

SEXUAL AGGRESSION AMONG PRISON INMATES

by

DANIEL LOCKWOOD

NCJRS

ALB - 9 1977

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

a Dissertation Submitted to the

SCHOOL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

August, 1977

128/9

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge my great debt to the hundreds of New York State prisoners who, patiently and enthusiastically, shared with me their experiences and ideas. The cooperation of the New York State Department of Correctional Services made this collaboration possible; I especially thank Earl Mayo, Fran Mills, and John Parker for assisting me to contact interviewees. Financial support for the research came entirely from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration: I gathered the data under the aegis of an LEAA research grant ("Interventions for Inmate Survival,"); a Graduate Research Fellowship from LEAA supported me for the year it took to analyze the data and write this report.

I thank the faculty of the School of Criminal Justice of the State University of New York at Albany for nurturing my growth in this field. I am grateful to Robert Hardt and William Brown, members of my dissertation committee, for their intelligent assistance. Michael Gottfredson and Commissioner Stephen Chinlund suggested meaningful changes. I also owe a debt to my colleagues on the "Interventions" grant - particularly James Fox and John Gibbs - for sharing with me their experience and skill. Hans Toch, chairman of my dissertation committee and director of the Interventions grant, guided and encouraged me from the time I presented a paper on this same topic in his class on violence until I defended the dissertation four years later.

Linda Beecher and Kathy Schmit transcribed the interviews. Phyllis R. Hladik, skillful and dedicated, typed the final drafts. David Wicks helped to code the interviews and make the incident diagrams.

ABSTRACT

Using transcribed interviews and background data from prison files, 107 "targets" of aggressive sexual threats and 45 inmate "aggressors" from New York State male prisons are examined. Targets are compared to "non-targets," and aggressors are compared to other prisoners. Interview material traces the impact of sexual victimization on targets and presents the aggressors' viewpoint. Staff handling of the problem is described.

While some targets and all aggressors were located through availability sampling, a random survey was also conducted. This survey found that 28 percent of prisoners interviewed had been targets of sexual aggressors at least once in their institutional career. Only one inmate had been sexually assaulted, suggesting that prevalence of prison rape is low relative to other categories of harm accompanying sexual incidents: inmates are abused physically, abused by threatening or insulting language, or subjected to propositions perceived by their targets as threatening.

Targets, compared to non-targets, tend to be young, white, non-violent offenders from non-urban areas who have slight builds and have higher rates of mental health residency and in-prison suicide attempts. Otherwise, the criminal records and social histories of targets resemble those of non-targets. Most incidents occur anywhere in the institutions where men congregate, and take place within the first 16 weeks of a target's confinement to state prison.

The 107 targets reported 152 incidents, which were content analyzed to describe the target-aggressor interaction. Aggression is often carried out by aggressors working together. About half of the incidents resulted in physical

violence and another third contained threats. Diagrammed and grouped, the sequences of moves in the incidents show patterns of escalation to physical violence having as much to do with communication issues as exploitation itself. Targets carry out a form of violence resembling victim-precipitated homicide, rationalizing their behavior by saying it lets others know they are "straight" and/or tough and that it deters sexual attacks. Peers and staff support such attitudes.

Clinical interviews explored the impact of victimization. Regardless of the level of force used in the sexual approach, fear, anger, and anxiety are common responses. Personal crises, sometimes accompanied by suicidal thoughts or gestures, follow about a third of the incidents. Suspicion and fear can alter social relations: some targets isolate themselves while others join cliques for protection. White targets, generally confronted with black aggressors, report the growth of racial hatred. Targets also report that victimization leads to lower thresholds for violent behavior and explosiveness. Targets' believe that sexual approaches easily lead to rape, their disdain of homosexuality, and a lack of acceptable solutions increases the impact of their experience.

Prison rapes occur when gangs of aggressors circumvent security arrangements and hold physical control over victims. In these cases, impact is severe. Fear, anxiety, suicidal thoughts, social disruption, and attitude changes follow homosexual rape: stigma and fear of stigma are major concerns. There is, however, little evidence of changes in sexual behavior or patterns of subsequent victimization discussed in the literature on the topic.

Comparing aggressors to a randomly selected comparison group, subcultural hypotheses become plausible explanations for sexual aggression. Statistically significant differences are found on the variables of age, ethnicity, violent disciplinary infractions, and a record of juvenile commitment. While not differing greatly from the comparison group, high percentages of aggressors have characteristics such as low education and economic levels, childhood marked by broken families headed by women, and records for violent offenses. The subcultural thesis thus helps to explain sexual aggression but provides little help in separating aggressors from other prisoners. Interview excerpts describe group processes motivating sex aggression and aggressors' sexual values supporting the activity.

Prison staff know about the victimization problem and take diligent measures to control it: vulnerable prisoners are often offered protective housing. So long as this social ecology persists, sexual aggression in its less flagrant forms will continue but prevalence of prison rape is unlikely.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
ABSTRACT	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Background: Origins of the Dissertation	1
Scope of the Inquiry	3
Implications and General Themes	4
Definition of Terms	6
Research Perspective	8
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	12
Prevalence	12
The Relation of Sexual Aggression to Prison Violence	16
Impact on Targets	21
Explanations for Sexual Aggression	29
3. METHODOLOGY	61
Target Study: Sampling and Data Collection	61
Discussion of the Target Sample	68
Aggressor Study: Sampling and Data Collection	75
Staff Study	81
Data Analysis Methods	82
4. STATISTICAL FINDINGS	86
Prevalence Levels	86
Ethnicity	89
Target Physical Appearance	101
Potential for Violence	104
Institutional Adjustment	108
Mental Health Residence	115

Age	115
Social History: Education, Occupation, and Family Background	119
Convictions, Sentences, and Incarceration Experience	122
Times and Places Incidents Occur	127
Summary	137
Influence of Target Sampling on Statistical Conclusions	139
Conclusion	142
5. THE TARGET-AGGRESSOR INTERACTION	147
Participants: Number of Aggressors and Activity of Peers	147
Incident Duration	149
Use of Violence and Threats	154
Types of Victimization	160
Sequence of Moves	165
Incident Resolutions	170
6. Target Violence	180
Violence as a Medium for a Message	180
Violence as a Means of Curbing Violence	185
Support Systems for Violence	186
Problems with Violent Solutions	196
7. THE IMPACT OF AGGRESSION ON TARGETS	201
Emotional Reactions	201
Lifestyle Changes	222
Social Relations	225
Racial Attitudes	231
Attitudes about Violence	233

Beliefs Affecting Impact	235
Floundering for Solutions	240
Summary	243
8. VICTIMS OF PRISON RAPE	246
A Case of Sexual Assault	247
Why Rape Can Occur	250
Immediate Victim Reactions	254
Long-Range Effects	260
9. EXPLAINING SEXUAL AGGRESSION	268
Research Hypotheses	268
Method	271
Findings: Background Characteristics and Research Hypotheses	277
Do the Background Characteristics Support the Hypotheses?	306
Typology of Aggressor Approaches	307
Group Process in Sexual Aggression	313
Aggressor Sexuality	320
10. STAFF PERSPECTIVE	328
Staff Knowledge of the Problem	329
How Staff Understand the Problem	336
Issues Concerning Staff Action to Help Targets	345
11. ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS RAISED BY THE FINDINGS	351
APPENDIXES	
Appendix A: Data Collection Instruments	366
Appendix B: Data Analysis Instruments	371
REFERENCES	382

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Background: Origins of the Dissertation

I carried out the research for this dissertation under the aegis of the project, "Interventions for Inmate Survival." As a staff member of this grant, I enjoyed financial support, and had near absolute access to New York State prison records, prison staff, and prisoners. Members of the "Interventions" grant shared the methodology they had employed on previous studies which has been adapted for this dissertation.¹

In this methodology, clinical and social psychology are applied to problems experienced by clients of the system. From James Fox, I learned how to conduct clinical interviews. From John Gibbs, I learned about the systematic collection, analysis, and presentation of quantitative data. Hans Toch has helped me shape my thematic analysis and written report.

As part of the "Interventions" grant, I investigated the Protection Company at Attica.² Here, I was able to test and improve my data collection instruments before plunging into this dissertation topic. While some of the Attica Protection interviews applied to the dissertation, the real value of

starting out in another prison situation than that in which I conducted the research for this study was the opportunity to learn about prison research in a less sensitive arena than the one I had chosen for the dissertation.

The Interventions grant was an inquiry into the environmental needs of prisoners and the psychological attributes of prison environments. Looking at ways to match man to environment, the project sought to improve prisoners' chances of psychological survival in confinement.³ The study of sexual aggression fit neatly into this grant because some prisoners have a predominant need for safety. To the extent that sex aggression makes prison a place of fear, targets of sex aggression are plausible clients for "intervention for inmate survival."

The staff of the New York State Department of Correctional Services enthusiastically supported the Interventions project. Generally, staff members viewed the project as an enterprise offering solutions to important problems. Consequently, I have experienced complete cooperation. Staff gave me access to all records, provided private interviewing rooms, and "called out" any prisoners and employees I wished to interview. At a seminar held for Department staff in Albany, I had the opportunity to report to prison officials some of my research findings.

When the Interventions grant ended, a Graduate Research Fellowship from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration supported me for the year it took to analyze the data and write the final report. Without this generous contribution, the information we describe here would still be locked in thousands of pages of interviews and data sheets.

Scope of the Inquiry

This dissertation explores sexual aggression in male prisons. Studying a continuum of aggressive behavior ranging from subtle pressure to rapes, we examine target responses that range from anxiety to murder. We describe two types of men; those who become aggressors and those who become targets. Their experiences are related to the world of the prison community. Sexual aggression is, thus, placed in its subcultural and administrative context.

Our inquiry is limited to sexual behavior perceived as threatening and offensive by targets of the aggressor. This approach differs from those of past writers who have examined prison homosexuality.⁴ At one time, prison researchers expounded on the mental health damage presumed to follow from consensual prison homosexuality.⁵ Their definition of the problem derived from the perspective of the outsider outraged and offended by "deviance" and "perversity." However, we define the social problem from the perspective of men who experience it. Defining the problem from the perspective of troubled inmates leads us to extend our research beyond sexual assault to the broad continuum of activity perceived as aggressive by its targets. When prison literature discusses sex aggression, it does so with emphasis on sexual assault. Sexual assault, however, is only one form of sexual aggression in prison. Other types of threats

affect more men than those who are victims of prison rape. Incidents falling short of completed rapes can cause tangible crisis and breakdown among susceptible inmates. Violent reactions result in damaging encounters.

In the modern prison, where custody administrators apply contemporary standards of inmate security, incidents of sexual assault are low relative to institutions where inmate security is neglected. The problem, however, does not end simply by making facilities secure.⁷ Our research documents sexual victimization short of rape in terms of trauma, breakdown, and personal disruption. These events occur in a prison system thought of as having a "low" rate of sexual assault. In this setting, single cells are mandated by state law, and well-trained staff carry out effective custodial measures. Yet, sexual aggression continues to be a problem. It can be a concern in the most "professional"⁸ of prisons. Extending the problem definition means we are discussing a matter not likely to disappear as the trend toward modernization of prison systems continues.

Implications and General Themes

Sexual aggression, to an extent, characterizes a certain percentage of all erotic encounters in our culture, regardless of race or social class.⁹ Ultimately, the implications of this study extend to aggressive behavior and values prevailing throughout our society.¹⁰ As Sykes notes about the prison aggressor, "His perversion is a form of rape and his victim happens to be a man rather than a woman, due to force of circumstances."¹¹

Prison sexual aggression is unique in that the targets are men. The masculine response to sexual threat brings out significant themes relevant to the general study of male behavior. The meaning of homosexuality colors and shapes the phenomena we study here. Some stress following victimization can be related to men's perception of the horror of appearing homosexual. The intensity connected to the average male's desire for a masculine image is an issue for aggressors and victims.

Another theme characteristic of this inquiry is that of violence. The study of prison sexual aggression is a study of violence. To the extent that either aggressors or targets may become violent, the outcome is related to other types of violence caused by interactions rather than original intentions. Force escalating beyond the intent of participants, problems of communication, and responses resulting from fear or slighted pride: these are features of violent interactions ranging from family quarrels to international warfare.

In addition to the general concerns of sexuality and violence, our research leads us to the theme of ethnicity. In the prison community, most aggressors are black; most targets are white.

Prison sexual aggression is a case study of inter-racial crime. White racism follows from or is re-inforced by the predatory actions of blacks. Fear of attack becomes fear of blacks. Why do whites become targets? Why blacks aggressors? What are the effects of the racial pattern of victimization? Our research must deal with these questions.

Another theme is the contribution of aggression to the meaning of the prison experience. To inmates in a penitentiary, the formal structure of a prison may be a thin veneer. The "real" world may come from the informal social environment created by the convict community. Sexual aggression, a component of this social environment, exemplifies the hold informal processes have on life in total institutions.

Definition of Terms

Sexual Aggression

Sexual aggression, for the purpose of this research, is defined as behavior which leads a man to feel that he is the target of aggressive sexual intentions. For our purposes, the perception of the target becomes more important than the objective actions of the aggressor in defining the situation. This definition is a problem-centered definition. We seek to contain within a term and subject area behavior which constitutes a psychologically tangible problem for men who are the objects of the behavior.
12

We view sexual aggression as a continuum marked by different levels of attempts to exploit, and different levels of reaction to exploitation. At the bottom of the continuum we might see a target imagining aggression from an aggressor's overture. At the top we might see the gang rape. Along this continuum, any incident of aggression is created as much by the interaction that unfolds as by the intentions of the aggressors.

The definition of sexual aggression we use differs from those of other writers. For Amir, for example, the uniqueness of rape is "anchored in an attempt

to enforce some reciprocity and mutual sexual orientation."¹³ Certainly, part of the activity we describe falls into this definition. But we also describe activity, which we define as sexual aggression, where the aggressor is not attempting to enforce his sexual attentions on the target.

Sexual Aggressors

In general, we use the word "aggressor" to refer to the prisoner who initiates the incident. For the specific purpose of examining the correlates of aggressive sexual behavior, we have chosen a group of aggressors marked by their use of force or the threat of force in prison sexual incidents. These men are "sexually aggressive" in the restricted sense of accompanying their overtures with violence or threats.

Targets

The target of sexual aggression is the recipient of a perceived aggressor's approach. Some targets are victims of rapes; others flee when confronted with talk of sex. Most targets encounter some form of violence or verbal threat. Others, however, create a fearful situation from stimuli not definable as threatening by objective indices. We call all of these men targets. We explore varieties of experience and behavior contained in the "target" concept. Our "targets" are not necessarily "victims." Bartollas, et al, for example, define victimization as a situation where "an imbalance exists in which one party is clearly the loser."¹⁴ Our definition of a target, including some who become "victims," also covers situations where the target (e.g., by being extremely violent) becomes the "winner" and the aggressor becomes the "loser" or "victim."

Sexual Assault

In the prisons we worked in, sexual assault generally refers to oral or anal sodomy. As in heterosexual rape, a sexual act of this kind must take place for an incident to be termed a sexual assault.

Our definition of sexual assault differs from the legal one used by Alan J. Davis in a report on "Sexual Assaults in the Philadelphia Prison System and Sheriff's vans." In this investigation, carried out by a District Attorney's office, "Sexual assaults were defined to include forcible buggery (anal penetration), forcible sodomy (oral penetration) and solicitations accompanied by physical assault or threats, and other coercive solicitations."¹⁵ Davis' legal definition could apply to a broad interpretation of prisoners' legal right to be free of sexual assault, but in our examination of target and aggressor behavior, we find our more limited definition more precise and useful. Omitting "coercive solicitations", brings our meaning of sexual assault close to the definition employed in most prisons.

Propositioning

We define propositioning as a request for sex that is not accompanied by force or threats. We need such a term because we are extending the "target" concept to cover men who feel themselves to be in trouble, who perceive themselves to be the object of aggressors, but who are not the objects of objectively aggressive behavior.

Research Perspective

Our topic concerns itself with criminal and victim behavior. Seen within the context of prison life, this behavior calls for an understanding of unique

subcultural values, a close look at the backgrounds of the participants, and close scrutiny of actual events. We believe an adequate account of prison sexual aggression, like an adequate account of criminal justice affairs in general, calls for the examination of "multiple systems transacting."¹⁶ The participants - targets, aggressors, non-targets, and staff-come together bearing varied cultural values and varied individual psychologies. These participants interact in an arena (the prison environment) where individual factors merge with group processes. Conflict and aggression in prison is individually handicrafted by men under the guidance of institutional forces. Background and milieu bring about sexual aggression.

Throughout this inquiry we are concerned with measuring in terms of objective indices the extent of the problem, its impact on vulnerable men, its frequency in different types of institutions, and the way it affects different types of men. Understanding sexual aggression requires a descriptive base. As much as possible, we endeavor to present grouped data which are the results of systematic analysis. At the same time, we extract themes from typical (or atypical) cases. We make inferences from individual experiences. Seeing sexual aggression from the perspective of the men involved, examining their thoughts and feelings, requires us to look into individual, as well as grouped, data.

