first year. The absence of this normal attachment bond will cause infant mistrust.

Looking at the "Unfavorable outcome" result in each stage of Erikson's model, it is very clear that a person who starts his life with mistrust suffers throughout his life from stunted personality development.

If a child fails to achieve trust during his first year (the first stage), he will have "Fear of the future; suspicion" (Gardner, 1982, p.51). His lack of trust prevents him from achieving adequate autonomy in his second year (second stage) and it will lead him to a "Sense of loss of self-control or sense of external overcontrol; the result is a propensity for shame and doubt about whether one willed what one did or did what one willed" (Gardner, 1982, p.51).

In his third through fifth years (third stage), the child is unable to take initiative and develops "Fear of punishment; self-restriction or overcompensatory showing off" (Gardner, 1982, p.51). During his sixth year through puberty (fourth stage), he fails to be industrious and the result is "A sense of inadequacy and inferiority" (Gardner, 1982, p.51). In his adolescence (fifth stage) the child (boy) cannot develop a positive self-identity and suffers from "Confusion over who one is" (Gardner, 1982, p.51).

In his early adulthood (sixth stage), the man is unable to experience intimacy with others and suffers from "Avoidance of commitments and of love; distancing of oneself from
others” (Gardner, 1982, p.51). In his middle age (seventh stage), the man fails to develop
generativity and ends up with “Self-indulgence, boredom, and interpersonal
impoverishment” (Gardner, 1982, p.51). In his old age (eighth stage), the man lacks
integrity and feels “Disgust with life; despair over death” (Gardner, 1982, p.51).

These character disorders that one develops in the Erikson model when the person
lacks the basic trustful, loving bond with his mother are very much in common with the
characteristics of the eighteen rapists.

So, the main cause, and the very nature of family dysfunction, in creating these
eighteen rapists is the lack of mutual trust, love, and respect between the parents and the
parents and their children. What is the cultural impact that causes such dysfunctional
families?

Every human culture plays a big parent’s role to its people. The family unit becomes a
cultural agent for the culture it belongs to. Except for some extraordinary cases, a husband
and wife more or less adapt to their cultural norm and live with it. The cultural value system
becomes their value system and they raise their children according to it.

What part of our cultural value system causes this lack of mutual trust, love, and
respect—the root cause of family dysfunction—among some family members? These
eighteen rapists abused their own sexuality, one of the most precious elements of their
humanity, in a devastatingly self-abusing manner. Is not this self-abusive nature of their
behavior hinting at a very self-abusive nature in our own culture?

Our culture today tends to place a high value on gaining material wealth, and our
spiritual life is sadly ignored. To define ourselves as servants of a material life is extremely
self-degrading and a self-abusive attitude. The rich spiritual resources in us are uncultivated
and forgotten. As a result, we tend to stray away from our genuine humanity to the extent
that we can no longer see or feel our original and essential spiritual self. We are lost! We
have lost our true humane self who can no longer be trusted, loved, and respected.

Moreover, our highly material-centered culture nurtures harsh competition between
people. We lose the chance to experience mutual trust and cooperation which is the heart of a healthy social life. The result is an impoverished social life and stunted personality growth. We lose spiritual vigor, becoming hopeless and apathetic. This situation will eventually lead us to the loss of self-esteem and the consequent inferiority complex. Then we may end up seeking some sort of compensating feeling of power in the form of more material wealth, higher social status, or even a victory in war.

Rape is a war that is going on daily in our cities, towns and villages. Our dysfunctional culture produces dysfunctional families which in turn produces rapists. Can we change this situation? Is a rapeless utopia possible? It is very possible if we truly understand the root cause of our cultural and family dysfunction and work toward changing the cause.

We took thousands of years to create our present culture and family system. The root of our dysfunctionality is complicated and profound. It may take a lot of time and effort to change its course. However, it must be done no matter how much time and effort it may take because the crime of rape is too painful and too costly for all humanity.
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APPENDIX A

TABLES AND FIGURES
# TABLE XVII

## INDEX OF CRIME, UNITED STATES, 1981-1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Crime Index total*</th>
<th>Modified Crime Index total*</th>
<th>Violent crime†</th>
<th>Property crime‡</th>
<th>Murder and non-negligent manslaughter</th>
<th>Forcible rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Aggravated assault</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Larceny-theft</th>
<th>Motor vehicle theft</th>
<th>Arson‡</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population by Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-229,146,000</td>
<td>13,423,800</td>
<td>1,341,820</td>
<td>13,061,900</td>
<td>22,520</td>
<td>82,500</td>
<td>592,910</td>
<td>663,900</td>
<td>3,779,700</td>
<td>7,194,400</td>
<td>1,087,800</td>
<td>7,142,500</td>
<td>1,062,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-231,534,000</td>
<td>12,974,400</td>
<td>1,322,390</td>
<td>12,622,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>78,770</td>
<td>553,130</td>
<td>665,480</td>
<td>3,447,100</td>
<td>7,142,500</td>
<td>1,087,800</td>
<td>7,142,500</td>
<td>1,062,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-233,081,000</td>
<td>12,108,600</td>
<td>1,258,090</td>
<td>10,856,500</td>
<td>19,310</td>
<td>78,920</td>
<td>506,570</td>
<td>663,290</td>
<td>3,129,900</td>
<td>6,712,800</td>
<td>1,007,900</td>
<td>7,142,500</td>
<td>1,062,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-236,158,000</td>
<td>11,881,800</td>
<td>1,273,280</td>
<td>10,606,500</td>
<td>18,600</td>
<td>84,230</td>
<td>485,010</td>
<td>683,350</td>
<td>2,934,400</td>
<td>6,391,900</td>
<td>1,032,200</td>
<td>7,142,500</td>
<td>1,062,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-238,740,000</td>
<td>12,411,400</td>
<td>1,328,800</td>
<td>11,152,600</td>
<td>18,980</td>
<td>88,670</td>
<td>497,870</td>
<td>723,230</td>
<td>3,013,200</td>
<td>6,926,400</td>
<td>1,102,900</td>
<td>7,142,500</td>
<td>1,062,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-241,077,000</td>
<td>13,211,900</td>
<td>1,495,170</td>
<td>11,372,700</td>
<td>20,610</td>
<td>91,460</td>
<td>542,780</td>
<td>834,320</td>
<td>3,241,400</td>
<td>7,237,200</td>
<td>1,224,100</td>
<td>7,142,500</td>
<td>1,062,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-243,400,000</td>
<td>13,508,700</td>
<td>1,494,000</td>
<td>12,047,700</td>
<td>20,100</td>
<td>91,110</td>
<td>517,700</td>
<td>855,090</td>
<td>3,216,200</td>
<td>7,499,900</td>
<td>1,288,700</td>
<td>7,142,500</td>
<td>1,062,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-243,807,000</td>
<td>13,923,100</td>
<td>1,566,220</td>
<td>12,336,900</td>
<td>20,680</td>
<td>92,490</td>
<td>542,970</td>
<td>910,090</td>
<td>3,176,000</td>
<td>7,705,900</td>
<td>1,432,900</td>
<td>7,142,500</td>
<td>1,062,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-245,239,000</td>
<td>14,231,400</td>
<td>1,646,040</td>
<td>12,656,400</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>94,500</td>
<td>578,330</td>
<td>931,710</td>
<td>3,168,200</td>
<td>7,872,400</td>
<td>1,564,800</td>
<td>7,142,500</td>
<td>1,062,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-247,097,875</td>
<td>14,477,600</td>
<td>1,820,130</td>
<td>12,633,500</td>
<td>23,440</td>
<td>102,560</td>
<td>639,270</td>
<td>1,034,800</td>
<td>3,073,900</td>
<td>7,947,700</td>
<td>1,635,900</td>
<td>7,142,500</td>
<td>1,062,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent change: number of offenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1989</td>
<td>+1.6</td>
<td>+1.06</td>
<td>+4.4</td>
<td>+9.0</td>
<td>+8.5</td>
<td>+10.3</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>+4.5</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>+4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1988</td>
<td>+0.6</td>
<td>+2.2</td>
<td>+8.0</td>
<td>+13.7</td>
<td>+12.3</td>
<td>+17.8</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
<td>+9.5</td>
<td>+33.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1991</td>
<td>+7.8</td>
<td>+3.3</td>
<td>+4.9</td>
<td>+12.3</td>
<td>+24.3</td>
<td>+78</td>
<td>+55.9</td>
<td>+18.7</td>
<td>+104</td>
<td>+50.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Rate per 100,000 inhabitants |          |                |                 |                   |                                      |               |         |                   |          |                |                     |        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>---</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>---</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate per 100,000 inhabitants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Population = United States resident population as of July 1, except 1990 which is the annual average.

†Because of rounding, the offenses may not add to totals.

‡Although annual data are included in the trend and clearance tables, sufficient data are not available to estimate totals for this offense.

*Violent crimes are offenses of murder, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. Property crimes are offenses of burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft. Data are not included for the property crime of arson.

All rates were calculated on the offenses before rounding.
### TABLE XVIII

**COMPARISON OF RESPONSES BY FBI INTERVIEWS OF RAPISTS (N = 41) AND BY CONTENT ANALYSIS OF RAPIST INTERVIEWS (N = 31) ON SELECTED VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family income (INCOME)</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant parent (BOSS)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's nurturance (MNURT)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's nurturance (FNURT)</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse when child (BEAT)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological abuse when child (FEEL)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually abused when child (SEXAB)</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed sexual violence as child (SEERAP)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbed by sexuality of parent (PSEX)</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbed by sexuality of relative (RSEX)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury to genitals in childhood (INJUR)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually attacked by group (ATKGP)</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punished or ridiculed for sex (PUNSEX)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels alienated from sexuality (NEGSEX)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsive masturbation (CONAN)</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism (SEEME)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voyeurism, Peeping (VOYR)</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fetishism (body or object) (FETISH)</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossdressing (XDRESS)</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscene phone calls (PHONE)</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual bondage (BOND)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collects violent sex magazines (MAG)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collects pornography (PICT)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used or ran prostitute (PROPIMP)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family income (INCOME)*</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant parent (BOSS)*</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s nurturance (MNURT)*</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s nurturance (FNURT)</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse when child (BEAT)*</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological abuse when child (FEEL)</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually abused when child (SEXAB)</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed sexual violence as child (SEERAP)*</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbed by sexuality of parent (PSEX)</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbed by sexuality of relative (RSEX)*</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury to genitals in childhood (INJUR)*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually attacked by group (ATKGP)</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punished or ridiculed for sex (PUNSEX)*</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels alienated from sexuality (NEGSEX)*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsive masturbation (CONAN)</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism (SEEME)*</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voyeurism, Peeping (VOYR)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fetishism (body or object) (FETISH)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossdressing (XDRESS)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscene phone calls (PHONE)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual bondage (BOND)*</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collects violent sex magazines (MAG)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collects pornography (PICT)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used or ran prostitute (PROPIMP)*</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Tests for pooled rapists (N = 72) and felons (N = 41). All other variables use FBI sample of rapists (N = 41) and felons (N = 41)
## TABLE XX

**COMPARISON OF RESPONSES BY RAPISTS AND BY MEN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS ON SELECTED VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family income (INCOME)*</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant parent (BOSS)*</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s nurturance (MNURT)*</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s nurturance (FNURT)</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse when child (BEAT)*</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological abuse when child (FEEL)</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually abused when child (SEXAB)</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed sexual violence as child (SEERAP)*</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbed by sexuality of parent (PSEX)</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbed by sexuality of relative (RSEX)*</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury to genitals in childhood (INJUR)*</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually attacked by group (ATKGP)</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punished or ridiculed for sex (PUNSEX)*</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels alienated from sexuality (NEGSEX)*</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsive masturbation (CONAN)</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism (SEEME)*</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voyeurism, Peeping (VOYR)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fetishism (body or object) (FETISH)</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossdressing (XDRESS)</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscene phone calls (PHONE)</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual bondage (BOND)*</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collects violent sex magazines (MAG)</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collects pornography (PICT)</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used or ran prostitute (PROPIMP)*</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Tests for pooled rapists (N = 72) and students (N = 150). All other variables use FBI sample of rapists (N = 41) and students (N = 150)
TABLE XXI

COMPARISON OF RESPONSES BY IMPRISONED FELONS (N = 41) AND BY MEN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS (N = 150) ON SELECTED VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family income (INCOME)</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant parent (BOSS)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s nurturance (MNURT)</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s nurturance (FNURT)</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse when child (BEAT)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological abuse when child (FEEL)</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually abused when child (SEXAB)</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed sexual violence as child (SEERAP)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbed by sexuality of parent (PSEX)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbed by sexuality of relative (RSEX)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury to genitals in childhood (INJUR)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually attacked by group (ATKGP)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punished or ridiculed for sex (PUNSEX)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels alienated from sexuality (NEGSEX)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsive masturbation (CONAN)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism (SEEME)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voyeurism, Peeping (VOYR)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fetishism (body or object) (FETISH)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossdressing (XDRESS)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscene phone calls (PHONE)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual bondage (BOND)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collects violent sex magazines (MAG)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collects pornography (PICT)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used or ran prostitute (PROPIMP)</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

STATE RAPE LAWS
State Rape Laws

Oregon:

163.355 Rape in the third degree.
(1) A male commits the crime of rape in the third degree if he has sexual intercourse with a female under 16 years of age.
(2) Rape in the third degree is a Class C felony.

163.365 Rape in the second degree.
(1) A male who has sexual intercourse with a female commits the crime of rape in the second degree if:
   (a) The female is incapable of consent by reason of mental defect, mental incapacitation or physical helplessness; or
   (b) The female is under 14 years of age.
(2) Rape in the second degree is a Class B felony.