In conclusion, this dissertation is a social psychological examination of a social problem. Our choice of topic, our definitions, come from the concerns of troubled men. Our methods, our view of research, come from different academic fields. While focusing on the specific issue of sexual aggression among male prisoners, our work relates to the general areas of victimization, violence, and "corrections."

Footnotes: Chapter One

1

Hans Toch: Violent Men. Chicago: Aldine, 1969. See also Hans Toch: Men in Crisis. Chicago: Aldine, 1975.

2

Daniel Lockwood: "Living in Protection." In Hans Toch: Survival in Prison. New York: The Free Press (in press).

3

Hans Toch: "Interventions for Inmate Survival." Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Grant Proposal, 1974. (Funded as Grant Number 75 NL-99-0030).

4

John Irwin: "Some Research Questions on Homosexuality in Jails and Prison," (unpublished manuscript, 1971), 12. See also Peter C. Buffum, Homosexuality in Prisons. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972, 25.

5

This attitude dominated writing about sex in prison until recently. See, for example, Benjamin Karpman: Sex Life in Prison. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology. 3 (1948): 475-486; Donald Clemmer: The Prison Community. Boston: Christopher Publishing House, 1958; and Clyde B. Vedder and Patricia G. King: Problems of Homosexuality in Corrections. Springfield (Ill.): Thomas, 1967.

6

The report of a conference on prison homosexuality noted the dangers of examining only sexual assault. Buffum, 2.

7 Benjamin E. Britt, for example, describes a poignant case of sexual victimization followed by self-injury and emotional trauma. He concludes, "a single cell ...plus the usual supervision would have been sufficient [as a solution]." "A Case to Illustrate the Need for Single Cells in Prison." Popular Government. 32 (April 1966): 2.

⁸ The problem is noted as occurring in the federal system: See Loren Roth, "Territoriality and Homosexuality in a Male Prison Population." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. 41 (1971): 510-513. A survey of prison violence in California prisons found 13 percent of violent encounters stemming from sexual approaches. See Task Force for Institutional Violence?"Aggressive History Profile and Known Reason for Violence Against Victims (CDC and YA Combined)." (mimeo, 1965). See also Clemens Bartollas, Stuart J. Miller, and Simon Dinitz: Juvenile Victimization. New York: Sage Publications, 1976, 265.

⁹E.J. Kanin found 25% of 241 college males reporting their own sex aggression at some time since they entered college. See "Male Aggression and Three Psychiatric Hypotheses." Journal of Sex Research, 1 (1965), 222.

¹⁰ See Germaine Greer: "Seduction is a four letter word." In Leroy G. Schultz: Rape Victimology. Springfield, [Ill.], Thomas, 1975.

¹¹Gresham M. Sykes: The Society of Captives. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971, 97.

¹²A similar definition of sex aggression is used in a study of "offender-offended" heterosexual relationships. Eugene J. Kanin: Selected Dyadic Aspects of Male Aggression." in Schultz, op.cit.,59.

¹³Menachem Amir: Patterns in Forcible Rape. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1971, 129.

¹⁴ Bartollas et al, 35.

¹⁵Unpublished report kindly provided by the author (1968),2.

¹⁶John P. Spiegel": "The Dynamics of Violent Confrontations." International Journal of Psychiatry 10(3) 1972, 96.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Prevalence

We find information about force used to obtain sexual access in prisoners' accounts, journalists' reports, government investigations, law cases, and scholarly books and articles.¹ This material leads one to assume that rape and lesser forms of sexual aggression have probably always been a problem in male prisons.²

The Scottsboro Boy tells of the experiences of a young man who entered a Southern prison several decades ago. In this prison, aggressors, "wolves," were apparently allowed free rein, and then forced weaker men to be their "gal boys." According to the author, virtually all convicts were caught up in this destructive system, which involved savage exploitation of weaker inmates and could be viewed as the major cause of violence in the prison.³

Other sources document similar pictures. The protagonist in The Jack Roller, an early classic in criminology, talks about sexual aggression in a reform school to which young men were sent to in the 1920's. Sociologists such as Sykes in the Fifties found sexual aggression in the institutions they studied, and psychiatrists and other professionals working in prisons have also noted the occurrence of the problem.⁴ Legal cases, law review articles, and works on prison violence cite instances of sexual aggression, as do books about notorious criminals.⁵ Vincent Bugliosi, in Helter Skelter, for example, tells about Charles

Manson, a 17 year old federal prisoner at that time in the Natural Bridge Camp, holding a razor blade to a youth's throat while he sodomized him. Losing 97 days good time, Manson was transferred to the Federal Penitentiary at Petersburg, Virginia. Within the next eight months, Manson, who was to leave prison and become a pimp and a murderer, sexually attacked three other prisoners.⁷

Sexual aggression also is described in prisons outside the United States. S. P. Srivastava, who wrote his Ph.D dissertation about an Indian prison, talks of sexual exploitation in an institution in Uttar Pradesh. Aggressors, or laundbaajs, in this prison coerced "boyish young newcomers." They used subtle tricks as well as outright force and openly bragged of their exploits. Victims underwent a terrible defamation process.⁸

Former prisoners have written about sexual aggression. Especially interesting among these personal writings are the accounts of conscientious objectors who served time during the Vietnam War. These articulate and literate draft resisters were ⁹ in a high risk category because they were young, middle-class, and white. Bob Martin, an active Quaker and journalist, was put in a Washington, D.C. jail following an antiwar action. Here, he was beaten and forcibly raped ¹⁰ some sixty times.

David Miller, a conscientious objector serving time in the federal system, was transferred from the Allenwood Camp to the maximum security penitentiary at Lewisburg. In Lewisburg, Miller became the target of sexual aggressors who offered him gifts and protection in exchange for compliance. As Miller resisted, the aggressors became more forceful. As a believer in non-violence, Miller refused to use force to protect himself. As a result, he found going to the "hole"

the only way he had of solving the problem. After leaving prison, Miller describes his experiences as a guide for draft resisters going to prison as well as for inmates committed to non-violence.

In contrast to the middle-class conscientious objectors' stance toward unwanted sexual advances is Piri Thomas' advice to his nephew, a New York City Puerto Rican entering Great Meadow Correctional Facility:

Well, [Thomas says to his nephew], the first time he says something to you or looks wrong at you, have a piece of pipe or a good heavy piece of two-by-four. Don't say a damn thing to him, just get that heavy wasting material and walk right up to him and bash out his face and keep bashing 'til he's down and out, and yell loud and clear for all the other cons to hear you.

'Mother Fucker, I'm a man. I came in here a mother-fucking man. Next time I'll kill you.'

The best known investigation of prison rape is that reported in "Sexual Assault in the Philadelphia Prison System and Sheriff's Vans." This inquiry was commissioned by the Philadelphia Police Department and court system in 1968, and it serves as an example of the seriousness of the rape problem where aggressors congregate and officials do not adequately protect vulnerable prisoners. The Philadelphia report estimates that of 60,000 inmates going through the city's system in a 26 month period, 2,000 men were subject to sexual assaults. Davis warns that "virtually every slightly built young man committed

13
by the courts is sexually approached within hours after his admission to prison."

Other findings of the Philadelphia investigation are that

- 1) victims tend to be white;
- 2) victims tend to be younger and smaller than aggressors;
- 3) most victims are afraid to report their aggressors to the authorities;
- 4) virtually every person having the characteristics of a potential victim is approached sexually by aggressors;
- 5) aggressors tend to be black;
- 6) aggressors tend to be guilty of more serious and more assaultive felonies than victims; and
- 7) both aggressors and victims tend to be younger than other prison inmates.

The Philadelphia report has received wide publicity, and the city has used
15
its findings to reform its prison system. The question remains, of course, as
of how many similar situations may exist elsewhere in the country. Sections of
the "Philadelphia report" are reproduced in numerous books and articles, and
some commentators, without grounds, allege that the rape rate in the Philadelphia
16
report applies to other penal settings.

Only a few other research studies are available. Bartolles, Miller and
Dinitz estimated that 16 of 149 boys in an Ohio training school were being sex-
ually exploited at the time of their research in the mid 1970's. Fuller,
17
Orsagh, and Raber estimated the sexual assault rate in 1976 for the North Carolina

Prison system as less than one percent based on 30-31 incidents of sexual assault yearly
18 among a population of 4495 . Nationwide nothing is known about rates of prison rape and no estimates exist for the percentages of prisoners who have been targets according to our definition.

In New York, we know that inmates have expressed concern about sexual attack to investigating officials. The State Special Commission on Attica
19 found that "inmates were not protected from unwelcome homosexual advances."
In addition, "the Commission found that popular conceptions of homosexual ad-
20 vances and assaults in prison were not exaggerated." Younger prisoners in New York City's Adolescent Remand Shelter spoke of fear of sexual assault to
21 the chairman of the Board of Corrections. When ombudsmen for the Division for Youth visited boys training schools in 1973, juveniles complained about
22 their fears of sexual attack.

The Relation of Sexual Aggression to Prison Violence

23

Most prison violence consists of inmates assaulting other inmates. As John Conrad points out, some basic features of prisons lead to such conflict: violent men and men from violent subcultures live in prison; as violence behind the walls becomes acceptable behavior, the prison world itself becomes a "subculture of violence." Men live with other men from different cultures, some who are dangerous and others who are perceived to be dangerous. As prisoners become distrustful and fearful, they arm themselves and prepare themselves psychologically for fighting. And prison, by definition a coercive organization, leads its clients away from official (peaceful) goals

24

toward endorsement of subcultural (violent) goals. In such a milieu sexual aggression results in three types of violence: 1) aggressors use violence to intimidate targets, 2) targets react violently to sexual approaches, and 3) aggressors react violently to target refusals, perceiving such rebuffs to be insults or challenges to fight.

A study of violence in six California prisons in 1963 and 1964 indicates the kinds of contribution that sexual aggression can make to prison violence. The report breaks inmate-to-inmate assaults into the following categories:

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 1. Accidental, real or imagined insult combined with hypersensitivity | 35% |
| 2. Homosexual activities | 25% |
| 3. Pressuring (for possessions) | 15% |
| 4. Racial conflict | 12% |
| 5. Informant activities | 9% |
| 6. Retaliation for past assaults | 7% |

Incidents attributed to homosexuality divide almost equally between homosexual rivalry (12 percent) and homosexual force (13 percent).
26

Hans Toch, a member of the Task Force on Institutional Violence which produced these figures, included violent sexual aggressors in his typology of violence, classifying them as "Homosexual Rapists" and "Homosexual Snub Rejectors." The Homosexual Rapist, using violence to help secure an otherwise unwilling homosexual partner, can be classified into two types: (1) the Sexer, who uses violence as a direct means of promoting submission, and (2) the Intimidator,

who uses violence to get his victim to willingly cooperate. The Homosexual Snub Rejector or "Toughness Demonstrator", is an "aggressive homosexual whose overtures have been rejected.....Violence is used to redress hurt self-esteem and to heal wounded pride." Toch provides the following example:

Inmate R is asleep in his cell; D enters and beats him about the head with a cell stool. Investigation reveals that D has pressured R for homosexual favors, and R has reacted by indicating that he did not indulge in such interactions with "niggers." D became angry because of the rebuff and because
27
he has been called names.

Other writers, speculating about aggressors' underlying motives, claim that aggressors may use violence beyond the level necessary to subdue the victim.
28 According to this view, excessive violence is neither instrumental for the sexual aim (i.e., it doesn't help aggressors to "cop" or "score") nor does it result from being rejected. Rather, aggressors abuse targets "in order to show power.
29 or dominance over other human beings." They are motivated to display violence in personal situations because their socio-economic position blocks
30 legitimate expressions of masculine dominance. While this idea has solid roots in the literature on violence, its relevance to the prison scene has been
31 unsubstantiated by empirical observation. No one has measured the amounts of gratuituous brutality accompanying incidents of sexual aggression much less
32 interviewed aggressors about their motives. Nonetheless, writing on prison sexual aggression is dominated by the theory that aggressors are violent because

they are suffering from thwarted masculinity drives: it is assumed that in order to overcome this disability aggressors must openly display brutality toward targets.

The same idea appears in interpretations of heterosexual rape, but more modulated, part of a typology of motives rather than as a single cause. Gebhard, et al and Cohen, et al both classify aggressors according to the amounts of

33
unnecessary violence in their acts. Sometimes violence is the sole need of the rapist; in other cases rapists are assumed to pursue sex only. Amir looks beyond individual needs in interpreting aggressors' violence. In upholding a "subcultural interpretation of sexual aggression," Amir states, "aggressive behavior is not a result of deviant sexuality but can be viewed as originating from participation in a group which condones the use of force in attaining

34
goals." For Amir, violence accompanying sexual aggression is not so much a personal expression as it is a culturally inspired act.

The study of violence and sexual aggression can also examine target reactions. Toch's typology recognized one such reaction, that of the "Homosexual Self-Defender," who uses violence against men who make sexual approaches to him in order to get these men to leave him alone. As Toch states, "The effort here is to get out of a corner by eliminating whoever is blocking the exit." For example:

Following a heated altercation between inmates S and L,

S obtains a razor blade, enters L's cell, and cuts L about the face and chest. S testifies that L had visited him to

involve him in homosexual activities, and had been pressuring him. Other inmate sources point out that S has
³⁶ been under pressure from several homosexuals.

Observers have described target reactions of this kind in a number of settings.³⁷ Following the riot of 1971, the McKay Commission interviewed inmates in Attica, who frequently voiced their belief that violence is the only way to ward off attacks. The Commission noted:

The irony was not lost on the inmates. They perceived themselves surrounded by walls and gates, and tightly regimented by a myriad of written and unwritten rules; but when they needed protection, they often had to resort to the same skills that had brought many of them to Attica in the first
³⁸ place.

When targets fight aggressors, it reminds us of the phenomenon of victim precipitated homicide. Offenders are incited to assaultive responses by the aggressive actions of their victims. Victims of targets (sexual aggressors), like homicide victims in the street, often have been previously arrested for
³⁹ crimes of violence. Their patterns of conduct involve them in situations which provoke others to hostile reactions. In prison, which is a physical environment enforcing contact between antagonists, the probability of an aggressor provoking a violent response may be even greater than in the street. As Albert Cohen points out, prisons create "back-against-the-wall situations"
⁴⁰ because threatened men often lack the option of withdrawing.

Target violence may also be motivated by the desire to show others one is tough. Baftollas, Miller, and Dinitz, in their study of juvenile victimization,⁴¹ note that newcomers who demonstrate strength are left alone. Such statements imply that the use of violence, or the display of a violent front, is a practical and useful tool for survival in prison. If this is so, what becomes of those who cannot meet the expectations of this manly model? We have seen how David Miller, the conscientious objector serving time in Lewisburg, found non-violence to be a difficult stance to maintain in prison, where non-violent men are deviants from the majority position. Even where inmates have no moral scruples against violence, however, they may fail to respond properly. Wolfgang and Ferricuti point out how some people, because of their class background, cannot match the expectations prevailing among subcultures of violence. They may become victims when they fail to respond properly (i.e.,⁴² violently) to overtures from a violent person.

Impact on Targets

John Irwin has been one of the few social scientists to point out the impact of sexual aggression (defined broadly) on vulnerable convicts:

Irwin has pointed to the nearly constant bombardment on heterosexual integrity which typifies prison. Jokes, innuendos, and attempts to seduce or assault are characteristic fare from the time of entry into prison and, in Irwin's opinion, constitute one of the most crippling aspects of prison climate.⁴³

While the effects of sexually aggressive behavior on its targets has been virtually ignored in the literature, it has been customary to assign to victims an imaginative list of consequences supposedly following from sexual assault.

Friar and Weiss, in a recent book, Terror in the Prisons, state one of the most common assumptions: "Repeated homosexual rape causes the inmate victims to develop a new sexual identity. They now harbor a raped female in their male bodies."⁴⁴

Other assumptions include the idea that victims become willing

"kids" of prison "daddies" and that recidivism can be linked to embitterment

engendered by prison victimization.⁴⁵ These assumptions lack empirical underpinnings and only refer to sexual assault, neglecting the effects of less drastic but more common levels of force.

In actuality, there has never been a clinical study of male sexual assault victims, much less a close look at the targets of lesser levels of force.

The most closely related work is that of Bartollas, Miller and Dinitz, which looks at the target experience in terms of the social role it entails. However, Bartollas, et al., rely greatly on staff describing how inmates are victimized.⁴⁶

Their study entailed staff identifying boys along an exploited-exploiting continuum. After staff rated the boys, the researchers gave the boys several psychological tests, none of which showed significant differences.⁴⁷

Many comments in the book, while valuable, are based on unsystematic observation.

The approach in Juvenile Victimization assumes that vital features of institutional life are determined by the interaction of "social roles."⁴⁸ The

authors present a hierarchy of exploiting and exploited role categories, whose occupants' behavior is supposedly governed by the expectations contained in these role definitions. Targets of sexual aggression are tested by peers upon arrival and are assigned to roles according to their responses. The effect of the target experience is social: it locks one into a degrading status. Emotional impacts can be traced to the "roles" victims are pressured to adopt: "Quality of life centers around labels....they [the exploited] have almost no opportunity to challenge the effects of the labels."⁴⁹

The lowest possible social roles described by Bartollas, Miller and Dinitz call for prisoners to accept continual victimization. In a ranking of 13 levels of exploitation, the top three levels (the worst) refer to men who are available for varieties of sexual victimization: anal sodomy, masturbation of others and oral sodomy.⁵⁰ Boys subject to these indignities are compelled to occupy the social role of the "scapegoat." They are "viewed as a social outcast, someone to be avoided," and undergo "role engulfment." They learn to act as others expect them to act, and "accommodation to the role entails becoming a willing sex object of others." In short, the impact of severe sexual victimization is understood as an identity transformation.⁵¹ The scapegoat begins a "deviant career" when he is victimized, and continues to serve as a low status sexual outlet for others throughout his institutional career; the boy's "label" follows him around and mandates his responses as well as his social position.

The authors link emotional states to failure to adjust to imposed roles. Those at the bottom of the "exploitation matrix" are susceptible to "withdrawal,⁵² isolation, medication, mental breakdown, runaway, or suicide." Hopelessness results for some when their victimization causes them to be confronted with "an unmanageable problem which was unshareable."⁵³

These boys manifest feelings such as "shame and humiliation," "despair and hopelessness," and "fear and anxiety."⁵⁴

While Juvenile Victimization is an original - and in some respects outstanding - contribution to a neglected subject, it is limited by the fact that we must rely on staff assessments of boys rather than on statements from the boys themselves. For other conclusions, especially those referring to mental health impacts, we must rely on a small number of unsystematic interviews. Finally, we must rely on the applicability, and relevance and importance of the social role and labeling perspective. Without belief in the dominant place of social role, many of the work's conclusions can be unconvincing. Ultimately, the value of this study depends on the degree to which the institutional experience is, in fact, governed by the interaction of social types or "roles."

Huffman, writing about "Problems Precipitated by Homosexual Approaches on Youthful First Offenders," is the only student in the literature dealing explicitly with the psychological impact of sexual approaches on men in prison. Looking at 62 men transferred to a correctional psychiatric facility from prison following sexual advances, Huffman concludes that "the sexual advance had caused them extreme anxiety, confusion and tension. Some had reacted by feigning suicide or by other impulsive behavior."⁵⁵ Only two of the men were returned to the prison they came from. The others were treated for mental illness.

The medical diagnosis of these men follows a then [1961] standard formula:

"Schizophrenic reaction following a homosexual panic." Here, the thing that matters most is the inner conflict felt by the target, who is assumed to be torn between a desire to go along with propositions and the dictates of his conscience, which sternly forbid such behavior. This dilemma, according to psychiatric interpretation, is sufficiently serious to cause temporary mental illness, in and out of prison. The concept of "homosexual panic" has been used through the years to describe a type of anxiety - especially among adolescents - which is thought to stem from one's attraction to homosexuality and a strong, super-ego abhorrence to homosexual activity. To clinicians who apply such a diagnosis, it is relatively unimportant if the aggressive approach arouses fear. What is important to look at is the inner-conflict, not the outer conflict. The stress reaction, according to its interpretation, results when males feel that they may yield to their own homosexual urges, not apprehension resulting from the possibility that they could be forced into sexual activity.

This interpretation disassociates homosexual victimization from aggressive approaches on females by males, where reactions cannot be linked to homosexual panics. Women who are the objects of aggressive approaches (mostly falling short of rape), reported their feelings in questionnaires given by Kanin and Kirkpatrick: while guilt, fear and disgust were widely mentioned, anger was
57
the emotion most often reported. It is unfortunate that data such as these recording the effects on women of a continuum of offensive sexual behavior is slight . for it could provide a useful comparison to the male experience. We

can, however, turn to studies of the emotional impact of rape on women. Such is the topic of Rape: Victims of Crisis, by Burgess and Holmstrom, which has become the operating manual for rape crisis intervention centers around the country.

58

The authors of this study, one a nurse and the other a sociologists, ran a treatment and research program for rape victims for two years out of the emergency ward of a Boston hospital. Basing their findings on clinical interviews with rape victims, they describe a typical "rape trauma syndrome." The symptoms of the acute state, which occurs immediately after the event, include physical pain and psychosomatic reactions such as changes in sleeping and eating patterns. Emotional reactions include mood swings, irritability with other people, recurring memories of the attack, and feelings of fear. Following the acute stage, rape victims report long term changes in life style: in seeking support, they contacted family members not ordinarily seen; some moved from their homes; others began to employ protective travel patterns. Victims talk about changes in dream content in which recurring themes of being victimized themselves are accompanied by dreams of committing acts of violence on others. Victims report changes in feelings, especially the development of phobias:

they fear being alone; they fear crowds; they fear seeing the assailant again; they fear another attack; they fear male company. Many victims, the authors state, feel a "global fear of everyone." In fact, "it is this main feeling of fear that explains why victims develop the range of symptoms we call the rape trauma syndrome. Their symptoms are an acute stress reaction to the

59

61

threat of being killed." According to the authors, this stress reaction to fear can signal a crisis, "a crucial situation which, in turn, causes a dis-
equilibrium to an individual's life style."⁶² Similar to people reacting to natural disasters, the rape crisis victim must manage a sudden and unexpected event for which she is unprepared.⁶³ As George Caplan notes, the victim confronts a troublesome situation which she can "neither escape nor solve with...
64 customary problem solving resources."

The character of the crisis experience differs according to the personality styles of the victims. Crises seem to be more acute with adolescent victims (ages thirteen to nineteen). This group may be more vulnerable to crisis than other age groups because the external event becomes combined with the usual "identity crisis" associated with adolescence. Moreover, adolescents are less available for ameliorative measures because they are reticent with adults.⁶⁵ The authors note especially sharp reactions from those with prior psychiatric and social deficits. In these cases, the trauma of the rape seems to compound pre-existing problems.⁶⁶ Past experience with stress, i.e., success or failure in meeting it, is also as an important factor separating those who successfully resolve stress from those who cannot do so.⁶⁷

The connection between fear, stress, and crisis in prison is examined by Hans Toch in his book, Men in Crisis. On the basis of data derived from prisoners who made suicide attempts, Toch developed a typology of motives leading to breakdowns in prison. One of these categories, which is numerically one of the most important, describes men with fear-related crises.⁶⁸ While Toch does not

focus on the objective cause of fear, he mentions that it can be based on sex pressure.

Similar to Burgess and Holmstrom, Toch sees breakdown following the disruption of a persons' life. Stress is a "set of reactions that make it impossible for the person to continue functioning as he would ordinarily."⁷⁰ Specifically, breakdown in prison can lead to men isolating themselves, or becoming "disoriented, paralyzed, or helplessly self-destructive."⁷¹

Fear is an element in breakdown, according to Toch, when an individual sees himself as vulnerable. "Self-doubt translates into fear when a man thinks that the odds against him are overwhelming."⁷² The subject's thoughts and feelings can contribute to his condition to the extent that, in some cases, no "independently definable stimulus"⁷³ is necessary for a total collapse from fear.

Potentially fearful situations can bring breakdown before they occur when men doubt their capacity to manage them. According to Toch, it is not the offending behavior itself which we should look to in order to understand crises of fear. Rather, it is the perception of danger. In fact, self-doubt itself can explain the stress reaction. When one sees himself as weak, as ineffective or inadequate, it is easy to envision oneself as a potential victim. The fear this inspires can be more damaging than the objective danger an outsider would see.⁷⁴

Toch relates what happens when men break down from fear. Some feelings - hopelessness, and confusion, for example - lead to self-segregation or self-injury: the men became "disoriented," or "paralyzed."⁷⁵ Other feelings evoked

by fear - anger, hostility and explosiveness - sometimes result in "secondary victimization." Feelings of frustration lead to violent acts for which men are punished by officials or harmed by the inmates they react to. If rage is repressed, it can lead to tension. Fearful behavior by the victim can encourage aggressors to attack: if men show self-doubt in their demeanor, they attract aggressors searching for the weak. Fear, translated into doubt about how one will handle future encounters, can actually accelerate such encounters. When this occurs, when the prophecy is fulfilled, the mental effect can be doubly devastating.

In Toch's study, men who seem most vulnerable to crises of fear are young whites. Robert Johnson explores this ethnic factor in his book, Culture and Crisis in Conflict. According to Johnson, whites are more likely than others to experience problems related to fear for several reasons: (1) previous prison victimizations accelerates their self-doubt when confronted with new exploitative cues; (2) they are a racial minority in New York State prisons and generally come from more sheltered backgrounds than either blacks or Puerto Ricans; (3) they may tend to counter preliminary "tests" with inappropriate strategies; and (4) to prison exploiters whites appear naive, weak and effeminate.

Explanations for Sexual Aggression

Susan Brownmiller, in her widely-read book, Against Our Will, referring to the "Philadelphia report," declares, "Homosexual rape in the Philadelphia prisons turned out to be a microcosm of the female experience with heterosexual

82 rape." Along with Kanin, Brownmiller favors an extended definition of rape, and views men engaging in all types of aggressive sexual acts as sharing the
83 same dynamics as rapists. Unfortunately, we still search in vain for a uni-
fied theory of the psychology of sexual aggression. While some explanations
for sexual aggression are currently in vogue - and may even influence policy -
some of these explanations lack empirical underpinnings: far from being scientific statements,
explanations for sexual aggression must be viewed as middle-level hypotheses rather than as hard and fast conclusions. Rather than looking at the reasons for rape as scientific facts, we still consider the topic in polemical terms.

This is not to say that we do not know anything about sexual aggressors. Different studies paint the same profile of the rapist in terms of age, social class, race, previous criminal behavior and modus operandi. While we examine a different scenario, and a wider continuum of sexual aggression, such facts about the rapist are relevant to us because they are the stuff of which theories of sexual aggression - which apply to our work - are made. For instance, several studies show a tendency for the rapist to be young. Radzinowicz found
85 37 percent of a group of convicted rapists to be under 21 years of age. The majority of rapists in Amir's study were teenagers or young adults, and the highest percentage fell in the 15 to 19 year old group, with the next highest proportion in the 20 to 24 year old group. Nationwide figures confirm these data: F. B. I. statistics for 1960 place 25 percent of rapists in the 20 to
86 24 year old group and 31 percent in the 15 to 19 year old group. In the Philadelphia report, the average inmate aggressor age was 23.67 years, but the

figures cannot be compared because the prison only held adults: within this adult prisoner population, rapists on the average were younger than the average age of prisoners.⁸⁷ Because rapists are young, many rapists are economically dependent. In Amir's study, rapists tended to be still living at home at the time they committed the crime: most were still dependent on their parents for physical support.⁸⁸

The evidence also shows that rapists tend to come from the lower-classes.⁸⁹ They are often inhabitants of urban ghettos, raised in fatherless homes, and tend to be black far out of proportion to the percentage of blacks in the population. Amir states that "negroes comprise 53 percent of all persons arrested for forcible rape, which is five times greater than their proportionate representation in the nation's total population."⁹⁰ When large numbers of blacks live in an area, most of the rapists from that area tend to be black. For example, in Philadelphia, 82 percent of 1,292 rapists in Amir's study were black.⁹¹ The same fact holds true for prisons. In Davis' study, for example, 85 percent of the sexual aggressors in 129 incidents were black.⁹² While aggressors in prison tend to be black, as they are in areas where large numbers of blacks live in the free world, the victims of black aggressors in the free world tend also to be black. In prison, however, victims tend to be largely white. In other words, black heterosexual rapists seek black female victims on the street while black homosexual rapists seek white male victims in prison.⁹³

This is not to say that a man who rapes in prison is typically a convicted street rapist changing the sex and race of his victims. At least in Davis'

study, the crime of rape does not stand out among the conviction offenses of prison sexual aggressors. Sixty-eight percent of the aggressors in the Philadelphia report were convicted of serious felonies which broke down as follows:

Weapons	6%
Assault	7%
Rape	23%
Robbery	56%

There is even some question about the chronicity of street rape. In Amir's work, 50 percent of the heterosexual rapists had previous arrest records. But of these records, only 9 percent were for rape and another 11 percent were for other crimes against persons.⁹⁵ While these percentages are small, Amir notes that the highest proportion in continuity was in offenses against the person.⁹⁶

Amir concludes that "the clue for the explanation of forcible rape may be sought in the tendency toward violent behavior of which rape is only one aspect."⁹⁷ The findings of the Philadelphia report seem to support this assertion for prison rapists, although one must be careful in making too much of these data. Among a population of prisoners it is not surprising to find large numbers of men with records for crimes against persons. Unfortunately, Davis could not infer from his data whether aggressors had more arrests for crimes using force than other prisoners.

If rape is part of a man's propensity for violence of all types, how do we account for the large percentage of rapists in Amir's study who have no record of crimes against the person? Perhaps part of the answer lies in the fact that

98
men and boys in groups carry out many rapes.

When a group

acts, causal explanations for individual behavior need not extend to everyone in the group. Blanchard, who studied two group rapes, thus found the leader alone to be a violent offender, a man who differed from his followers in posses-

99
sing "clearly defined sadistic impulses."

Amir points out that when a group rape is preceded by intimidation with a weapon, it is generally the leader who wields the weapon. The author of Forcible Rape, struck by the difference

between leaders and followers in group rape, talked of "core members", "re-

101
luctant participants", and "non-participants" in rape.

The importance of these findings is that we must be careful in deducing general theories from the tabulated characteristics of rapists. As Geis points out, group processes in youthful gangs may be so strong as to submerge the influence of individual

102
characteristics.

We know something about the way rapists operate. Rape of women on the street tends to be deliberate and planned.

103
Bartollas, Miller, and Dinitz observed "booty bandits" in juvenile institution working secretly, with the most successful aggressors carefully deploying smooth maneuvers almost con-

stantly. They waited for weaknesses in potential victims, moved in at the right time, and their sexual preying amounted to a full-time, round-the-clock

104
hustle. Dr. Loren Roth, who worked as a physician at Lewisburg, examined the "territorial" habits of fourteen sexual aggressors using housing records.

He found the aggressors spread evenly throughout the institution, and he inferred that such dispersal was a sign of conscious planning.

105

Virtually all observers of prison sexual aggressors find that the aggressors show in the way they handle themselves and in the way they talk and act, that they consider themselves to be masculine and that they view their victims as substitute women. Bartollas, Miller and Dinitz observed aggressors to be
¹⁰⁶ also interested in conquering prison queens, (the make believe women of the prison). Clemmer's typology of homosexuals in prison, while not explicitly concerned with sexual aggression, has been continually employed to explain this aspect of prison consensual sex: "wolves," "jockers" "daddies" play masculine
¹⁰⁷ roles; "punks" play female roles.

Where researchers have talked to individual rapists about the needs and desires that cause them to rape, different testimonials emerge. This fact befuddles the discussion of the cause for rape, for cases can be found to prove and to disprove any theory. Murray Cohen and his associates, who base their work on interviews with rapists, declare that "the act of rape clearly cannot be understood unidimensionally simply in terms of motivation or of any factor."
¹⁰⁸ The proposed solution has been to subtype rapists according to the needs that are mentioned by them or that can be inferred by their act. Guttmacher and Weihofen, for example, divide rapists into men who seek: 1) to satisfy sexual desires, 2) to defend themselves against homosexual urges and 3) to harm women
¹⁰⁹ because they hate them. Gebhard and his associates describe two classes of rapists: 1) those who use violence as a means to carry out a sexual goal, and
¹¹⁰ 2) those to whom violence itself is the goal. Murray Cohen, et al., in a

typology widely accepted today, provide a "clinical classification" of rapists according to the proportions of "aggressive" and "sexual" components in their acts. They talk of rape in which the 1) primary aim is hostile and destructive - the intent is to hurt the victim, 2) primary aim is sexual, 3) sexual aim is combined with a violent aim (the aggressor needs or desires violence accompanying sex).¹¹¹ These typologies of heterosexual rapists have no parallel in studies of homosexual rapists, and indeed, may not apply. But what these typologies do indicate is that the motives of sexual aggressors can vary.

Stating any single cause for the behavior can be an invitation to invalidation.