163.375 Rape in the first degree.
(1) A person who has sexual intercourse with a female commits the crime of rape in the first degree if:
   (a) The female is subjected to forcible compulsion by the male; or
   (b) The female is under 12 years of age; or
   (c) The female is under 16 years of age and is the male’s sister, of the whole or half blood, his daughter or his wife’s daughter.
(2) Rape in the first degree is a Class A felony.

Washington:

9A.44.040. Rape in the first degree.
(1) A person is guilty of rape in the first degree when such person engages in sexual intercourse with another person by forcible compulsion where the perpetrator or an accessory:
   (a) Uses or threatens to use a deadly weapon or what appears to be a deadly weapon; or
   (b) Kidnaps the victim; or
   (c) Inflicts serious physical injury; or
   (d) Feloniously enters into the building or vehicle where the victim is situated.
(2) Rape in the first degree in a class A felony.

9A.44.050. Rape in the second degree.
(1) A person is guilty of rape in the second degree when, under circumstances not constituting rape in the first degree, the person engages in sexual intercourse with another person:
   (a) By forcible compulsion; or
   (b) When the victim is incapable of consent by reason of being physically helpless or mentally incapacitated.
(2) Rape in the second degree is a class B felony.

9A.44.060. Rape in the third degree.
(1) A person is guilty of rape in the third degree when, under circumstances not constituting rape in the first or second degrees, such person engages in sexual intercourse with another person, not married to the perpetrator:
   (a) Where the victim did not consent as defined in RCW 9A.44.010(6), to sexual intercourse with the perpetrator and such lack of consent was clearly expressed by the victim’s words or conduct, or
   (b) Where there is threat of substantial unlawful harm to property rights of the victim.
(2) Rape in the third degree is a class C felony.

9A.44.070. Statutory rape in the first degree.
(1) A person over thirteen years of age is guilty of statutory rape in the first degree when the person engages in sexual intercourse with another person who is less than eleven years old.
(2) Statutory rape in the first degree is a class A felony. No person convicted of statutory rape in the first degree shall be granted a deferred or suspended sentence except under RCW 9.94A.120(7).

9A.44.080. Statutory rape in the second degree.
(1) A person over sixteen years of age is guilty of statutory rape in the second degree when such person engages in sexual intercourse with another person, not married to the perpetrator, who is eleven years of age or older but less than fourteen years old.
(2) Statutory rape in the second degree is a class B felony.

9A.44.090. Statutory rape in the third degree.
(1) A person over eighteen years of age is guilty of statutory rape in the third degree when such person engages in sexual intercourse with another person, not married to the perpetrator, who is fourteen years of age or older but less than sixteen years old.

California:

261. Rape defined.

Rape is an act of sexual intercourse accomplished with a person not the spouse of the perpetrator, under any of the following circumstances:

(1) Where a person is incapable, because of a mental disorder or developmental or physical disability, of giving legal consent, and this is known or reasonably should be known to the person committing the act. Notwithstanding the existence of a conservatorship pursuant to the provisions of the Lanterman–Petris–Short Act (Part 1 (commencing with Section 5000) of division 5 of the Welfare and Institutions Code), the prosecuting attorney shall prove, as an element of the crime, that a mental disorder or developmental or physical disability rendered the alleged victim incapable of giving consent.

(2) Where it is accomplished against a person's will by means of force, violence, or fear of immediate and unlawful bodily injury on the person or another.

(3) Where a person is prevented from resisting by any intoxicating or anesthetic substance, or any controlled substance, administered by or with the privity of the accused.

(4) Where a person is at the time unconscious of the nature of the act, and this is known to the accused.

(5) Where a person submits under the belief that the person committing the act is the victim's spouse, and this belief is induced by any artifice, pretense, or concealment practiced by the accused, with intent to induce the belief.

(6) Where the act is accomplished against the victim's will by threatening to retaliate in the future against the victim or any other person, and there is a reasonable possibility that the perpetrator will execute the threat. As used in this paragraph "threatening to retaliate" means a threat to kidnap or falsely imprison, or to inflict extreme pain, serious bodily injury, or death.

(7) Where the act is accomplished against the victim's will by threatening to use the authority of a public official to incarcerate, arrest, or deport the victim or another, and the victim has a reasonable belief that the perpetrator is a public official. As used in this paragraph, "public official" means a person employed by a governmental agency who has the authority, as part of that position, to incarcerate, arrest, or deport another. The perpetrator does not actually have to be a public official.

(Annotated California Codes, 1988, Vol.48, pp.118–119)
Illinois:

11.1. Rape.
(a) A male person of the age of 14 years and upwards who has sexual intercourse with a female, not his wife, by force and against her will, commits rape. Intercourse by force and against her will includes, but is not limited to, any intercourse which occurs in the following situations:
   (1) Where the female is unconscious; or
   (2) Where the female is so mentally deranged or deficient that she cannot give effective consent to intercourse.
(b) Sexual intercourse occurs when there is any penetration of the female sex organ by the male sex organ.
(c) Sentence.
Rape is a Class X felony.
(Smith-Hurd Illinois Annotated Statutes, 1979, Vol.38, p.9)

Alabama:

13A–6–61. Rape in the first degree.
(a) A male commits the crime of rape in the first degree if:
   (1) He engages in sexual intercourse with a female by forcible compulsion; or
   (2) He engages in sexual intercourse with a female who is incapable of consent by reason of being physically helpless or mentally incapacitated; or
   (3) He, being 16 years or older, engages in sexual intercourse with a female who is less than 12 years old.
   (b) Rape in the first degree is a Class A felony.

13A–6–6. Rape in the second degree.
(a) A male commits the crime of rape in the second degree if:
   (1) Being 16 years old or older, he engages in sexual intercourse with a female less than 16 and more than 12 years old; provided, however, the actor is at least two years older that the female.
   (2) He engages in sexual intercourse with a female who is incapable of consent by reason of being mentally defective.
   (b) Rape in the second degree is a Class C felony.
**New York:**

130.25 Rape in the third degree.

1. He or she engages in sexual intercourse with another person to whom the actor is not married who is incapable of consent by reason of some factor other than being less than seventeen years old; or
2. Being twenty-one years old or more, he or she engages in sexual intercourse with another person to whom the actor is not married less than seventeen years old.

Rape in the third degree is a class E felony.

130.30 Rape in the second degree.

A person is guilty of rape in the second degree when, being eighteen years old or more, he or she engages in sexual intercourse with another person to whom the actor is not married less than fourteen years old.

Rape in the second degree is a class D felony.

130.35 Rape in the first degree.

A male is guilty of rape in the first degree when he engages in sexual intercourse with a female:

1. By forcible compulsion; or
2. Who is incapable of consent by reason of being physically helpless; or
3. Who is less than eleven years old.

Rape in the first degree is a class B felony.


**Florida:**

794.011 Sexual Battery.

(1) Definitions:

(a) “Offender” means a person accused of a sexual offense.

(b) “Mentally defective” means that a person suffers from a mental disease or defect which renders that person temporarily or permanently incapable of appraising the nature of his or her conduct.

(c) “Mentally incapacitated” means that a person is rendered temporarily incapable of appraising or controlling his or her conduct due to the influence of a narcotic, anesthetic, or intoxicating substance administered to that person without his or her consent or due to any other act committed upon that person without his or her consent.

(d) “Physically helpless” means that a person is unconscious, asleep, or for any other reason is physically unable to communicate unwillingness to an act.
(e) “Serious personal injury” means great bodily harm or pain, permanent disability, or permanent disfigurement.

(f) “Sexual battery” means oral, anal, or vaginal penetration by, or union with, the sexual organ of another or the anal or vaginal penetration of another by any other object; however, sexual battery shall not include acts done for bona fide medical purposes.

(g) “Victim” means the person alleging to have been the object of a sexual offense.

(h) “Consent” means intelligent, knowing, and voluntary consent and shall not be construed to include coerced submission.

(2) A person 18 years of age or older who commits sexual battery upon, or injures the sexual organs of, a person 11 years of age or younger in an attempt to commit sexual battery upon said person commits a capital felony punishable as provided in Sec. 775.082 and 921.141. If the offender is under the age of 18, that person shall be guilty of a life felony, punishable as provided in Sec. 775.082, 775.083, or 775.084.

(3) A person who commits sexual battery upon a person over the age of 11 years, without that person’s consent, and in the process thereof uses or threatens to use a deadly weapon or uses actual physical force likely to cause serious personal injury shall be guilty of a life felony, punishable as provided in Sec. 775.082, 775.083, or 775.084.

(4) A person who commits sexual battery upon a person over the age of 11 years, without that person’s consent, under any of the following circumstances shall be guilty of a felony of the first degree, punishable as provided in Sec. 775.082, 775.083, or 775.084:

(a) When the victim is physically helpless to resist.

(b) When the offender coerces the victim to submit by threatening to use force or violence likely to cause serious personal injury on the victim, and the victim reasonably believes that the offender has the present ability to execute these threats.

(c) When the offender coerces the victim to submit by threatening to retaliate against the victim, or any other person, and the victim reasonably believes that the offender has the ability to execute these threats in the future. “Retaliation,” as used in this section, includes, but is not limited to, threats of future physical punishment, kidnapping, false imprisonment or forcible confinement, or extortion.

(d) When the offender, without the prior knowledge or consent of the victim, administers or has knowledge of someone else administering to the victim any narcotic, anesthetic, or other intoxicating substance which mentally or physically incapacitates the victim.

(e) When the victim is older than 11 but less than 18 years of age and the offender is in a position of familial, custodial, or official authority over the victim and uses this authority to coerce the victim to submit.

(f) When the victim is mentally defective and the offender has reason to believe this or has actual knowledge of this fact.

(5) A person who commits sexual battery upon a person over the age of 11 years, without that person’s consent, and in the process thereof uses physical force and violence not
likely to cause serious personal injury shall be guilty of a felony of the second degree, punishable as provided in Sec. 775.082, 775.083, or 775.084.

New Mexico:

   Criminal sexual penetration is the unlawful and intentional causing of a person, other than one’s spouse, to engage in sexual intercourse, cunnilingus, fellatio or anal intercourse, or the causing of penetration, to any extent and with any object, of the genital or anal openings of another, whether or not there is any emission.
   A. Criminal sexual penetration in the first degree consists of all criminal sexual penetration perpetrated:
      (1) on a child under thirteen years of age; or
      (2) by the use of force or coercion which results in great bodily harm or great mental anguish to the victim.
   Whoever commits criminal sexual penetration in the first degree is guilty of a first degree felony.
   B. Criminal sexual penetration in the second degree consists of all criminal sexual penetration perpetrated:
      (1) on a child thirteen to sixteen years of age when the perpetrator is in a position of authority over the child and uses this authority to coerce the child to submit;
      (2) by the use of force or coercion which results in personal injury to the victim;
      (3) by the use of force or coercion when the perpetrator is aided or abetted by one or more persons;
      (4) in the commission of any other felony; or
      (5) when the perpetrator is armed with a deadly weapon.
   Whoever commits criminal sexual penetration in the second degree is guilty of a second degree felony.
   C. Criminal sexual penetration in the third degree consists of all criminal sexual penetration perpetrated through the use of force or coercion.
   Whoever commits criminal sexual penetration in the third degree is guilty of a third degree felony.
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRES
Thank you for your willingness to help in this study. Our research objective is to find relations between different childhood experiences and a range of adult male behaviors. Some of the questions we will ask are very personal. We will ask you to volunteer information about sexual experiences and behaviors. If at any point you feel too uncomfortable in answering the rest of the questionnaire, you may stop and turn it in unfinished. If you feel emotional distress because of the questions asked, counseling services are available at the PSU Counseling Center located on the 2nd floor of Smith Center. The Counseling Education Department also offers counseling services on a limited basis for a minimal fee, based on your income. It is located on the 2nd floor of the School of Education. Remember, all your answers will remain completely anonymous and confidential. That is, no one will be able to trace your answers to you, not even the researchers; and no one but the researchers will see the actual questionnaires. The procedure we follow makes it impossible to trace any answers back to you.

Please fill out the bottom of this page before going on to the next page. When you are finished place both pages in the envelope provided, seal it, and put it in any Campus Mail drop box on the PSU campus. You can find a Campus Mail drop box in any Departmental or Administrative office in the University. You may also drop the envelope in the mail box of Dr. Hugo Maynard in the Psychology Department, if you prefer.

Thank you very much for your help. We appreciate your contribution to this important research.

Age______ Race ________ Religious affiliation ______________________

Parents religious affiliation when you were growing up ______________________

Were you raised in the USA? Yes ___ No ___ => Where?________________

If your parents are divorced, how old were you when it happened? __________

What was your father's occupation while you were growing up? (If your father was not a part of your childhood, answer about your stepfather or man who raised you)

____________________________________________________________________

What was your mother's occupation while you were growing up? (If your mother was not a part of your childhood, answer about your stepmother or woman who raised you)

____________________________________________________________________

Have you ever been convicted of a felony (a serious crime)? Yes___ No ___

Now please go on to the questionnaire on the next page
Please answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge and memory. Do not discuss your answers with anyone else. There are no right or wrong answers to the questions; we just want to know what you think or remember. Pick the best answer. Thanks for your help.

1. When you were growing up, how would you describe your family income?
   - We always had enough money to do what we wanted.
   - We had enough to be comfortable; we were average.
   - We just got by, but it was enough.
   - We were poor; sometimes we had to worry about the food and rent.
   - We were sometimes well off and sometimes poor; it varied a lot.