While therapists such as Cohen have provided a service in conducting and reporting interviews with rapists, such enterprises are medically inspired; they run against the problem that most rapists are not mentally ill. It is premised that rapists generally have normal personalities, leading some to conclude that the cause for rape lies in the subcultural context which allows rape to flourish.¹¹²

Others claim sexual aggression can be found among any culture in our society. E. J. Kanin, in giving questionnaires to college males, thus found a surprising amount of self-reported sexual aggression among normal, middle-class, whites.¹¹³

Where sexual aggression is a group activity, ideas about men in groups have been used to explain sexual aggression. Amir, drawing on the extensive literature about adolescent gang behavior, explains group rape as violent gang activity. In the case of rape, the gang has values supporting the activity; females are defined as sex objects, and rape is viewed favorably; it even enhances or establishes masculine "rep."¹¹⁴ Given this favorable value climate,

group processes reduce inhibitions, neutralize guilt, and "contagion"
114 takes over. Relevant emotion spreads from one youth to another much as though they were all breaking windows in a rampage of vandalism. The leader's behavior bolsters the courage of the followers and the presence of the followers may in turn be the stimulus for the leader to begin the activity. Geis 115 points out the importance in such groups of members sustaining an image for the benefit of their fellows: roles are played to the detriment of victims, for group rape often calls for even more violence than individual rape. 116 Violence is more probable in group rape, some suggest, because in publicly sharing the same sexual outlet group members open themselves to accusations of homosexuality, accusations which can be repudiated by acting violently. 117

Race hatred has been used to explain prison sexual aggression. Irwin, for example, holds resentment of middle-class whites by lower-class blacks to be 118 the main cause for the black aggressor-white victim pattern. Scacco strongly upholds this explanation, and reports aggressors telling him they attacked 119 their victims to get back at whites. Davis cites the brutality in incidents 120 he examined as evidence of race hatred motivating the activity. Given the fact that most prison rape seems to involve black aggressors and white victims, it should not surprise us that some claim that blacks rape whites for revenge. Beyond the existence of the victim-aggressor race pattern itself, however, little empirical evidence supports this position. Opposing this theory is the fact that most rape victims of black aggressors in the street are black. If sexual aggression were primarily motivated by racial animosity, we would expect

to find the same victim-aggressor ethnic pattern on the street as we find in prison.

Other ideas have also been suggested to explain why blacks predominate among the aggressor category. Huffman believes that black conceptions of homosexuality differ from white attitudes. According to Huffman, blacks seek not to become emotionally involved in prison homosexuality; their aim is to achieve expedient ejaculation.¹²¹ Gagnon and Simon claim that a black man who is more economically deprived than a white man of legitimate economic expressions of masculinity, "finds continuing validation of masculinity needs in aggressive homosexual relationships in prison."¹³²

Gagnon and Simon worked as research sociologists at Alfred C. Kinsey's Institute for Sex Research at Indiana University, where Gagnon cooperated with Bebbard, et al, in writing Sex Offenders. They wrote a paper integrating knowledge about sexual behavior in general with what they knew about prison homosexuality. "The Social Meaning of Prison Homosexuality," later revised and published in the book, Sexual Conduct, influences most current writing about sex in prison.¹²³ Gagnon and Simon combine ideas from Lindner, Ward, and Ovesey - past interpreters of prison sexuality - with Kinsey's findings about lower-class male sexual behavior.¹²⁴ According to this view, lower-class men in prison carry out the same sexual patterns they carry out on the street. In these mens' lives, sex is a social need more than a physical need. It is thus said about the lower-class world that "men have sex with women in order to be able to talk about it with other men."¹²⁵ Sexual behavior, as a way of

proving oneself a man carries over into prison life. The behavior is reinforced by the fact that, according to Kinsey, lower-class men have taboos against masturbation and "a paucity of complex fantasies" which make masturbation satisfying. Gagnon and Simon include this perspective of masturbation in their interpretation. They state:

The usual prisoner is drawn from a population in which sexual experience is concrete and not symbolic; in which there is a taboo on masturbation; and, finally, in which much of heterosexual experience is structured around the need to have sexual encounters that validate his masculinity
127 among other men.

Lacking acceptable outlets and driven by the need for status, prisoners seek sex targets.

In the late Fifties, Jack L. Ward observed in writing about training schools that "bullying and aggressive homosexual behavior become confused with manliness, while dependence and submission are involved with passive homosexual behavior."¹²⁸ Ward cites Ovesey's clinical observation that dream material often shows that dependence is interpreted as helpless submission to sex assault; and that power, the opposite, consists of subjugating another individual to sexual assault.¹²⁹

Ward and Lindner both trace aggressive sexual behavior to the dependency of incarceration. The process of reducing a man's autonomy is viewed by these writers as a form of emasculation. In response to this experience, men

become aggressive and predatory. They act out their frustration by coercing weak victims in an attempt to restore their masculine image.

Gagnon and Simon in their article aim to explain consensual sex in prisons. Thus, they emphasize that aggressors, along with satisfying social needs by open displays of masculinity, are also seeking emotional relationships.¹³¹ According to this view, two needs are operating together: the need to express power and the need for love. Far from wishing to harm, humiliate, or injure, they see the aggressor wishing to possess his target as a willing partner, an inmate wife to show off to his friends and to bring some warmth and sexual stimulation into his life. Aggressor approaches, ranging from propositions or requests for sex to attempts to intimidate with threats, can be explained by this theory.

But what about sexual assault? That, certainly, cannot involve a need for emotional relationships, although it can be easily explained by involving the need for power. Gagnon and Simon do not meet this question. They write, that in prison:

Homosexual rape is not a very frequent occurrence, and at time there is some question (as in heterosexual situations) as to whether the situation is really in fact rape or whether it is a seduction which has simply gone wrong.¹³²

If we explain prison homosexuality in terms of power and domination, this makes the subject similar to current feminist discussions about the causes of rape in the free world. As we have seen, Brownmiller sees prison sexual

aggression as similar to the rape of women. Both are "an acting out of power roles."¹³³ Susan Green, assuming only slight differences between rapists and normal males, sees all male eroticism motivated by power. Most male sexual pleasure, she holds, derives as much from "force and dominance" as it does from sex play itself.¹³⁴ In her study, The Politics of Sex, Kate Millet sees Genet portraying a homosexual criminal world that is a paradigm of a world-wide situation where people in masculine roles (usually men) dominate people in feminine roles (usually women, except in prison). The view that sex is a symbol of dominance reaches its zenith in Brownmiller's assumption of a "male ideology of rape." Rejecting any quest for affection or sex, Brownmiller explains aggressive sexual contact as not only conquest, but as conquest accompanied by the intention to brutalize and the need to humiliate beyond the harm necessary for rape itself. According to Brownmiller, men rape because of their contempt for women [or for men in female roles] and because of their need to dominate them.¹³⁵

Amir presents a "subcultural interpretation of forcible rape, which makes sexual aggression part of an overall pattern of violence carried out by lower-class men and boys."¹³⁶ Amir believes that the subculture of violence thesis best explains sexual aggression, offering the following proof for his position:

- 1) sexual aggression prevails in the same subculture in which other types of violence prevail,
- 2) the rates of rape are highest among the same group which produces the highest rates for other violent crime - i.e., black, single, young, lower-class males,

- 3) half of those arrested for rape had been previously arrested for other crimes against persons: blacks more so than whites,
- 4) the incidence of group rape shows that rape unfolds in the context of a peer group, where it is learned along with other violent behavior, and
- 5) descriptive studies indicate sexual aggression is part of
the subculture of violence.
¹³⁸

When Amir looks to "subculture" to explain rape, he looks to a group made up of young, lower-class black males. And the Philadelphia report, as we have noted, found the same characteristics associated with prison sexual aggressors as Amir found associated with rapists on the street. This makes it important for us to consider the theory of the subculture of violence as Amir relates it to sexual aggression.

While Amir's data come from victims' reports to police, he brings in published research about young blacks to show how and why such men may have a proclivity toward sexual aggression. Amir thus cites work by Walter Miller and others which suggests that masculine concerns of lower-class youths stress
¹³⁹ demonstrations of toughness. Here, Amir's viewpoint becomes similar to Gagnon and Simon's and Brownmiller's, for, according to Amir, youths from the subculture of violence, because of social factors, tend toward machismo, or
¹⁴⁰ hypermasculinity, more than other youths.

In explaining aggressive sexual behavior, it is certainly legitimate to consider studies that explain lower-class aggression in terms of thwarted

masculinity needs. It is also relevant to consider general descriptions of the sexual and violence values of young lower-class blacks, such as Dollard and Davis' Children of Bondage,¹⁴¹ portraying case studies of a subculture of violence in the deep South.¹⁴² Harold Finestone, in "Cats, Kicks and Color," writes about The Cat - the young, lower-class black who directs his life around the search for "kicks." Among "The Cat's" adventures, perverse sex, and drugs are esteemed goals. Sexual values of the Cat, according to Finestone, include aspirations to be a pimp.¹⁴³ In Pimp: The Story of My Life, by Iceberg Slim,¹⁸⁶ these sexual values are more fully described through flights of exploitative fantasy. Sweet Jones, the pimp in Slim's book, giving advice to a young man just starting out in his pimping career, tells him how to get his woman to work: "Make that bitch get outta that bed and get in the street, Put your foot in her ass hard. If that don't work, take a wire coat hanger and twist it into a whip."¹⁴³ The pimp role is a way of regarding women and a way of looking at violence. It forms the kind of cultural backdrop which Amir sees behind rapes on the street and which could be part of the cultural heritage behind prison sexual aggression as well.

How do writers consider the relation between sexual aggression and sexual deprivation? In spite of the fact that prison bars heterosexual men from female contact, in spite of a lack of evidence about the consequences of this fact, most writers do not give much weight to sexual deprivation as a cause for sexual aggression. Gagnon and Simon go so far as to claim prisoners do not even have strong sexual urges while incarcerated; Davis and Buffum, whose

144

writings are widely quoted, adopt the same position.

While no systematic evidence supports either side of the question, some observers close to the prison claim that sexual deprivation is a major concern of inmates. Clemmer, for one, considers "sex yearning...the most painful phase of incarceration."¹⁴⁵ Bloch believes prisoners have strong sexual thoughts, which are continually reinforced by the "aphrodisiac quality of modern media."¹⁴⁶ Writing about sexual deprivation in an Indian prison, Srivastava states that "its grip over prisoners minds is very pressing."¹⁴⁷

E. J. Kanin carried out empirical studies on the general question of sexual aggression and sexual deprivation in college men. He claims that "aggressives entertain significantly higher subjective estimates of their sex drive than do the nonaggressives."¹⁴⁸ Kanin also reports that aggressives, while they were more successful at arranging for sex than nonaggressives, were also more dissatisfied by their experiences. He concludes that sexual deprivation, rather than being a function of absolute deprivation, depends on the disparity between erotic aspirations and erotic accomplishments.¹⁴⁹ Sexual frustration would be more intense for those who have been or are sexually active than for those who have been sexually quiescent.¹⁵⁰ This could mean that, in prisons, the men with the greatest sexual experience, those with the most developed "erotic aspirations," would be the most sexually frustrated and could become the most aggressive. This could relate to the prevalence of aggression among blacks, for studies by Gold¹⁵¹ and Ehrmann¹⁵² indicate that nonmarital sexual behavior is more widespread among black youths than white youths. Kanin's re-

search could thus help to explain why black prisoners are more sexually aggressive than white prisoners, provided that experienced deprivation is a mediating variable.

Footnotes for Chapter Two

1

Examples of journalists' accounts are: Linda Carlton, "The Terrifying Homosexual World of the Jail System". The New York Times, April 1971, 40. "Escapee Tells of Prison Attacks," Times Union [Albany] 22 April 1975, 4; Concerns sexual aggression in Glades State Prison, Florida. Bruce Jackson, "Our Prisons are Criminal", New York Times Magazine, 22 October 1968. Wayne King: "Rise in Inmates Strains Jails in South: Florida Jams 10 Into 12-by=15 Foot Cells." The New York Times, 24 October 1975, A-1, C-10. "6 Indicted in Sodomy at Dutchess Co. Jail," Times Union [Albany] 31 May 1975, 8: Aggressors charged with first degree sodomy after raping two youths. "Needed: Prisons of Another Stripe." The National Observer, 15 June 1974, 1.14.16, Prisoners' accounts of sexual aggression they observed: Mickey Cohen (McNeil Island), James Hoffa (Lewisburg).

Official inquires , see: Employees of the New York State Commission of Corrections, testimony before a hearing held by the Senate Standing Committee on Crime and Correction [New York State], Albany, 21 April 1975. Commission employees investigated recent sexual assaults occurring at the Schenectady County Jail (two prisoners sexually abused five days in a row, August, 1974) and at the Ulster County Jail. Alan J. Davis: "Report on Sexual Assaults in the Philadelphia Prison System and Sheriff's Van's." Investigation of Philadelphia District Attorney Office and The Police Dept. (Dec. 1968), copy kindly provided by the author. Excerpts from this report are published in A.J. Davis, "Sexual Assaults in the Philadelphia Prison System and Sheriffs Vans." Trans-Action 6(2)(Dec. 1968) 8-16."Panel Says and Informed Public Would Demand Prison Reform." The New York Times, 7 March 1974, C-18. Report of House Judiciary subcommittee headed by Representative Robert W. Kastenmeir (D. Wis.) - mentioned sexual assault among problems it found in visits to prisons and in committee hearings

2

Experts agree sex aggression is far more prevalent in male institutions than in female ones. Susan Brownmiller: Against Our Will. New York: Simon and

Schuster, 1975. 267. Rose Giallombardo; Society of Women. New York: John Wiley, 1966, 98. Fox, states that the problem is far less severe in New York's female prison, Bedford Hills, than in the male prisons. Fox believes this is so because the "family" system protects inmates without exploiting them. Women, more used to sexual approaches than men, do not react so intensely to them. And a lesbian approach with aggressive overtones puts the target in a female role, a position not as threatening as in males prisons where the target is put in the role of a sex different than his own. . Fox did describe an incident where sex aggression was employed by a group to humiliate a female prisoner (personal communication).

See also Les Brown: "Four Advertisers Drop Spots on Repeat of 'Born Innocent'"

The New York Times, 25 October 1975; TV program about girl raped by other girls in a juvenile institution. Lesbian Feminist Liberation pressured to have the show dropped, claiming it "has nothing to do with reality...Men rape, women don't." However, two female prisoners, charged with escape, proved their innocence by claiming they had to escape to avoid sexual harassment from other inmates [females]. See: People v. Lovercamp, 43 Cal. App. 3d 823, 118 Cal. Rptr. 110 (1974). The case is interpreted in: Martin R. Gardner; "The Defense of Necessity and the right to escape from prison - A step towards incarceration free from sexual assault". Southern California Law Review, 110-52, (November 1975). Other reports contain charges of male staff abusing female prisoners: "Ex-Inmate Tells of Sexual Abuse." The New York Times, 19 November 1975, C-29 (Female inmate at Ray Brook Rehabilitation Center claims sex pressure came from staff.) "Killing of Carolina Jailer, Charged to Woman, Raises Question of Abuse of Inmates. "The New York Times, 1. December 1974, (Joan Little case. Female prisoner charges rape by male guard in Beaufort County Jail, North Carolina.)

3

Haywood Patterson and Earl Conrad: Scottsboro Boy. New York:
Doubleday, 1950.

4

Clifford R. Shaw: The Jack-Roller, Chicago: The University of Chicago
Press, 1966, 69.

5

Donald Clemmer: The Prison Community. New York: Holt,
Rinehart, and Winston, 1958, 261.

Sykes, 97. Donald Webster Cory: "Homosexuality in Prison." Journal of Social Therapy 1 (1955): 137-141. Arthur Huffman, "Sex Deviation in a Prison Community." Journal of Social Therapy 6 (1960): 170-181. Benjamin Karpman, "Sex Life in Prison." Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 3 (1948): 475-486. Loren Roth, "Territoriality and Homosexuality in a Male Prison Population." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 41 (1971): 510-513. Charles Smith, "Some Problems Dealing with Homosexuals in the Prison Situation." Journal of Social Therapy 2 (1956) : 37-45.

6

"Sexual Assaults and Forced Homosexual Relationships in Prison." Albany Law Review 36 (1972): 428-438. Green v. State 10 Criminal Law Reporter 2017 (Mo. 1971). Johnson v. U.S. 258 F Supp. 372, (1966). Hamilton v. Love, 328 F. Supp 1182 (1971). Martin R. Gardner, "The Defense of Necessity and the Right to Escape from Prison - a Step toward Incarceration Free from Sexual Assault" Southern California Law Review, 49 (1975): 110-52. Richard S. Berger, "Escape from Prison. Defenses, Duress. Homosexual Attacks." Akron Law Review 9 (1975): 352-9. David Gilman, "Courts and Corrections" Corrections Magazine II (Sept. 1976): 51-53. Hans Toch: Peacekeeping: Police, Prisons, and Violence. Lexington [Mass.]: Lexington Press, 1976, 51-52.

7

Vincent Bugliosi: Helter Skelter, New York: Norton, 1974, 139.

8

"Sex Life in an Indian Male Prison." Indian Journal of Social Work

3 (1974): 21-33.

9

See, for example: Piri Thomas : Down These Mean Streets. New York: New American Library, 1967. Vincent Teresa: My Life in the Mafia. Greenwich (Conn.): Fawcett, 1973, 17.

10

With others: "The Account of the White House Seven," Friends Journal, (October 1, 1974): 484-499.

11

David Miller and Howard Levy: Going to Jail. Grove Press, 1970.

12

Thomas, 256.