2. Who was the boss in your family when you were growing up?
   - Mother
   - Father
   - Other
   - Explain:

3. How did you get along with your mother (or main woman who raised you)?
   - We had a warm, close relationship; she loved me and took care of me.
   - It varied a lot. She could be nice sometimes, then she would be terrible.
   - She was cold and distant. I never knew much about her or how she felt.
   - She just didn't care about me. She didn't care what I did or how I felt.
   - She seemed to hate me. She hit me a lot and said bad things to me.
   - I was not raised by my mother or by any other woman.

4. How did you get along with your father (or the main man who raised you)?
   - We had a warm, close relationship; he loved me and took care of me.
   - It varied a lot. He could be nice sometimes, then he would be terrible.
   - He was cold and distant. I never knew much about him or how he felt.
   - He just didn't care about me. He didn't care what I did or how I felt.
   - He seemed to hate me. He hit me a lot and said bad things to me.
   - I was not raised by my father or by any other man.

5. Did any parent or other adult taking care of you when you were young beat you or hurt you physically?
   - No
   - Yes
   - Relationship

6. Did any parent or other adult taking care of you when you were young run you down or hurt your feelings a lot?
   - No
   - Yes
   - Relationship

7. Did any one older than you have sex with you against your wishes before you were 18?
   - No
   - Yes
   - How old were you when it happened?
   - About how old was the other person?
   - Who was the person?
8. When you were young, up until you were 18, did any of the following happen to you? Check all that are true for you.

- I was punished or made fun of for my sexual acts.
- Saw or heard someone being raped.
- Saw or heard my parents being sexual in a way that bothered me.
- Saw or heard a relative or friend being sexual in a way that bothered me.
- Had some injury or disease of my own private parts.
- I was sexually attacked by one person: one time, a few times, many times.
- I was sexually attacked by a group of people: one time, a few times, many times.

9. Since you became an adult, from age 18 and older, which of the following are true for you? Check all that are true for you. If it doesn't apply to you, just skip the item.

- I enjoy sex a lot and I do it as often as I can.
- I enjoy sex with men, women, both men and women.
- I like the idea of sex, but I am a little afraid to do it because I may be no good at it.
- I don't like having sex at all and I would rather not do it.
- Sex is frightening.
- Sex is disgusting.
- I masturbate: never, rarely, every month, every week, every day, ___ times a day.
- I get excited if other people watch me when I am naked or when I am doing sexual acts.
- I get excited when I watch other people who are naked or doing sexual acts.
- I used to go out peeping at night.
- I am more excited by other parts of the body than I am by the sexual parts.
- I am more excited by some objects than I am by sexual parts of the body.
- I sometimes like to dress in women's clothes.
- I have made sexual phone calls to people who didn't know it was me.
- I have worked as a prostitute.
- I have had one or more prostitutes working for me.
- I have used the services of a prostitute.
- I mainly enjoy sex if I can tie up or handcuff my partner.
- I mainly enjoy sex if I am tied up or handcuffed.
- I like to humiliate my partner during sex.
- I like to be humiliated by others during sex.
- I like to read magazines that describe violent acts like rape and murder.
- I like to collect pictures, movies and stories showing or describing sexual acts.

10. In my opinion, I have, at some time since I was 18, had sex with someone against their will.

- No.
- Yes===> I felt it was not rape.
- It might have been rape.
- It was rape.

Thanks very much for your help. Please put your answers into the envelope and seal it. You can return it to the Psychology Department or put it in the Campus Mail in any Department or University office.
Thank you for your willingness to help in this study. Our research objective is to find relations between different childhood experiences and a range of adult male behaviors. Some of the questions we will ask are very personal. We will ask you to volunteer information about sexual experiences and behaviors. If at any point you feel too uncomfortable in answering the rest of the questionnaire, you may stop and turn it in unfinished. Remember, all your answers will remain completely anonymous and confidential. That is, no one will be able to trace your answers to you, not even the researchers; and no one but the researchers will see the actual questionnaires. The procedure we follow makes it impossible to trace any answers back to you.

Please fill out the bottom of this page before going on to the next page. When you are finished place both pages in the envelope provided, seal it, and put it in the marked box.

Thank you very much for your help. We appreciate your contribution to this important research.

Age________ Race________ Religious affiliation ____________________________

Parents' religious affiliation when you were growing up __________________________

Were you raised in the USA? Yes____ No ____=> Where? __________________________

If your parents are divorced, how old were you when it happened? __________

What was your father's occupation while you were growing up? (If your father was not a part of your childhood, answer about your stepfather or man who raised you)

________________________________________

What was your mother's occupation while you were growing up? (If your mother was not a part of your childhood, answer about your stepmother or woman who raised you)

________________________________________

Now please go on to the questionnaire on the next page.
Please answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge and memory. Do not discuss your answers with anyone else. There are no right or wrong answers to the questions; we just want to know what you think or remember. Pick the best answer. Thanks for your help.

1. When you were growing up, how would you describe your family income?
   - We always had enough money to do what we wanted.
   - We just got by, but it was enough.
   - We were poor; sometimes we had to worry about the food and rent.
   - We were sometimes well off and sometimes poor; it varied a lot.

2. Who was the boss in your family when you were growing up?
   - Mother
   - Father
   - Other

3. How did you get along with your mother (or main woman who raised you)?
   - We had a warm, close relationship; she loved me and took care of me.
   - It varied a lot. She could be nice sometimes, then she would be terrible.
   - She was cold and distant. I never knew much about her or how she felt.
   - She just didn't care about me. She didn't care what I did or how I felt.
   - She seemed to hate me. She hit me a lot and said bad things to me.
   - I was not raised by my mother or by any other woman.

4. How did you get along with your father (or the main man who raised you)?
   - We had a warm, close relationship; he loved me and took care of me.
   - It varied a lot. He could be nice sometimes, then he would be terrible.
   - He was cold and distant. I never knew much about him or how he felt.
   - He just didn't care about me. He didn't care what I did or how I felt.
   - He seemed to hate me. He hit me a lot and said bad things to me.
   - I was not raised by my father or by any other man.

5. Did any parent or other adult taking care of you when you were young beat you or hurt you physically?
   - No
   - Yes

6. Did any parent or other adult taking care of you when you were young run you down or hurt your feelings a lot?
   - No
   - Yes

7. Did any one older than you have sex with you against your wishes before you were 18?
   - No
   - Yes

   About how old were you when it happened?

   Who was the person?
8. When you were young, up until you were 18, did any of the following happen to you? Check all that are true for you.

- I was punished or made fun of for my sexual acts.
- Saw or heard someone being raped.
- Saw or heard my parents being sexual in a way that bothered me.
- Saw or heard a relative or friend being sexual in a way that bothered me.
- Had some injury or disease of my own private parts.
- I was sexually attacked by one person one time a few times many times.
- I was sexually attacked by a group of people one time a few times many times.

9. Since you became an adult, from age 18 and older, which of the following are true for you? Check all that are true for you. If it doesn't apply to you, just skip the item.

- I enjoy sex a lot and I do it as often as I can.
- I enjoy sex with women men both men and women.
- I like the idea of sex, but I am a little afraid to do it because I may be no good at it.
- I don't like having sex at all and I would rather not do it.
- Sex is frightening.
- Sex is disgusting.
- I masturbate: never rarely every month every week every day ___ times a day.
- I get excited if other people watch me when I am naked or when I am doing sexual acts.
- I get excited when I watch other people who are naked or doing sexual acts.
- I used to go out peeping at night.
- I am more excited by other parts of the body than I am by the sexual parts.
- I am more excited by some objects than I am by sexual parts of the body.
- I sometimes like to dress in women's clothes.
- I have made sexual phone calls to people who didn't know it was me.
- I have worked as a prostitute.
- I have had one or more prostitutes working for me.
- I have used the services of a prostitute.
- I mainly enjoy sex if I can tie up or handcuff my partner.
- I mainly enjoy sex if I am tied up or handcuffed.
- I like to humiliate my partner during sex.
- I like to be humiliated by others during sex.
- I like to read magazines that describe violent acts like rape and murder.
- I like to collect pictures, movies and stories showing or describing sexual acts.

10. In my opinion, I have, at some time since I was 18, had sex with someone against their will.

- No
- Yes == I felt it was not rape
- It might have been rape
- It was rape

Thanks very much for your help.
Please put your answers into the envelope and seal it.
No one but our research staff will see these answers and they cannot be traced back to you.
Crime and the Nation's Households, 1991

By Lisa D. Bastian
BJS Statistician

Nearly 23 million American households, or 24%, were victimized by crime in 1991, the same proportion as in 1990. This percentage continues to be the lowest recorded since 1975, the first year that the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) produced this estimate. From 1985 through 1989 the proportion of households victimized had remained fairly constant, at about 25%.

Additional findings for 1991

The following was also found in 1991:

- Five percent of U.S. households had at least one member age 12 or older who was the victim of a violent crime.
- Black households were more likely to experience a crime than were white households.
- Thirty percent of Hispanic households, but only twenty-three percent of non-Hispanic households, sustained at least one crime last year.
- The likelihood of a personal theft victimization increased as household income increased. The percentage of households in the lowest income bracket victimized by personal theft was 7.9%; in the highest bracket, 14.3%.
- Households in urban areas were most likely, and households in rural areas least likely, to sustain a crime in 1991.

Households experiencing selected crimes of violence and theft, 1975-91

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>Percent of Households</th>
<th>Percent Change 1975-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any violent crime</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal theft</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household burglary</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape, robbery, and assault</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle theft</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing trends in crime rates](image)
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For the second year in a row, the proportion of U.S. households victimized by crime reached a low of 24%, or nearly 23 million households. The Bureau of Justice Statistics has been reporting this estimate since 1975, when 32% of all households had experienced one or more crimes.

Drawing on data from the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), this households-victimized-by-crime indicator measures the dispersion of crime in our Nation. It also allows for comparisons of the proportions of households victimized among various demographic groups, household income levels, and geographic regions.

Steven D. Dillingham, Ph.D.
Director

Comparison of findings from the National Crime Victimization Survey and the Uniform Crime Reports

The U.S. Department of Justice administers two programs to measure the magnitude, nature, and impact of crime in the United States: the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), the source of this report, and the Uniform Crime Reporting Program (UCR).

Because of differences in methodology and crime coverage, the two programs examine the Nation’s crime problem from somewhat different perspectives, and their results are not strictly comparable. The definitional and procedural differences can account for many of the apparent discrepancies in estimates from the two programs. The Department of Justice fact sheet The Nation’s Two Crime Measures (NCJ-122705) contains a detailed description of the NCVS and UCR.
The National Crime Victimization Survey

The NCVS is an ongoing survey of victims of crime, which was first administered in 1972. The NCVS measures the personal crimes of rape, robbery, assault, and theft, as well as the household crimes of burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft. Since it is a survey of victims, the NCVS may obtain data on crimes reported to the police as well as those that were not reported but does not obtain information on homicides. Commercial crimes are also excluded from the survey. Over the past 16 years this indicator, which reports the proportion of households that experienced an attempted or completed crime, has been calculated to estimate the dispersion of crime (see Methodology on page 6 for further discussion of the indicator and of the NCVS).

### Table 1. Households experiencing crime in 1991, and relative percent change since 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1991</th>
<th>Relative Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95,451,000</td>
<td>96,561,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimized by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any NCVS crime</td>
<td>22,652,000</td>
<td>22,855,000</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>4,478,000</td>
<td>4,711,000</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td>161,000</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>967,000</td>
<td>951,000</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>3,591,000</td>
<td>3,852,000</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated</td>
<td>1,297,000</td>
<td>1,367,000</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>2,527,000</td>
<td>2,732,000</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total theft</td>
<td>15,905,000</td>
<td>16,069,000</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>10,042,000</td>
<td>10,209,000</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With contact</td>
<td>548,000</td>
<td>463,000</td>
<td>-16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without contact</td>
<td>9,552,000</td>
<td>9,555,000</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household theft</td>
<td>7,199,000</td>
<td>7,437,000</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>4,547,000</td>
<td>4,734,000</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle theft</td>
<td>1,825,000</td>
<td>1,735,000</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Percent of households experiencing crime, by type of crime, 1975-91

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal theft</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household theft</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle theft</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A household refers both to a dwelling unit, like a house or apartment, and to the people who live in it. A household was counted as having experienced a crime during the year if it met one of these criteria:

- It fell victim to a burglary, motor vehicle theft, or household theft.
- A household member age 12 or older was raped, robbed, or assaulted.

A household member age 12 or older experienced a personal theft.

### Trends

Since the inception of the households-victimized-by-crime indicator in 1975, the proportion of U.S. households experiencing a crime of any type has never shown a significant year-to-year increase (table 2, figure 1). The proportion of households victimized declined by 66% between 1975 and 1985, with 32% of all households reporting at least one victimization in 1975 compared to 25% in 1985 (table 2). After a period of stability between 1985 and 1989, the proportion of households touched by crime decreased to 24% in 1990 and remained at this level through 1991.

Certain demographic groups have experienced trends that differed from this national trend: the percentage of urban households sustaining a crime rose to 31% between 1986 and 1988. Rural households experienced a decline in vic timizations from 20% to 17% over this period.
same period and remained at this level through 1991. After four years of stability between 1985 and 1989, the percentage of white households victimized decreased to 23% in 1990.6 Black households, however, experienced an increasing level of victimization during this period. The proportion of black households touched by crime has not changed significantly since 1989.

The proportions of black and white households experiencing crime in 1991 were well below the proportions for 1975. However, the decrease for black households over this period was smaller relative to white households. Between 1975 and 1991 the proportion of white households victimized declined by 27%; for black households the decline was only 19%.

1990-91 comparisons

The percentage of households touched by a crime of any type did not vary significantly between 1990 and 1991. Specifically, for the violent crimes of rape, robbery, and assault, there was evidence of an increase only in the proportion of households with at least one member who had been the victim of a rape.