13

Davis, 3.

14

Davis, 33-36.

15

See, for example, "Catalogue of Savagery; Philadelphia Inquiry". Illustrated Time, 92 (54) (1968): 520.

16

See especially, Carl Weiss and David Jones Friar: Terror in the Prisons.

New York: Bobbs - Merrill, 1974.

17

Bartollas, Miller, and Dinitz, 2.

18

"Violence and Victimization Within the North Carolina Prison System."

Unpublished Manuscript, 1976), 7.

19

Attica. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974, 3.

20

Ibid., 78.

21

Carlton, 40.

22

John Sparkes, "The Ombudsman," Unpublished paper presented at the School of Criminal Justice, Albany, October, 1973.

23

Albert K. Cohen, "Prison Violence: Sociological Perspective". in Albert K. Cohen, George F. Cole, and Robert G. Bailey: Prison Violence, Lexington, (Mass.): Lexington Books, 1976, 9.

24

"Violence in Prison." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 3646 (May 1966): 113-19.

25

Lawrence Bennett: "The Study of Violence in California Prison: A Review with Policy Implications". in Cohen, 152.

Another type of estimate, a court investigation of a jail, reports 51 percent of all violent incidents recorded by staff were sexual assaults. See Wayne County Jail Inmates v. Wayne County Board of Commissioners in 1 Prison Law Reporter (), 51.

26

Hans Toch: "Institutional Violence Code, Tentative Code of the Classification of Inmate Assaults on Other Inmates." California, September 1965, report prepared for the California Department of Corrections Research Division (hereinafter referred to as Toch (1965)).

27

Toch (1965).

28

Davis, 38.

29

Anthony M. Scacco: Rape in Prison. Springfield (Ill.): Thomas, 1975, 67,69.

30

Ibid., 69.

31

Amir, 294-97.

32

Davis sees aggressors' abusive comments to targets as evidence for the idea that "Conquest and degradation of the victim is a primary goal of the sexual aggressor," 38. However, his position is an interpretation - not an empirical finding.

33

Paul H. Gebhard, et al: Sex Offenders. New York: Harper and Row, 1965, 196.
Murray L. Cohen: "The Psychology of Rapists." Seminars in Psychiatry. 303 (1971):312-325.

34

Amir, 319.

35

Toch (1965).

36

Ibid.

37

Arthur Huffman: "Sex Deviation in a prison community." Journal of Social Therapy, 6 (Third Quarter 1960), 177. See also Merklin, 209; Thomas, 242-43.

38

New York State Special Commission on Attica, 101, See also, 79.

39

Leroy Schultz: "The Victim Offender Relationship." Crime and Delinquency, 14 (1964), 139.

40

Albert Cohen.

41

Bartollas, Miller, and Dinitz, p.76.

42

Marvin E. Wolfgang and Franco Ferracuti: The Subculture of Violence.
London: Tavistock Publication, 1967, 156.

43

Buffum, 18.

44

Carl Weiss and James David Friar: Terror in the Prisons. New York:
Bobbs-Merril, 1975, 74.

45

Davis 27, Weiss and Friar , 78, xi.

46

Bartollas, et al, 37, 42.

47

Ibid., 136 - 149.

48

Ibid., 13. See also Giallombardo for discussion and defense of
this approach to studying prisons (105 and passim.) It is a deep tradition in
prison literature.

49

Ibid., 101.

50

Ibid., 76.

51

Ibid., 122-23.

52

Ibid, 175.

53

Ibid., 186

54

Ibid, 172.

55

Proceedings American Correctional Association, (1961), 241.

56

Ibid., 241. See also John W. Cronin: "Emotional Panics Among Prisoners."

American Prison Association, (1941), 362.

57

Kanin and Kirkpatrick's data come from questionnaires given to college women. They cross tabulate emotional reaction and level of "erotic intimacy" in the aggressive act. They use mutually exclusive categories of reaction: "anger," "guilt," "fear," and "disgust, disillusionment or confusion." It is hard to see how the presence of one of these categories can exclude the others - a basic problem in comparing aggressive acts to emotional reactions. E.J. Kanin and C. Kirkpatrick: "Male Sex Aggression on a University Campus." The American Sociology Review, 22 (1953), 56.

58

All but three victims were female. Male victims were ages 3, 6, and 13 (257). Ann Wolbert Burgess and Lynda Lyle Holmstrom: Rape: victims of crisis. Bowie (Maryland): Robert J. Brady Co., 1974.

59

Ibid., 37.

60

Ibid., 37, 39, 43.

61

Ibid., 39.

62

Ibid., 300.

63

Ibid., 110-11.

64

In Burgess and Holmstrom, 109. Cite not given.

65

Ibid., 109,115.

66

Ibid., 47, 269-80.

67

Ibid., 269.

68 Hans Toch: Men in Crisis. Chicago. Aldine Publishing Co., 1975.

69 Ibid., 51.

70 Ibid., 2.

71 Ibid., 322.

72 Ibid., 70.

73 Ibid., 68.

74 Ibid., .

75 Ibid., 68-71.

76 Ibid., 68-70.

77 Ibid., 283-84.

78 Ibid., 295.

79 Ibid., 67.

80 Ibid., 284.

81 Robert Johnson: Culture and Crisis in Conflict, Lexington (Mass.)

Lexington Books, 1976, 127-130.

82 Brownmiller, 102.

83 E.J. Kanin: Male aggression and three psychiatric hypotheses. Journal
of Sex Research, 1 (1965), 221-222.

- 84 Amir indicates how theorists differ on motives, needs, and intensity of demands, 132,292.
- 85 Sexual offenses. London, 1948, in Amir, 122.
- 86 Amir, 52, 57, 93.
- 87 Davis, 33.
- 88 Amir, 64, 338.
- 89 Amir, 70. Bartollas, Miller, and Dinitz, 115.
- 90 Amir, 46.
- 91 Amir, 46.
- 92 Davis, 34.
- 93 See also Bartollas, Miller, and Dinitz, 115.
- 94 Davis, 34. Similar observation is made by Bartollas, Miller, and Dinitz, 115.
- 95 Amir, 341.
- 96 Amir, 116, 341.
- 97 Amir, 116.

98

See Brownmiller, *passim*.

99

W. Blanchard: "The group process in gang rape," Journal of Social Psychology, 49 (1959) 264, 266. This view of the gang leader is developed in Lewis Yablonsky. The Violent Gang. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1962.

100

Amir, 218.

101

Ibid, 192.

102

G. Geis: "Group Sexual Assaults." Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality,

(May 1971), 110. Amir found youths more likely to rape in groups than older rapists, 202.

103

In Amir's study, three-fourths of the incidents were planned, 141, 336.

104

Bartollas, Miller, and Dinitz, 56.

105

Roth, op. cit., *Passim*.

106

Bartollas, Miller, and Dinitz, 121.

107

On prison sex roles see Clemmer, 249-275. Sykes, 95 - 99. Buffum, 14, and Herbert Block: "Social Pressures of Confinement toward Sexual Deviation" Journal of Social Therapy, 1 (1955) 122-123.

108

Murray Cohen, et al, 310.

109

M. Guttmacher and H. Weihofen: Psychiatry and the Law. New York:

Norton, 1952, 116.

110

Gebhard, et al, 196.

111

Murray Cohen, et al, 312-325.

112

Kanin (1965), 222. (see chapter one, note 6.)

113

Ibid, 190. Kanin, in one of his studies of self-reported sex aggression among college males, also found aggressives had friends who supported their behavior. E.J. Kanin: "An examination of sexual aggression as a result of sexual frustration." Journal of Marriage and Family, (1967 August.), 433, see also Amir, 190.

114

F. Redl: "The Phenomenon of Group Contagion and Shock Effect in Group Therapy." In Eissler, Searchlight on Delinquency, New York: International University Press, 1949, 315-328.

115

Amir, 188.

116

Geis, 101. Amir, 156.

117

Ibid, 184-85.

118

Irwin (1971), 2.

119

Scacco, 3-6. 48.

120

Davis, 38.

121

Arthur Huffman: "Sex Deviation in a prison community." Journal of Social Therapy, 6 (1960) 173.

122

John H. Gagnon and William Simon: Sexual Conduct, Chicago: Aldine, 1973, 255.

123

Federal Probation, 32 (1) March 1968.

124

The following, for example, adopt Gagnon and Simon's position: Davis, 38; Scacco, 78; Buffum, 14-15,22. See also an extended treatment of their position in Vergil L. Williams and Mary Fish: Convicts, Codes, and Contraband. Cambridge (Mass.): Ballinger Publishing Company, 1974, 63, 69.

125

Robert M. Lindner: "Sexual Behavior in Penal Institutions," in Albert Deutsch, Sex Habits of American Men. New York: Prentice Hall, 1948. Jack L. Ward: Homosexual behavior of the institutionalized delinquent Psychiatric Quarterly Supplement 32 (1958): 301-314. Lionel Ovesy: "The Homosexual Conflict," Psychiatry, 17 (1954): 243-50. Alfred C. Kinsey, Pomeroy B. Wardell, and Clyde E. Martin: Sexual Behavior in the Human Male. Philadelphia": W.B. Saunders, 1948.

126

Gagnon and Simon (1973), 243.

127

Ibid., 243.

128

Ward, 306.

129

Ibid., 305.

130 Gagnon and Simon (1973), 243.

131

Ibid., 246. See also Williams and Fish, 59.

132

Gagnon and Simon (1973), 250.

133

Brownmiller, 256. See also Scacco, 80.

134

Green, 24.

135

Kate Millett: Sexual Politics. New York: Avon, 1970 in Scacco, 83.

136

Brownmiller, 187.

137

Amir, 319-34.

138

Described in Marvin E. Wolfgang and Franco Ferracuti: The Subculture of Violence. London:Tavistock, 1967. Cf. Amir, 319-34.

139

Walter B. Miller: "Lower Class Culture as a Generating Miliey of Gang Delinquency." Journal of Social Issues, 14 (1958), 15-19. Walter B. Miller, Hildred Geerty, and Henry S.G. Cutter,: "Aggression in a Boy's Street Corner Group." Psychiatry 29 (1961): 283-298.

140

Amir,

141

Allison Davis and John Dollard: Children of Bondage. New York: Harper, 1964. See especially, 69-96.

142

Harold Finestone: "Cats, Kicks and Color." Social Problems. 5 (July 1957): 3-13.

143

Iceberg Slim: Pimp: The Story of My Life. Holloway House, 1967. In Gregory Armstrong: Life at the Bottom. New York: Bantam, 1971. 232-237.

144

Gagnon and Simon (1973), 242-44. Davis, 4. Buffum, 14.

145

Clemmer, 256.

146

Bloch, 122. Contrast this with Gagnon and Simon's idea that sex hunger in prison is cut down by lack of stimuli, (1973), 243.

147

Srivastava, 21.

148

E.J. Kanin: "Male aggression and three psychiatric hypotheses. Journal of Sex Research, 1 221-231, 1965. 1 (1965): , 229.

149

Kanin (1967), 433.

150

Ibid., 432.

151

Martin Gold: Delinquent Behavior in an American City. Belmont California]: Brooks/Cole, 1970.

152

W. Ehrmann: "Marital and nonmarital sexual behavior." In H.T. Christensen (ed.), Handbook of Marriage and the Family. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964, 585-622.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Target Study: Sampling and Data Collection

We carried out our research in several New York State prisons. We obtained descriptions of incidents occurring in juvenile institutions, jails, adult prisons or reformatories, and correctional mental health facilities (see Table 3.1), but most incidents we record¹ take place in New York State adult and youth prisons. Only two occurred out of state, one in Virginia and one in Missouri.

Sources of information include institutional files and tape-recorded interviews. As our sample comes from a relatively small sub-culture, we found different people in different roles describing similar events. These descriptions, combined with staff reports in files, allow us some degree of independent verification of our data.

Interview Procedures

The interviews with targets were open-ended but all items on the schedule (see Appendix A) were covered.¹ We strove to get concrete narratives of specific incidents. In the context of these incidents, we asked our respondents to describe their thoughts and feelings, those they had now and those experienced at the time of the incident (s). The effort here was to capture the meaning of the experiences for the persons involved.

Table 3.1: Type of Institution in which the Incident Occurred.

Institution Type	Number of incidents
Juvenile Institution:	9
Jail:	11
Adult prison:	56
Youth Prison or Reformatory:	64
Correctional Mental Health Facility:	12
Total Incidents:	152

Data Collection Safeguards

Interviews were anonymous and are identified by code numbers. Inmates were instructed to use no names of other inmates during the interviews. If any names appeared on the tapes they were not transcribed. Inmates were not used as referral sources and the specific content of interviews was not discussed with anyone except immediate members of the research project.

Inmates were told that their participation in the study was voluntary, that their participation might help other men in the future, but was not likely to offer them aid or relief.

Target Sampling Procedure

Target sampling procedures include availability sampling and random sampling. For some purposes, the groups are combined; for others, they are separated. Throughout this study, random and non-random samples are identified. The "Target Sample" refers to a combination of random and non-random groups of men who have had at least one incident of sexual aggression at some time during their institutional career. The "Non-Target Sample" is a group of men extracted from a random sample who have had no such incidents. By comparing the characteristics of the Target sample to the Non-Target Sample, we hope to show the types of men who become involved in - or those who escape-aggressive sexual incidents.

Availability sampling focused on pre-defined high risk groups and staff referrals. Here, we aimed to capture recent incidents, incidents of use in spelling out the boundaries of the problem. We aimed to find men who could remember incidents well and still felt the impact of these incidents. Random

sampling was useful for gathering representative cases, but proved less useful for gathering the best informed cases. In discussing the data, we shall try to point to the sample sources used in any particular section to avoid pitfalls of unfounded inference.

Table 3.2 shows the sources for our target sample. The first category refers to formal protective settings. We interviewed all men living in "Protective custody" in two adult prisons (Attica and Auburn). At Attica, we interviewed all "Protection Men" during the months of October, November and December of 1974. These men lived in solitary confinement under conditions closely resembling those found in disciplinary segregation. A third of the men in Attica Protection had been targets of sexual aggression at one time in their institutional career, although not all of them had been targets immediately preceding their move to Protection. Three men, out of a protection population of thirty-one, refused to speak with us. We conducted confidential interviews on an isolated part of the Protection company itself, out of sight and beyond hearing distance of others. Following the interviews, data were collected from institutional files. We interviewed all men living in Auburn's Protection Unit in March of 1975. Here, we found 3 targets among 7 Protection men. One of these men we had previously interviewed in Attica.

We interviewed all men living in Coxsackie's C2 ("Weak") Company from January of 1975 to April of 1975. Here, we interviewed 42 men, of whom 28 were targets. C2 Company in the Youth prison differs from Protection in the Adult prisons. Protection is a legal term designating solitary confinement or confinement to an area cut off from the main prison population. C2 Company, on the

Table 3.2: Sources of Target Sample.

<u>Sample Name</u>	<u>Total Interviewed</u>	<u>Targets of Sexual Aggression at One Time</u>	
			<u>N</u>
Protective environments			
a. Coxsackie weak company (C2)	42	28	67%
b. Attica Protection	31	10	32%
c. Auburn Protection	7	2 ^a 40	30%
Referrals, Staff (N=31) and other (N=3)			
a. Attica	16 ^b	20	
b. Coxsackie	9	11	
c. Auburn	3	3	34 ^b
Surveys:			
a. 4% of Attica Housing List (N=1297)	48 (six refusals)	14	29%
b. 4% of Coxsackie Housing List (N=729)	28 (seven refusals)	7	25%
c. All white inmates who entered Coxsackie between 3/7/75 and 4/7/75	14	10	71%
Aggressors who were targets ^c	15	3	34
Total Interviews	213	101 (not including six referral targets unavailable)	
Total targets		107 (One man, a target in two sampling sources, is counted once)	

- a. One of these men was also interviewed in Attica protection.
- b. Six targets could not be reached for interviews. Staff referrals, confirmed by reports in files, identified them as targets.
- c. Target - aggressors identified by target files who told about being targets during the interview. Three other target - aggressors are in the Youth Random sample, making a total of six targets who were also aggressors.

other hand, provides a less restricted place for men who require a safe environment. Weak Men have all freedoms and advantages of the regular prison population. Safety comes from having cells on one gallery where only residents have access. When at school, at work, and in the yard, C2 Men mingle with other inmates.

Weak Company men were interviewed in a private room. There were no refusals. We developed a close rapport with many of these men and word spread throughout the Weak Company that we were sympathetic to their problems. Following the interviews, data were gathered from institutional files.

We asked counselors and mental health professionals to refer men to us who had reported a problem with sexual aggression. Most such referrals came from a psychiatric nurse at Attica and a psychologist at Coxsackie. These professionals explained the project to men on their caseload and if a man agreed to being interviewed, he was referred to us. At Auburn, a knowledgeable "Special Housing Counselor" also referred men to us from disciplinary segregation. Counselors, dealing with administrative affairs relating to victimization (such as a transfer to a different block), sometimes referred men to us. We also had a few self referrals from volunteers who learned about our interviews from friends who had been interviewed.