6In the NCVS the race of the household is considered to be that of the household head. All other crime categories remained unchanged between 1990 and 1991. Among most demographic groups examined, the overall households-victimized-by-crime indicator changed little between 1990 and 1991. Households earning $50,000 or more were somewhat less likely to be victimized by crime in 1991. This can be attributed to a slight decrease last year in the proportion of those households that sustained a burglary. There was slightly more variation within specific crime categories:

The percentage of white households with a member who had suffered a rape increased somewhat in 1991, while the comparable proportion for black households and "other race" households — those with members of Asian or Native American descent — remained unchanged. There was some evidence that Hispanic households were less likely to experience a motor vehicle theft in 1991 than in 1990.

The proportion of households in the highest-income category ($50,000 or more) that were burglarized declined somewhat in 1991.

Table 3. Percent of households experiencing crime, by race and ethnicity of household head, 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of households experiencing crime</th>
<th>High income</th>
<th>Middle income</th>
<th>Low income</th>
<th>Any NCVS crime</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any NCVS crime</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total theft</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle theft</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious violent crimea</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimes of high concernb</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Detail does not add to total or crime subcategories of overlap in households experiencing various crimes.

Figure 2

The proportion of households in the Northeast experiencing motor vehicle thefts showed evidence of a decrease last year; in the Midwest, South, and West, percentages remained the same.
Burglaries of households with six or more members increased significantly between 1990 and 1991.

**Race and ethnicity of household**

Black households were generally more likely than white households to have been victimized in 1991 (table 3). Members of black households were 2.5 times more likely than members of white households to sustain a robbery (2.1% versus .8%). There was some evidence that the members of white households were more frequently victims of simple assaults. Whites were also more likely than blacks to fall victim to a personal theft without contact.

Black households were twice as likely as white households to experience a motor vehicle theft. These households were also significantly more likely than both white households and households of "other races" to be burglarized.

Larger proportions of Hispanic than non-Hispanic households were touched by most of the violent crimes and all the household crimes measured in the NCVS (table 3). There were no significant differences between Hispanic and non-Hispanic households for the crimes of assault and personal theft.

**Family Income**

Generally, as household income increased so did the household's susceptibility to personal theft (table 4). For instance, households in the highest income bracket were twice as likely as households in the lowest income group to experience a theft. Only households earning under $7,500 annually and those earning between $7,500 and $14,999 a year were victimized in similar proportions.

Violent and household crimes did not present such a consistent pattern of victimization. Members of households in the lowest income category were more likely than members of households earning $15,000 or more annually to sustain a violent crime, excluding simple assaults. There was some evidence that members of households earning less than $7,500 a year were more likely to experience these crimes than members of households earning $50,000 or more, but there were no other significant differences among household income categories.

Similar proportions of households with annual incomes under $7,500 and those with incomes between $7,500 and $14,999 were victimized by violent crime. However, there was some evidence that members of households in the lowest income category were more frequently victims of aggravated assault.

Households in the lowest income group were the most likely to be burglarized; there were no significant differences among households earning at least $15,000 a year. Low income households were least likely to sustain a motor vehicle theft, and there were no significant differences among the proportions of households in each income group that had experienced a household larceny.

**Place of residence**

Urban households were the most likely of all households to experience a crime, with a few exceptions (table 4): Although larger percentages of urban households sustained assaults and burglaries compared to suburban and rural households, suburban households were not more likely than rural households to experience these crimes. Members of households located in rural areas were less likely than members of both urban and suburban households to be victims of personal theft (7.2% versus 11.7% and 10.9%, respectively).

**Region**

As in previous years, Northeastern households experienced some of the lowest and Western households some of the highest rates of crime (table 4). The proportions of Midwestern and Southern households victimized tended to be similar. Some exceptions to this rule included:

The proportions of households in the Northeast whose members had experienced a simple or aggravated assault were lower than those of the remaining three regions. While households in the

---

### Table 4. Percent of households experiencing crime, by selected characteristics, 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of households</th>
<th>Annual household income</th>
<th>Place of residence</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under $7,500</td>
<td>$7,500-$14,999</td>
<td>$15,000-$24,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any NCVS crime</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated assault</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total theft</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle theft</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious violent crime</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimes of high concern</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data does not add to total because of overlap in households experiencing various crimes.

*These estimates are not comparable to estimates for place of residence prior to 1986 because of changes in geographic classification (see footnote 3).

*Race, robbery, or aggravated assault.

1. Rape, robbery, or assault by a stranger or a burglar.
Midwest and West had similar rates for simple assault — 3.2% and 3.7% — while these percentages were higher than the 2.6% of households in the South that were affected by this crime.

Robberies were more frequently committed against members of households in the Northeast than in the Midwest. Motor vehicle theft rates did not vary significantly among households in the Northeast, Midwest, or South. The percentage of Western households that was a victim of this crime was higher than that of Midwestern and Southern households and similar to the proportion of Northeastern households victimized by this crime.

Size of household

Because more household members could potentially fall victim to crime, larger households may be viewed as being more susceptible to crime. The likelihood of personal crime victimization, however, does not increase at a rate proportional to increases in household size. For instance, the percentage of six-or-more person households experiencing a personal theft was 2.5 times that of one-person households (16.4% versus 6.3%) (table 5).

There are various reasons why this relationship is not directly proportional. For example, many households with two or more members include children under the age of 12, whose victimizations are not measured by the NCVS.7 Differing definitions of crimes against children under age 12 are excluded from the NCVS because asking sensitive questions about victimization might be stressful to the child or the parents, possibly discouraging adult participation in the survey.

Table 5. Percent of households touched by selected crimes, by size of household, 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Any NCVS</th>
<th>Percent of households in household experiencing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any NCVS</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle theft</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the crimes measured by the NCVS, many people find burglaries and violent crimes committed by strangers to be especially threatening. For the purposes of this report, these crimes have been termed crimes of high concern. Last year 1 in 14 households in the Nation were touched by a crime of high concern, the same ratio as in 1990.

Certain demographic groups were more likely than others to experience crimes of high concern: A higher percentage of black households than white households fell victim to a crime of high concern in 1991 (table 3). Hispanic households were more likely than non-Hispanic households to sustain these crimes, and households earning under $7,500 a year were more likely than households in any other income group to experience such crimes (table 4). A greater percentage of urban households than suburban or rural households was victimized by a crime of high concern last year. Households in the Northeast were least likely, and those in the West most likely, to sustain at least one of these crimes while similar proportions of Midwestern and Southern households were victimized by a crime of high concern.

From 1981 to 1984 the percentage of households victimized each year by a crime of high concern decreased from 11% to 8%. This percentage remained constant between 1985 and 1988 before declining in 1989 to 7%. The proportion of households touched by crimes of high concern remained at this level through 1990 and 1991.

Race and crime seriousness

Along with crimes of high concern, black households were also more likely than white households to fall victim to a serious violent crime — rape, robbery, or aggravated assault. Of black households, 3.8% experienced a serious violent crime while 2.3% of white households experienced such crimes in 1991 (table 3). Crimes of high concern touched 9.5% of black households and 6.9% of white households.

Factors affecting trends

Over time, population shifts and changes in household composition have affected the overall downward trend that the households-victimized-by-crime indicator has shown since 1975.

The trend in population shifts throughout the country has been toward the South and West and away from the Northeast and Midwest. Urban residents have been moving to suburban and rural areas as well. In 1975, 50% of the U.S. population lived in the Northeast or Midwest, compared to 45% in 1991. Between 1975 and
1985 the percentage of households located in urban areas fell from 32% to 29% of all households, while suburban and rural households increased from 68% to 71%. After 1986 urban households continues to account for a declining percentage of all households, and suburban households, an increasing one.

Household size fluctuates as people are constantly moving into and out of different households, creating new households, and merging existing ones. Between 1975 and 1991, the average size of the American household decreased. One-person households represented 21% of all households in 1975 but 26% in 1991. The percentage of households consisting of six or more persons fell from 7% to 3%.

The two population movements outlined above, changing household size and household location, have shifted population from households more likely to experience crime — larger ones and those in urban areas — to those less likely — smaller ones and those in suburban or rural areas. Another movement has shifted the population in the opposite direction, from the Northeast, a region with a lower likelihood of crime, to the West, where a higher proportion of households experience crime.

While current data do not permit measurement of the degree to which all population movements have affected the indicator, estimates can be made for the effect of changes in household size. If the size distribution of American households were the same in 1975 as in 1975, the estimate of households experiencing crime would have been 24.7% rather than 23.7%. This adjusted estimate, however, is still significantly below the 1975 estimate of 32% of households victimized by crime.

Methodology

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) developed the households-vicimized-by-crime indicator in 1981 to improve the overall understanding of the impact of crime on our society. The household was chosen as the unit of analysis because crimes such as burglary are crimes against an entire household and crimes against persons affect members of the victim's household.

Crimes not included in the NCVS

Households-vicimized-by-crime estimates are derived from NCVS statistics on rape, personal robbery, assault, household burglary, and personal and household theft, and motor vehicle theft. Because the NCVS counts only crimes for which the victim can be interviewed, homicide is not counted. Its exclusion does not noticeably affect the estimates. If each of the homicides during 1991 had occurred in a different household and if those households had been victimized by no other crime (the largest possible effect), then the inclusion of homicides in these findings would not have raised the overall percent of households victimized by crime (23.7%) by as much as 0.02%.

Other crimes against persons or their households, such as fraud, confidence games, kidnapping, and arson are not included in this analysis because they are not measured by the NCVS. Commercial crimes, drug trafficking, and drug possession crimes are also not included.

Rates of crime — number of crimes per 1,000 persons or households

Traditional measures of crime are in the form of volumes or rates. Data on the volume of crime have limited usefulness because the size of the population is not taken into account. Rates — expressed in the NCVS as crimes per 1,000 households or per 1,000 persons — automatically correct for different population sizes. Rates based on the individual person and household, however, give only one measure of how common a crime is. Because crimes against individuals are likely to affect everyone with whom they reside, another estimate of whether crime is widely spread or highly concentrated is to measure its occurrence in households with different characteristics.

Households-vicimized-by-crime indicator

For each type of crime examined, a household is counted only once, regardless of how many times that household was victimized. For example, if a household were burglarized twice and one of its members was robbed once during the year, it is counted once for households sustaining burglary even though it was victimized twice by burglary. It is also counted once for households victimized by robbery. Finally, it is counted once in the overall measure, households victimized by crime.

Consequently, the households-vicimized-by-crime estimate for 1991 (23.7%) is less than the sum of the estimates likely to be victimized by personal crimes (14.0%) and those victimized by household crimes (13.0%) because 3.3% of U.S. households were victims of both personal and household crimes. Similarly, because about 1.2% of U.S. household experience both personal theft and violence, the sum of households victimized by personal theft (10.4%) and those victimized by violence (4.9%) exceeds the estimate of those victimized by personal crime (14.9%).

All data in this Bulletin are from the NCVS except those specifically attributed to other sources. The NCVS is an ongoing survey conducted for BJS by the Bureau of the Census. Interviews are conducted at 6-month intervals with all occupants age 12 or older in about 49,000 housing units (39,000 persons). Because the NCVS does not obtain information about crimes against persons under age 12, households experiencing only such crimes are not included in the estimate of households victimized by crime.

Revisions to prior year estimates

Estimates of the percentage of households affected by crime for 1987 and
1989 vary from those published in House-
holds Touched by Crime, 1987 and Crime
and the Nation’s Households, 1999, re-
spectively.
In 1987 the NCVS conducted a prelimi-
nary test on 5% of the sample using com-
puter-assisted–telephone interviewing
(CATI). In CATI an interviewer enters
responses directly into a computer rather
than on a printed form. Data from the
CATI experiment were excluded from
estimates until the effects of the change
in procedure were known.
Subsequent to the publication of Crime
and the Nation’s Households, 1999, Cen-
sus Bureau programmers discovered that
a weighting adjustment was inadvertently
omitted from the processing to produce the
1989 crime prevalence estimates. In gen-
eral, the effect of the error was a slight
overestimate of the percentage of
households touched by crime for the
Nation and for most population groups.
Comparison of the corrected 1989 esti-
mates with published estimates did not
uncover any substantive change.

Estimates of standard errors
The estimates in this Bulletin are derived
from sample survey data, and they are
subject to sampling variation.5 Because
the procedure used to produce estimates
of households sustaining crime differs
from that for victimization rates, the
households-victimized data have standard
ers about 8% higher than those for vic-
timization rates with the same population
bases, even though they are derived from
the same sample survey.
Comparisons presented in this report
were determined to be statistically signifi-
cant at the 95% confidence level, mean-
ing that the estimated difference is greater
than twice the standard error. Statements
of comparison qualified by language such as
"slightly," "somewhat," or "marginal"
indicate statistical significance at the 90%
level (1.6 standard errors). The estimates
are also subject to response errors, in-
cluding crimes that are forgotten or with-
held from the interviewer. Such response

errors tend to cause underestimated counts
of households victimized by crime. 6

The standard errors for the estimated
levels used in these calculations are
computed using the following formula:

\[ s.e.(x) = \sqrt{\frac{x}{y}} \]  

where

\[ x = \text{estimated number of personal or}
\]  

\[ y = \text{base population or total number of}
\]  

\[ b = \text{a constant equal to 4321.}
\]

5Details of the NCVS sample design, the standard
error computation, and the customary assumption
procedure for victimization risks and counts may be
found in Criminal Victimization in the United States,
1990, NCJ-134129, February 1992, appendix III.

6A more detailed description of the procedures used
to estimate households victimized by crime appears in
an unpublished memorandum prepared by the U.S.
Bureau of the Census. The memorandum is available
from Lisa Bastian, NCVS Programs, 633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.,
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