We conducted random surveys in the Youth Prison (Coxsackie) and an Adult Prison (Attica). We chose these two sites in order to have respondents of varying ages; Coxsackie has men from 16 to 21, while Attica has men over 21.

In Attica and Coxsackie we drew a list of names using the housing list as a sampling frame. The sample arrived at by this method totaled 54 in Attica

and 35 in Coxsackie, or about four percent of the respective populations. In Attica six men refused to be interviewed, including an organized crime figure and two members of the Nation of Islam. In Coxsackie, seven youths, all blacks, declined the interview.

Random sampling showed the target rate to be low (11%) among Coxsackie black inmates. The white target rate could not be estimated, since the percentage of whites in the institution was low. Therefore, we added a white inmate comparison sample. In July of 1975, we spoke with all white men who had entered Coxsackie between March 7, 1975 and April 7, 1975. Most of these men by the time we interviewed them had been institutionalized for about half a year (including jail, reception, and their three months in Coxsackie). We found ten of these fourteen men to have had target incidents, and some of these incidents had occurred just days before the interview. Several of the inmates were under stress, and two exhibited signs of recent suicide attempts.

The Attica Random survey was carried out in June and July of 1975, the Coxsackie Random survey and White Cohort Survey in July and September of 1975. Following the interviews, we gathered data from institutional files.

Targets Who were also Aggressors

Six targets were also aggressors. Three of these men came from the Youth Random sample. Staff referred the others to us because they were aggressors. However, in the interview, these men told us about being targets at one time before taking up the aggressor role.

Discussion of the Target Sample

Combining three sample sources (protective environments, referrals, and random surveys), we must look at the differences and similarities between these target groups. Can the sample sources be pooled for statistical analysis? On what variables are they different? Table 3.3 displays the characteristics of targets from protective environments, referral sources, and random surveys. Statistically significant differences between the groups show up for age, average number of disciplinary infractions, and marital status. For other variables, percentage differences stand out. The primary reasons for these differences are that 1) men from protective environments bear more manifest "weakness" than other targets; 2) men from random surveys are "stronger" than others; 3) staff referrals are more "middle-class"; and 4) the many targets from Weak Company (C2), a housing area in a prison made up of youths, result in the protective environment group displaying characteristics common to youthful prisoners. Sampling bias in the protective environment sample leads to any over-representation of youthful characteristics for this group, compared to the others.

Only a few adult targets from a place like Attica go to protection. In Coxsackie, on the other hand, as many as a quarter of all white youths may be living in special protective settings. The men from C-2 we interviewed represent a fair share of the young targets in the youth prison. Still, the tabulated characteristics of these men indicate they are slightly "weaker" than other targets. For example, as we see by Table 3.3, men from protective environments, compared to random and referral targets, are younger, and less criminal: they

TABLE 3.3: CHARACTERISTICS OF TARGETS FROM PROTECTIVE ENVIRONMENT, REFERRAL SOURCES AND RANDOM SURVEYS.

	Protective Environments (N=39)	Referral Sources (N=34)	Random Surveys (N=31)
Mean Height	68.23	68.94	67.64
Mean Weight	144.44	153.76	143.96
Mean Age*	21.08	24.18	23.90
Number of Juvenile Convictions	1.03	0.72	.97
Number of Adult Convictions	2.29	3.30	4.10
Mean Maximum Sentence in Months	57.41	65.00	84.00
Mean Number of Disciplinary Infrac- tions** 15.70		7.57	5.90
Mean Number of Violent Disciplinary Infractions	2.06	1.64	1.10
Age left school	16.66	16.43	16.37
Mean I.Q.	94.05	98.44	96.65

* F Test Significant at .01

** F Test Significant at .05

TABLE 3.3(Con't.): CHARACTERISTICS OF TARGETS FROM PROTECTIVE ENVIRONMENTS
REFERRAL SOURCES, AND RANDOM SURVEYS.

	Targets from Protective Environments (N=39)	Targets from Referral Sources (N=34)	Targets from Random Surveys (N=31)
Life Sentence			
Yes	3%	9%	10%
No	97%	91%	90%
Total Percent	100%	100%	100%
Women head of household			
Yes	40%	45%	62%
No	60%	55%	38%
Total Percent	100%	100%	100%
Family Background			
Intact Family	32%	34%	28%
Broken Family	68%	66%	72%
Total Percent	100%	100%	100%
Marital Status*			
Single or divorced	87%	66%	93%
Married	13%	34%	7%
Total Percent	100%	100%	100%

*Chi square between the three groups is significant at $p < .01$.

TABLE 3.3:(Con't.); CHARACTERISTICS OF TARGETS FROM PROTECTIVE ENVIRONMENTS
REFERRAL SOURCES, AND RANDOM SURVEYS.

	Targets from Protective Environments (N=39)	Targets from Referral Sources (N=34)	Targets from Random Surveys (N=31)
Ethnicity			
White	82%	82%	77%
Black	18%	18%	16%
Puerto Rican	0%	0%	7%
Total Percent	100%	100%	100%
Commitment County			
New York City	10%	18%	16%
Other Counties	90%	82%	84%
Total Percent	100%	100%	100%
Home Town Population			
Over 50,000	41%	63%	65%
Under 50,000	59%	37%	35%
Total Percent	100%	100%	100%
Prior Adult Commitment			
Yes	36%	52%	68%
No	64%	48%	32%
Total Percent	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 343 (Con't.): CHARACTERISTICS OF TARGETS FROM PROTECTIVE ENVIRONMENTS
REFERRAL SOURCES, AND RANDOM SURVEYS.

	Targets from Protective Environments (N=39)	Targets from Referral Sources (N=34)	Targets from Random Surveys (N=31)
Juvenile Commitment			
Yes	31%	33%	47%
No	69%	67%	53%
Total Percent	100%	100%	100%
Force used with commitment offense			
Yes	47%	55%	40%
No	53%	45%	60%
Total Percent	100%	100%	100%
Suicide Attempt			
Yes	49%	39%	26%
No	51%	61%	74%
Total Percent	100%	100%	100%
Declared Sexual Identity			
Homosexual	10%	18%	6%
Straight	90%	87%	94%
Total Percent	100%	100%	100%
Prior Mental Health Residence			
Yes	33%	33%	30%
No	67%	67%	70%
Total Percent	100%	100%	100%

have shorter sentences, are less likely to have previous adult or juvenile commitments, and have fewer adult convictions. They are more likely to come from small cities, towns and rural areas, than random or referral targets. They also show a higher percentage of suicide attempts than the men in the other samples.

The protective environment sample, containing more youths than other target samples, shows some differences from other samples because sampling bias over-represents youthful characteristics in this group. Contacts with the criminal justice system, measured by the number of adult convictions and previous adult commitment, are less than in the other groups because youths have less time to accumulate criminal records. Similarly, sentences are shorter, in part, because recidivism does not influence sentencing as much with youths (who have not had time to develop records) as it does with adults. Indices of prison adjustment, such as suicide attempts and disciplinary reports, also differ among youth and adult prisoners. Younger prisoners are more volatile; they fight more, fool around more, and, consequently, get written up more. Administrative differences between prisons also contribute to differences on this variable because staff in the youth prison are much quicker to "write up" a misbehaving inmate than staff in the adult prison. Age differences also are a factor leading to a higher rate of suicide attempts among the men in the protective environments, for the young in prison are in a high risk group to injure themselves.

Comparing referral targets to targets from other groups, we see similar effects of age differences. Because of our excellent working relationship with a psychiatric nurse in Attica's mental health facility, many adult targets were referred to our study. Because adults are over-represented in the referral group, the group shows heavier average physical weight than the other groups; it also has men with more criminal convictions, higher sentences, and more adult commitments than the protective environment group.

Referral targets also demonstrate some features unique to prison mental health caseloads. For example, referrals are more likely to be married because married prisoners are more conventional, more "middle-class", and more likely to get into formal treatment in Attica. More referrals than random men have a history of suicide attempts and more referrals than either protective environment men or member of the random sample declare themselves to be homosexual. Men with both characteristics tend to end up on mental caseloads. Suicidal inmates are seen because they are depressed, and homosexual men because they have situational difficulties or are referred by custody staff to the mental health facility.

The random target group differs from the other two groups in having the characteristics of more serious offenders: random targets have higher sentences and higher recidivism rates than the other groups. They have more adult and juvenile commitments. They have used force more freely. They are less suicidal than either men from protective environments or referrals and appear to be "stronger" inmates, more capable of handling the pressures of confinement

without breaking down than other inmates from our sample. They tend to come from more populated areas than protective environment targets and show less cultural disparity from the general population.

Our method is to pool the three groups and then compare targets to aggressors and non-targets. In our analysis of these comparisons, for specific variables, we refer to the incompatibilities we have been discussing.

Time Between Incident and Interview

One aim of the target interview was to gather information about specific incidents. Decay exists from the time of the incident date to the time of the interview date. During this time, memory lapses occur; fantasy may sometimes replace reality. In some cases, descriptions of remote incidents are incomplete when compared to recent incidents. Most incidents we shall review occurred relatively close to the time of the interview. (See table 3.4).

The Non-Target Group Comparison Group

The non-target group is made up of the youth and adult random samples (drawn from the housing list). Men in these samples were designated "non-targets" by means of a probing personal interview. The 13 cases refusing the interview have been excluded from this group. When the interview determined a man to be a "non-target," we followed a brief schedule (see appendix A).

Aggressor Study: Sampling and Data Collection

We acquired the names of aggressors in seven different ways, as Table 3.5 shows. Most of these men were participants in the incidents targets told us about: the sample has the benefit of being made of the actual players in the interactions we examine. On the other hand, the sample has the liability of

Table 3,4. Months Before Interview Date Incident takes Place.

Mean	13.70
Mode	4.00
Minimum	1.00
Maximum	98.00
Median	6.20

being a pure availability sample. We added to the aggressor sample every available aggressor who came our way because this was the only way possible for us to obtain a sample of these men.

Acquiring an aggressor sample was a sensitive undertaking. We declined to ask targets and victims the names of the men who had been approaching them. Informants were specifically told not to mention definite names. Our ability to work successfully would have been hampered if the word got around that we were trying to get inmates to "drop dimes" on fellow inmates.

Fortunately, as the target study progressed, we learned some aggressive incidents were recorded by staff in the file of the target or in the file of the aggressor. These files became the main source of our aggressor sample. Since we were gathering pre-recorded information, our status as observers of this sensitive activity was maintained. We were not in a likely position to damage either targets or aggressors.

Staff investigations identify most of our aggressors. In these cases, a correctional officer or administrator prepares a hand-written report. A carbon copy of this report is placed in the file of both target and aggressor. When our interview with the target confirms the information in the report, we then include the aggressor in our sample. The following are examples of such reports:

Lieutenant's Report: Inmate Brown, C Block Porter, denies any involvement or knowledge of alledged incident. I had Figliani

observe inmate through the door and he identified Brown.

I then brought Figliani into this office, where he identified Brown, in person, as one of the attackers.

* * * *

Ward 16 Incident Report: Patient Heller and patient Marchland were involved in an altercation in the ward library...it seems to stem from possible homosexual advances made by Marchland toward Heller.

Marchland received an injury to his lower lip and a laceration of upper left arm that required eight sutures... two screw drivers and a comb with a razor blade taped to it were found.

Heller was placed in camisole for protection of self and others. Marchland confronted Heller and let out with a barrage of threatening statements:

"You're a punk kid. I'm going to get you; it might take years, but walk slow and think fast. You went for my throat twice with that blade and missed both times."

Our aggressor sample is an availability sample. We stumbled on the names of most of these men in the course of data collection for the target study. We believe these men to be a legitimate group of aggressors. In most cases their aggression has been identified through independent sources. Generally, detailed incident reports, written hours after the incident, confirm staff

referrals, inmate complaints, and our interviews.

Aggressor Interviews

At the time our random sample was being conducted, aggressors' names were added to the list of random informants. Then, the interviewer explained to the aggressor that he was studying problems people have in prison and elicited his cooperation. In the course of the interview, the man was encouraged to talk in general about sexual aggression in prison. The men were generally reluctant to talk about their own personal sexually aggressive behavior and the group exhibited an unusually high refusal rate (9 or 30%). However, a few interviews did yield rich material from the aggressors point of view. Unfortunately, these are too few cases to construct any systematic analysis based on interview content. Thus, these interviews serve only as a source of insight into individual aggressor experiences and attitudes.

The Aggressor Comparison Group

On certain variables, aggressors are compared to the characteristics of the entire prison population. Figures used for this comparison have been compiled by State authorities for general purposes. They were made available to us through the courtesy of the New York State Department of Correctional Services.

We removed three aggressors found in our random sample to make up a comparison group. These three cases, all from the youth prison, were identified by incident reports in the files. The comparison group, thus, is a random sample of men who have no incidents of sexual aggression recorded in their files. It may well be that some aggressors, whose behavior has eluded official notation, may be in the comparison group. The comparison group may not represent non-aggressors as much as it represents a normal body of prison inmates.

Data Collection Periods and Places

The first aggressor file was examined in November of 1974; the last in December of 1975. The first aggressor was interviewed in January of 1975, the last in October of 1975. Files of aggressors were examined in two adult prisons, one youth prison, and the central files of the correctional department. Interviews with aggressors were conducted in the adult prison and the youth prison.

The incidents which caused these men to be identified as aggressors occurred in one jail and five prisons throughout New York State. The incidents took place between 1973 and 1975. We interviewed the comparison group from June of 1975 to September of 1975. We collected data from these men's files during the same period.

Discussion of Aggressor Sample

Our group of "sexual assaulters" is probably the most dependable part of the aggressor sample. Prison sexual assault is a dramatic event not usually

hidden from other inmates and staff. We probably have identified many men who committed forced sodomy on other men during or closely before our periods of data collection. Our assaulters group is small. This is an indication that prison rape in our research setting is a relatively rare occurrence and, as our target survey shows, only part of the continuum of sexually aggressive moves in prison. Our sample of sexual aggressors represents those aggressors who come to the attention of staff. Thus, they occupy the same position as the convicted do in criminological studies based on official data. The selection bias includes those who get caught and excludes those who evade detection and identification. In our setting, this bias also may mean we have included those aggressors who are most worrisome to targets. Innocuously perceived approaches are excluded, serious ones are included. Our aggressor sample describes the types of men who threaten or use force.

Staff Study

We interviewed top administrators in Attica, Comstock, Coxsackie and Auburn. In these prisons, we also interviewed mental health professionals and the counselors and officers with special responsibility to men in protective environments. Additional officers, counselors, sergeants, and lieutenants were interviewed on an unsystematic basis throughout the state. These staff members made decisions about targets or potential targets. (See Appendix A for Schedule) Some interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed. In other cases, we took field notes of our conversations with staff. The aim of staff interviewing was to get the staff view of the problem, its causes and solutions.

We copied out of inmate files staff comments in regard to the perception and handling of specific cases. This, along with interview content from staff and targets, gives us a record of staff-in-action.

Data Analysis Methods

Information from prison records was transferred to Fortran sheets. Information from the transcribed interviews was transferred to data sheets resembling questionnaires. (see "Victimization Incident Form." Appendix B). After all the interview transcripts were summarized on these data sheets, a coding scheme was constructed. The information on the interview summary sheets was then coded onto Fortran Sheets. We carried out computer analysis using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. We used two basic units of study, the individual and the incident. Each study unit had its own computer file. Target background information was included in each coded incident, enabling us to correlate background with incident behavior. The "sample" codes of all individuals and incidents allowed us to examine effects of sampling bias on the findings. Similarly, we could select data which was purely random for certain purposes.

To look at the target-aggressor interaction, we followed a method presented by Hans Toch in Violent Men. Toch states;

In this type of approach, each move is seen as the rational response by one player to the play of another. The focus is on logical possibilities left open by preceding moves and on logical implications of each move for successive moves. These possibilities and implications can be conceptualized and

quantified...Our focus must be on the perceptions and
motives and needs of real players in concrete settings.²

In our interviews, we asked men to describe incidents of sexual aggression, encouraging a description of the behavioral moves in the incident. We asked for the words the aggressor said to the target and the words the target said to the aggressor. From interview transcriptions, we made a diagram of each incident, showing the sequence of aggressor and target moves.

We gave our informants a difficult task, and not all could complete it successfully. Some could not remember these incidents completely. Others could not describe incidents with enough detail to permit accurate diagramming. Only about two thirds of all recorded incidents were found suitable for diagrammatic analysis. Every incident consists of characteristics unique to each incident and characteristics unique to each move, which, in turn, depend on its relation to previous moves. We handled the problem of analyzing both incidents and sequences of moves by treating these parts of the data as separate units. Every incident was viewed as having attributes and variables which could be coded and tabulated. Moves in incident sequences, on the other hand, were coded, kept in sequence, and compiled on figures showing aggressor approaches, target responses, and aggressor counter responses.

A wide range of psychological reactions were reported to us in open-ended interviews. We coded and tabulated these responses. Results, however, should be considered with caution. While emotional reactions outline the

continuum of target responses, the frequencies themselves are suspect. Some targets obstinately refused to discuss their emotions, and questions about feelings were answered by masculine braggadocio, in spite of the interviewer's attempts to break through the poses prison encourages men to adapt. Some targets could not describe their emotions: our target profile, for example, places the retarded inmates in a high risk group; unfortunately, some of these men in the sample had difficulty in communicating with us. In some interviews, the degree of rapport we sought, which we required to encourage men to freely talk about their deep and personal feelings, was absent. Because of these reasons, there is a likely chance of under-reporting of emotional reactions in our survey.

Statistics

The tables in this study present three problems for tests of significance: 1) samples are not necessarily random samples, 2) the numbers in the samples are small, and 3) the frequencies for some variable values are zero or quite small. Because we use availability samples, and because some frequencies are small, we calculate observed - expected ratios to show percentage differences. Some readers, however, may find a measure of association useful. We include tests of significance for those prepared to consider them with appropriate and applicable reservations.

Footnotes: Chapter Three

1

The interview is similar to the "focused interview" and the "clinical interview" described by Claire Sellitz, Marie Jahoda, Morton Deutsch, and Stuart W. Cook: Research Methods in Social Relations New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1951,264-66. The method for exploring sequences of events and the thoughts and feelings attending each step is described by Toch (1969),18-19. See also Toch (1975),27.

2

Toch (1969),35.

3

We use Chi Square and Phi, both measures of association for nominal scale data. William L. Hays: Statistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 597. Phi varies from zero to one, the strength of the association increasing as Phi approaches one. Phi is based on the same principles as chi square measures and is mainly intended for 2XK tables. (Herman J. Loether and Donald G. McTavish: Descriptive Statistics for Sociologist. Boston: Allyn and Bacon,1974,196.) In spite of some cell frequencies being less than five, we have still shown the chi square and its related measure, Phi. Authorities differ on the minimum permissible cell frequency for the chi square, but it is recognized that it may be used in situations where cell frequencies fall as low as one if caution is exercised using judgments based on such measures. (Hays, 597).

CHAPTER FOUR:STATISTICAL FINDINGS

In this chapter, an examination is made of the major statistical findings obtained in our random and availability samples. The specific areas we investigate are incidence levels, characteristics of targets, aggressors, and non-targets, and situational features of the incidents which targets describe. A later chapter, dealing with the topic of "Explaining Sexual Aggression," looks more closely at the characteristics of aggressors. In the present chapter we focus on what kinds of men are selected to be targets and we look at the high risk times and places the incidents unfold in.

Prevalence Levels

As was indicated in Chapter Three, our target group derives from four sources:

- 1) interviewing the total resident populations of Protection in Attica and Auburn and C-2 or "Weak Company" in Coxsackie (40 targets out of 79 men interviewed),
- 2) interviewing referrals made by staff and others (34 targets),
- 3) interviewing targets identified as a result of a systematic random sample of the populations of Attica and Coxsackie (21 targets out of 76 men interviewed), and
- 4) interviewing all white inmates entering Coxsackie during a 30 day period (10 targets out of 14 men interviewed).

In order to compare targets to inmates who avoid becoming targets, we derived a "non-target" comparison group from the systematic random sample. Chosing 89 men from the housing lists of Coxsackie and Attica (about four percent of the population), we conducted a probing personal interview with the men wishing to participate (13 or 15% declined to be interviewed). On the

basis of this interview, 21 of the 76 randomly selected inmates (28%) were classified as having been the targets of sexual aggressors at some point in their institutional career. The others, 55 of the 76 men in the random sample (72%), were classified "non-targets." Table 4.1 summarizes our data estimating the prevelance levels in the two institutions.

The target rate varied considerably by race in this random sample. As we see by Table 4.1, about half of the whites in the random sample were targets at one time, compared to about a fifth of the blacks and latins. If we look only at whites in the youth cohort sample, the percentage rate is even higher, indicating the problem is most severe among white youths.

While a substantial number of sampled inmates were targets of aggressors, only one inmate in the random sample was identified as the actual victim of a sexual assault. A probing personal interview conducted with each inmate in our sample lessened the chances of under-reporting. The relatively low rate of sexual assault is also suggested by the number of incidents recorded as occurring in the two prisons where the bulk of interviews took place. According to administrators, in the adult prison, with a resident population of about 2000, one or two sexual assaults occur a year. Such assaults were somewhat more common in the youth prison of 700, where sexual assault occurred about once every two months.

Inmate interviews verify these estimates derived from administrators. Informants told the interviewer about sexual aggression occuring in the New York State prison system, in New York City's correctional complex, and in various jails throughout the state. The intensity and frequency of incidents seems to vary from place to place. The problem is probably negligible in some

Table 4.1: Target Rate by Race in Random Samples and Youth Cohort

	Percent Targets					
	White		Black and Latin		Total	
	%	(N) ^a	%	(N)	%	(N)
Random Samples						
Adult	42	(22)	20	(26)	29	(48)
Youth	55	(9)	20	(19)	25	(28)
Random Samples						
Combined	45	(31)	19	(37)	28	(76)
Youth Cohort						
	71	(14)			71	(14)

a

Numbers in parentheses refer to the denominator populations on which the percentages are based.

CONTINUED

1 OF 5

smaller county jails; many prisoners, having served both local and state time, only experienced sexual aggression in the state prison system.

Ethnicity

Other data derived from our study complement the random sample. With respect to ethnicity, for instance, we can look at the race of the aggressors in incidents. Since about half of all incidents involve multiple aggressors, targets in 152 incidents report the race of 237 aggressors: as reported by targets, most are black (80 %), some are Latin (14%), and only a few are white (6%). Table 4.2 crosstabulates the ethnicity of the targets in the incidents with the ethnicity of the aggressors. The percentages nearly reverse when we examine the ethnicity of targets in these 152 incidents: most incidents had white targets (83%); some had black targets (16%); and practically none had Latin targets (2%).

Table 4.3 illustrates the ethnicity of target and aggressor in specific incidents. The tendency for blacks to be aggressors and whites to be targets persists. It is interesting to note that 76 cases involve black aggressors and white targets while no cases involve white aggressors and black targets. Even though this finding is made less striking by 18 black targets with race of aggressor missing in the interview, statements by virtually all of the prisoners and staff we spoke with confirm the generality of the ethnic pattern portrayed in Table 4.3.

Table 4.2: Ethnicity of Target and Aggressor in Incidents of Sexual Aggression

	Target		Aggressor	
	%	(N)	%	(N)
White	83	(125)	6	(14)
Black	16	(25)	80	(189)
Latin	1	(2)	14	(34)
Total	100	(152)	100	(237)

Note. To make this table (and Table 4.3) aggressor ethnicity is coded from the transcribed interviews. Target ethnicity comes from institutional files. Targets and aggressors are counted by incident. Since there are 152 incidents among 107 targets, some targets are counted more than once. Aggressors acting as a group in about half of the incidents account for 237 aggressors among 152 incidents. Race of aggressor is missing in 42 incidents, many of which involve black targets. While most whites mentioned the aggressor's race, most blacks did not unless specifically asked; and the interviewer failed to specifically ask for the race of aggressor in every case.

Table 4.3: Ethnicity of Targets and Aggressors in Incidents

<u>Aggressor Ethnicity</u>	<u>Target Ethnicity</u>			
	<u>White</u>	<u>Latin</u>	<u>Black</u>	
White	9	0	0	9
Latin	11	1	2	14
Black	76	1	4	81
Black and Latin	6	0	1	6
Race unknown	23	0	18	41
Total	125	2	25	152

Ethnicity is practically the only objective characteristic targets can tell us about aggressors. For other comparisons, thus, we must rely on our "aggressor sample," or the 45 aggressors we found mainly through staff reports. As we explain in the chapter on methods, this aggressor group may not be representative. It is a pure availability sample and may not portray the total population of aggressors. But we use this sample, in spite of its liabilities, because it is the only group of aggressors we are able to find.

Similarly, about two thirds of our targets derive from availability sampling (with the remaining one third coming from a systematic random sample of the Attica and Coxsackie population). The validity of our comparisons must be evaluated in reference to these sample sources, as we do all targets to compare them to aggressors and non-targets. Table 3.3, in the methods chapter, compares these three target sub-groups. On most of the tables in this chapter, we also present the relevant figures for the three target sub-groups. And this chapter concludes with a summary description of the effects of sampling on our findings. The numbers of cases vary from table to table because each variable is marked by different amounts of "missing data."

Table 4.4 compares the ethnicity of the total target sample (with the six aggressors removed who were also targets) to the aggressor sample, the non-target sample, and the three target sub-group sample sources. As the table shows, there is a clear trend for whites to be targets in all three sources, i.e., protective settings, referrals, and the random group. Other studies parallel our findings with respect to the dramatic tendency of targets to be white.¹

Table 4.4 : Ethnicity of Total Target Sample, Aggressor Sample, Non-Target Sample, and the Three Target Sample Subgroups

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Ethnicity</u>			<u>Total</u>
	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Latin</u>	
Total Targets (N=100) ^a	82%	16%	2%	100%
Non-Targets (N=45)	13%	78%	9%	100%
Aggressors (N=54)	32%	50%	19%	101%
<hr/>				
<u>Target Sub-Groups</u>				
Protection and C-2(N=39)	82%	18%	0	100%
Referral (N=34)	82%	18%	0	100%
Random Sample (N=21)	67%	23%	10%	100%

^a When compared to both aggressors and non-targets, targets show a chi square significant at $P < .001$

Since white inmates in these specific institutions are predominately from upstate New York, while black inmates are drawn more heavily from New York City, it might be conjectured that some of the previously reported race differences merely reflect a big city- small city difference. While targets tend to be associated with small cities and rural areas, however, this association does not continue when we control for race (see Tables 4.5-4.7). The white prisoner from New York City is just as likely to have been a target as the white inmate from other New York State counties.

Interview data indicate whites become targets because they are perceived to be weak and because they are perceived to be sexually attractive. One reason why sexual aggressors may perceive some whites as weak has to do with ideas held by the aggressor's culture. Young urban blacks see strength in group membership.² Those who never become targets explain their invulnerability by reference to group ties. The same men class others as weak when they do not have a group behind them:

AR-45: If you come in here alone then they will try to crack on you for something. But if they know that you know people and that you have been here for awhile, then they know better. They try to pick on some of the weak ones. They like to pick on them.

* * * * *

CR-11: I don't have all that hassle like all the rest of the new guys that come. You see, I have got a whole lot of homies and the new ones that come in, they don't know nobody. That is

TABLE 4.5: HOMETOWN POPULATIONS OF TARGET, AGGRESSOR AND NON-TARGET PRISON INMATES.^a

	Less than 10,000		10,000 - 50,000		50,000 to 500,000		More than 500,000 (and suburbs)		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Target	29	29%	16	16%	36	36%	20	20%	100%
Non-Target	9	17%	2	4%	12	22%	30	58%	100%
Aggressor	3	7%	7	16%	5	11%	30	66%	100%
<hr/>									
Target sub-groups									
Protection and C-2	15	39%	8	21%	10	26%	6	15%	101%
Referral	7	21%	6	18%	13	38%	8	23%	100%
Random and Cohort	7	23%	4	12%	13	42%	7	23%	100%

^a
When compared to both aggressors and non-targets, targets show a chi square significant at

$p < .001$.

TABLE 4.6 COMMITMENT BY COUNTY OF TARGETS, AGGRESSORS, NON-TARGETS AND TOTAL POPULATION OF ATTICA AND COXSACKIE^a.

	<u>COMMITMENT BY COUNTY</u>					
	<u>New York City</u>		<u>Other Counties</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>		
Targets ^b	15	15%	86	85%	100%	
Non-Targets	28	52%	26	48%	100%	
Aggressors	30	67%	15	33%	100%	
Total Population (Attica and Coxsackie)	795	42%	1102	58%	100%	
Target Sub-groups	—	—	—	—	—	—
Protection and C-2	4	10%	35	90%	100%	
Referral	6	18%	28	82%	100%	
Random and Cohort	5	16%	26	84%	100%	
<u>OBSERVED TO EXPECTED RATIO</u>						
	<u>New York</u>		<u>Other</u>			
Targets to Total Population	.35		1.46			
Aggressors to Total Population	1.60		.57			
Non-Targets to Total Population	1.25		.83			

^a Source of total prison population: New York State Department of Correctional Services; 7.

^b When targets are compared to aggressors or to non-targets, the chi square is significant at <.001

Table 4.7: COMMITMENT BY COUNTY OF WHITE, BLACK, AND LATIN TARGET AND RANDOM NON-TARGET GROUPS

	<u>White</u>			<u>Black and Latin</u>		
	<u>N.Y.C.</u>	<u>Other Counties</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>N.Y.C.</u>	<u>Other Counties</u>	<u>Total</u>
Target	8%	92%	100% (N=84)	41%	59%	100% (N=22)
Non-Target	18%	82%	100% (N=17)	68%	32%	100% (N=37)
Observed Expected Ratio	.44	1.12		.60	1.84	
Chi Square:		.173		3.28		
Significance Level		.677		.070		
Phi:		.081		.269		

why they have to go through all that hassle, the dudes talking about ripping them off and all that stuff. You see, after you know somebody then you don't have to worry about it. But they don't know nobody so they have to go through all that hassle. It is mostly the white boy and they get some of the black boys, but not too many of them. If the white dude knows somebody, then the black dude don't mess with him.

* *.* *

CR-9: Most of the people that they do it to is people that don't have no friends and they can't fight. They just don't hang around alot of people.

* *.* *

AU-1: You come in here and you don't, like, know anybody, and finally you see that one guy that you remember from 25 years ago, light years away. Right away you have found a friend. Until you have found a foothold or something - a friend that is willing to help you without wanting to impose upon you - it is a rough situation.

Whites are a minority in the population. Yet, Puerto Ricans, also a minority, do not tend to be targets. It is not cultural minority status per se which accounts for the ethnic disparities in the aggressor-target interaction; it is the characteristics of the interacting cultures.

When blacks come to prison, they often encounter a group of "home boys" or "homies" ready to accept them. Some have known these associates on the street or in the detention centers of New York or some other large city. The peer group has offered protection (and other opportunities) both in the street and in the institution. The black peer group, having its origins in the ghetto, is a specialized informal organization. In the street it protects its members from rival gangs; in the prison it protects its members from exploitation. In the street, some black peer groups may take up violent crime; in prison, some groups may take up sexual victimization. Black patterns of group formation help to explain why blacks avoid being targets.

Whites in prison also form into groups, but find it harder to join a group. White groups in prison also differ from black groups in that they are less powerful, less cohesive, and have less potential for violence. Such groups are less likely to retaliate for an experienced slight to one of their members. And such groups inspire less fear in exploiters. Caucasian groups also exclude many whites from membership. Many targets, as we see by Table 4.5, come from rural areas, small towns, and small cities. Since they come from less densely inhabited areas, they stand less chance than do blacks of meeting other inmates from their home neighborhoods. And even when white inmates find familiar faces, these associates are likely to lack both a gang tradition and a violent tradition.³ Blacks and Latins who come from urban areas with high violent crime rates, tend to find close associates (and often

even relatives) in prison. In other words, whites are less likely to form groups, and the groups they do form tend to be less adapted than black or Latin groups to violence or its corollary - protection.

Other obstacles may keep some whites isolated, at least for a while.

Class status divides whites in prison more than other groups.⁴ Some middle class whites disdain lower class whites. Soft drug offenders view themselves as a counter-culture. And some whites in prison reject other whites because they see them as criminal deviants. Whites, more than other groups, are apt to look upon other inmates as unsavory, immoral people. Some whites in prison see themselves as "normal" and others (including other whites), as "abnormal." Forces acting against white cohesion are important in explaining why whites tend to become targets, for the isolate is seen as "weak" by aggressors.

Aggressors know they will be in trouble if they "mess with" a Latin. Latins in prison form close bonds just as they do in their communities. Newly arriving Latin inmates quickly join existing Latin groups. Whites, in comparison, are distant and cold toward newcomers:

AR-42: They [white targets] would come in by themselves and they don't know anyone. You might know this individual but nobody makes a move to call the guy over or clue him in on what is going on. It is hard to make friends in jail. If somebody don't know you, they are not going to go over and just say, "Hi - how are you. I am so and so."

And when they [aggressors] see the guy alone he is open for this trouble. He is looking for trouble. Someone will go over and hit on him.

Target Physical Appearance

Targets on the average weigh less than aggressors and non-targets (see Table 4.8). Weight differences increase between white targets and white non-targets, with the average white non-target weighing 168 pounds. Slightness, in a prison subculture, is one possible attribute of weakness, though being black or Latin, and being a white in a group, can cancel out the liability of small size.⁵ For the isolate, small size may increase the chance of an aggressor approach.

Prison aggressors look to attractiveness as well as to weakness when they select targets. Attractiveness, in this case, generally means that the potential target resembles a sexually desirable woman. For example, we asked one aggressor:

I: What is it in their being more attractive? When someone has been down for so many months and so many years, what do they look for in a man if they are looking for some man to get over on?

The aggressor answered:

The way he walk. The size of his ass. His facial expressions, his ways and actions. If his face look like a woman, they is going to think that he is a woman. The psychological thing about it is that any dude - white or black dude or any Puerto Rican - can come in here looking like a woman. And you say, "Damn, Man, that man looks like a woman.. He had to be squeeze in a certain institution."

TABLE 4.8: PHYSICAL SIZE OF TARGETS, NON-TARGETS AND AGGRESSORS.

	<u>Mean Weight</u>	<u>Mean Height</u>
Targets (N=101)	147 lbs.	68 inches
Non-Targets (N=59)	164	69 inches
Aggressors (N=45)	162 lbs.	70 inches

<u>Groups Compared</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANCE</u>		
	<u>df</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Significance Level</u>
Targets to Aggressors			
Weight	144	11.07	.01
Height	144	7.64	.01
Targets to Non-Targets			
Weight	154	15.74	.01
Height	154	1.11	Not Significant

<u>Target Sub-Groups</u>	<u>Mean Weight</u>
Protection and C-2(N= 39)	144
Referral (N=34)	154
Random and	
Cohort (N=31)	143

Weight of white targets compared to white non-targets ^a

	<u>Mean Weight</u>
White targets (N=84)	147
White non-targets (N=21)	167

^aF test with 103 degrees of freedom is significant at the .01 level.

As in heterosexual affairs, of course, the ideal sex partner does not always resemble the actual sex partner. Our inquiry documents targets and sexual assault victims who are black as well as white, large as well as small, ugly as well as good looking. Nonetheless, some informants tell us young slender white men are ⁶ the highest object of desire. The young white's appeal lies in his presumed naivete and in his physical appearance, which is perceived as feminine. The aggressor sees himself as a male; therefore, he selects targets who look, to him, like females. Choosing a member of another race may help this process. The young white target, like the prison queen, is feminized; aggressors refer to him with female pronouns. Like a woman on the street, he is viewed as an object of masculine exploitation:

AR-12: Well, it had to be the way that he appeared to them physically because he wasn't a bad looking dude. He looked younger than what he really was and his hair was long. All I can remember about him was that he wasn't the type that was heavy handed and rough. He doesn't like that. He would rather sit down and play checkers or cards rather than play football or basketball and that is maybe what attracted them to him.

* * * *

AR-18: I was trying to understand why was he selected.

When he started talking I could understand. Like they way that his voice was - like it sounded tender like he was about to cry. So, like, I told him, it is the way that you carry yourself. You have got smaller guys coming in here and they don't deal with the problem. So it is a way that a man carries himself. Like you can watch a person and tell just about how much he will take before he will break. They have hair like girls and I feel sorry for them, man. They're in big trouble. The girls have long hair and there is something about the dudes that they like and they say, "That looks like a girl to me doesn't that look like a girl to you?"

Potential for Violence

In prison, potential for violence is an asset. Prestige results if one can act tough when the situation is defined as calling for it. Those who lack the ability to muster a reaction of power or those who lack a reputation of being capable of violence are apt to be victimized. The attribute is an important criterion when an aggressor selects a target. Approaching some men can result in risk while approaching others carries no risk. The values of the mainstream prison culture call for a violent response to an unsolicited sexual approach. Aggressors, who are members of this "subculture"

8

of violence," look for targets who deviate from this norm. As we shall see in a later chapter, aggressors' expectations are not always met. But aggressors, before making an approach to a target, have an expectation that the target is less likely than others to respond violently, that he has had little experience in dealing with violence.

In interviews, aggressors explain how a potential for violence deters approaches:

AA-13: You see a young pretty dude who doesn't come in here on a violent record. Now, he is probably in the worst situation than the guy that comes in here on a violent record. Because if you know that a guy has murdered someone on the street, and has taken a life, and is in here for life, you are going to think three or four times - not just once but three or four times - before you go up against him.

* * * * *

AR-3: When they first came in the butch kids would stand by the door and they would watch and wait for all the guys to come in. And they would see them come in from outside the gates. And so they would pick a fight with them. And if the guy would fight, that might stop the butch kids. I wouldn't say that that would end it, but it might put the question in his mind that this was just a fight and then the next time this kid might kill him. And I think that

this might put a little bit of pressure on the butch kid and might raise him out a little bit.

* * * * *

AR-5: Somebody that shows timidness, who is real quiet.

That is basically it. Someone who is real quiet and withdrawn and looks scarey. He looks frightened you know. He is most apt to be approached.

In American society, expressions of aggression differ among social classes
9 and ethnic groups. In New York State prisons, a higher percentage of blacks than whites are serving time for violent offenses. In addition to being seen as weak because they have no group behind them, whites are also seen as weak because they are less likely than blacks or Latins to respond violently to perceived threats. In our survey, the most extreme violence against perceived threats comes from blacks and Puerto Ricans. In one case, when a man made a sexual request to him, a young black killed the man with a chair. In another case, a Puerto Rican, threatened with sexual assault, gave the aggressor a cut across the face requiring twenty-two stitches.

Within our data set, one index of "potential for violence" is provided by the nature of past criminal behavior, namely, whether an inmate has a commitment offense which involves personal force or threat of force. As may be seen in Table 4.10 , an examination of convictions prior to current

Table 4.10: Force or Threat of Force Used in Conviction Previous to Commitment Offense
of Target, Aggressor, and Non-Target Prison Inmates

	<u>Force</u>	<u>No Force</u>	<u>Total</u>
Target (N=77)	25%	75%	100%
Non-Target (N=39)	58%	42%	100%
Aggressor (N=29)	79%	21%	100%
<hr/>			
<u>Target Sub-Groups</u>			
Protection and C-2(N=27)	15%	85%	100%
Referral (N=25)	32%	68%	100%
Random and Cohort (N=28)	32%	68%	100%

a

When compared to both aggressors and non-targets, targets show a chi square significant at $p < .001$.

commitment offense reveals that only 25 percent of targets had a conviction for forcible crime in contrast to 58 percent of non-targets and 79 percent of aggressors. An inspection of the nature of the current commitment offense (Table 4.11) indicates that force or threat was used by 46 percent of targets, 85 percent of non-targets, and 84 percent of aggressors. Thus, there is a strong association between being a target and having offense histories involving no threat or use of personal force. However, it is important to consider the possible effect of race on these findings.

In Table 4.12 the relationship between target status and use of force in the commitment offense is presented for white and black and Latin prisoners separately. These findings reveal that there are only five black and Latin prisoners in the "no force" category which should make us cautious about generalizing. However, it is interesting to note that four out of the five are targets. Thus, among blacks, there is a tendency for targets to have been committed for a non-forcible offense ($\phi = .28$). Among whites, the relationship is in the same direction but is of smaller magnitude ($\phi = .13$). Indeed, the control for race results in a considerable reduction in the overall relationship presented in 4.11. The relationship between race and target status remains a strong one in 4.12. For example; among forcible offenders, we find 31 of the 40 whites are targets, while only 13 of 49 blacks and Latins are targets.

Institutional Adjustment.

Suicide Attempts

Both aggressors and targets have recorded in institutional files more suicide attempts in prison than non-targets (see Table 4.14). In part, this difference reflects

Table 4.11: Threat or Use of Personal Force Accompanying Commitment

Offense of Targets, Aggressors, Non-Targets and Population of Attica and
Coxsackie^a

	<u>Force</u>		<u>No Force</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
Targets ^b	44	46%	52	54%	100%
Non-Target	45	85%	8	15%	100%
Aggressors	38	84%	7	16%	100%
Total Population (Attica & Coxsackie)	1136	.73%	414	27%	100%

Target Sub-Groups

Protection and C-2	17	47%	19	53%	100%
Referral	18	55%	15	45%	100%
Random and Cohort	12	40%	18	60%	100%

Observed to Expected Ratio

	<u>Force</u>	<u>No Force</u>
Targets to Total	.63	2.00
Aggressors to Total	1.15	.59
Non-Targets to Total	1.16	.56

^a New York State Department of Correctional Services, op. cit., 11.

^b

When compared to both aggressors and non-targets, targets show a chi square significant at .001.

Table 4.12: Force or Threat of Force Used in Current Commitment Offense of
Target and Non-Target White and Black or Latin Prisoners

	White prisoners ^a						Black and Latin prisoners ^b					
	Force		No force		Total		Force		No force		Total	
	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
Target	40	(31)	60	(47)	100	(78)	77	(13)	24	(4)	101	(17)
Non-target	56	(9)	44	(7)	100	(16)	97	(36)	3	(1)	100	(37)
Observed-												
expected ration	.71			1.36			.79			8.00		

^a Chi square not significant, phi = .13.

^b Chi square not significant, phi= .28.

TABLE 4.14: History of Suicide Attempts of Aggressors, Targets and non-Target Inmates

	Per Cent History			Total
	Suicide Attempt	No Suicide Attempt		
Targets (N=94)	36%	64%		100%
Non-Targets (N=54)	2%	98%		100%
Aggressors (N=44)	18%	82%		100%
<hr/>				
Target Sub-Groups				
Protection and C-2 (N= 35)	49%	51%		100%
Referral (N=31)	39%	61%		100%
Random and Cohort (N=31)	26%	74%		100%

a

When compared to non-targets, targets show a chi square significant at $<.001$, compared to aggressor, $<.05$.

the fact that aggressors and targets are younger than non-targets, for youths
in prison are in a high risk group for suicide attempts. Targets, however,
are more than twice as likely than aggressors to have made attempts on their
lives: thirty-eight percent of all targets have made a suicidal gesture in
prison.

Although some recorded acts of self-mutilation are undoubtedly tied to specific target incidents, data in institutional files is not detailed enough for us to make this connection. (In our chapter on target emotional reactions, we discuss target experiences leading to suicidal ideation and acts of self-mutilation). A suicide attempt may be associated with having been a target as both situations are linked to fear. Toch, in his study of "Human Breakdowns in Prison," indicates one category of difficulty some targets experience. He calls this "fate avoidance." It indicates a feeling of powerlessness to cope with a fearful situation, a helplessness to avoid or protect oneself from harm. A person with such a problem makes a suicide attempt because he wishes to avoid being harmed and sees being harmed as
an unavoidable fate.

Suicide attempt rates differ among our three target sample sources.

Targets from protective environments are almost twice as likely as randomly selected targets to attempt suicide. Again, just as accelerated feelings of fear drive men to Protection, they drive men to take their lives. Men are made fearful by target incidents; target incidents confirm the worst expectations of already fearful men; fearful men are also more likely to be inviting targets.

Disciplinary Infractions

Table 4.15 shows that both aggressors and targets have higher average numbers of disciplinary infractions than non-targets. This is a function of their younger ages as well as a function of their concentration in the youth prison, where officers are more likely to "write up" an inmate than are officers in the adult prison. Our sampling biases this variable, however. Random and Referral groups show only slightly more average disciplinary infractions than non-targets; targets from C2 and Protection have more than three times as many disciplinary infractions as non-targets. Combining the three groups inflates the overall target statistic on this variable, not because targets misbehave more but because youths are "written up" more. The sampling bias only holds for general infractions. All three target groups have more violent infractions than non-targets (although youths still tend to get more violent reports than adults). This difference is tied to target status.

If we look only at violent disciplinary infractions, we see aggressors have more such infractions than targets, and non-targets. These findings confirm the generality of aggressors being more violent than other inmates, a position already substantiated by the nature of the commitment offense (see Table 4.9 to 4.11).

The finding of targets having more violent disciplinary infractions than non-targets, seems to contradict the assumption that targets are less violent than other inmates. However, a large number of targets' violent infractions are fights precipitated by sexual approaches. Targets are involved in prison

TABLE 4.15: Prison Disciplinary Infractions of Targets, Non-Targets and Aggressors

	<u>Mean Number of Disciplinary Infractions</u>	<u>Mean Number of Violent Disciplinary Infractions</u>
Targets	9.62 (N=90)	1.58 (N=86)
Non-Targets	4.60 (N=48)	.31 (N=49)
Aggressors	12.97 (N=36)	2.49 (N=35)

SIGNIFICANCE

<u>Groups Compared</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Significance Level</u>
Targets to Aggressors			
Non-Violent Infractions	124	1.61	Not Significant
Violent Infractions	119	5.22	.05
Targets to Non-Targets			
Non-Violent Infractions	137	4.46	.05
Violent Infractions	134	17.34	.01

<u>Target Sub-Groups</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Protection and C-2	33	15.7	31	2.06
Referral	30	7.57	28	1.64
Random and Cohort	30	5.90	30	1.10

violence, not because they are more violent than non-targets, but because being a target may involve a violent encounter with an aggressor.

Mental Health Residence

When compared to non-targets, there is an association between being a target and prior mental health residence (Table 4.16). This association holds regardless of sampling procedures: nearly as many randomly selected targets had mental histories as other targets.

Similarly,

more targets than non-targets were in "Special Classes" (for the retarded or emotionally disturbed) during high school (see Table 4.19). ¹² Especially if he has other features characteristic of potential targets, the man with a handicap is likely to be approached for sex because he may be alone in prison.

In addition to his weakness, his psychological peculiarities may make it easier for an aggressor to dehumanize (or feminize) him. The odd acting man, especially if he is young and from an unsophisticated background, may be seen more easily as something less than a man. Exploiting him sexually may also be easier because the probability of empathy is reduced.

Age

In our sample, targets and aggressors are approximately the same age, while non-targets tend to be older than both (see Tables 4.17 and 4.18). Since sexual aggression is more prevalent in the youth institution (see Table 4.1), the closeness in age between target and aggressor reflects our sampling procedures more than the way aggressors select targets. In a prison system segregated by age, only youthful targets are available to youthful aggressors. Where age

TABLE 4.16: Prior Residence in Mental Health Facility of Aggressors, Targets and Non-

116

Targets

	Per Cent History			Total
	Mental Health Residence	No Mental Health Residence		
Targets (N=99)	32%	68%		100%
Non-Targets (N=54)	9%	91%		100%
Aggressors (N=45)	24%	76%		100%
<hr/>				
Target Sub-Groups				
Protection and C-2 (N=39)	33%	67%		100%
Referral (N=33)	33%	67%		100%
Random and Cohort (N=30)	30%	70%		100%

a

Compared to non-targets, targets show a chi square significant at $p < .005$.

TABLE 4.17: AGES OF TARGETS COMPARED TO AGGRESSORS,
NON-TARGETS AND
ATTICA AND COXSACKIE.

	16 - 18		19 - 20		21 - 29		30 and above		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Targets ^a	48	36%	36	26%	43	31%	10	7%	100%
Non-Targets ^b	7	13%	11	20%	16	30%	20	37%	100%
Aggressors ^c	9	20%	18	40%	10	22%	8	18%	100%
Total Population of (Attica & Coxsackie) ^d	240	13%	250	13%	628	33%	779	41%	100%

^aAt time of Incident.

^bOn December 31, 1975.

^cOn December 31, 1975.

^dSource: New York State Department of Correctional Services. op. cit., 11.

TABLE 4.18: Age on the Same Date (December 31, 1975) of Targets, Non-Targets and Aggressors

	<u>Mean Age in Years</u>
Target (N=101)	22.98
Non-Targets (N=59)	26.65
Aggressors (N=45)	22.73

SIGNIFICANCE

<u>Groups Compared</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Significance Level</u>
Targets to Non-Targets	154	10.26	.01
Targets to Aggressors	144	.05	Not Significant

<u>Target Sub-groups</u>	<u>Mean Age</u>
Protection and C-2 (N=39)	21.08
Referral (N=34)	24.18
Random and Cohort (N=31)	23.90

groups are more mixed, researchers have found targets to be younger than aggressors.¹³ since sexual aggression is most concentrated among young people, separating youths from adults does not solve the problem. Youth is associated with violence in general as well as sexual exploitativeness.¹⁴ Youth also becomes a time when prisoners are most likely to have breakdowns and crises related to fear.

Education, Occupation, and Family Background

Targets have less pre-prison education than non-targets (see Table 4.19). Considering the numbers of targets between the ages of 16 and 19 (49 percent of total targets), this is a difference we expect to find. Because non-targets are older, they have had more of a chance to finish high school than targets. Looking at the percentages of both groups completing the eighth grade, an educational level that is not biased by age differences between the groups, we see near similar figures for the two groups. Comparing targets to the total populations suggests the same findings as when targets are compared to non-targets.

Targets are less likely than non-targets to have worked at skilled or semi-skilled jobs before coming to prison (Table 4.20). But age, more than social class, brings about this difference. The data on occupation place both targets and non-targets in the lower class. While some targets had "no occupation" because they were students on the street, only one or two of these were college students. More than half of the non-target group, and almost two thirds of the target group were unemployed at the time of their conviction. The others, from both groups, worked at lower-class jobs.

TABLE 4.19: Pre-Prison Education OF TARGETS, AGGRESSORS, NON-TARGETS AND ATTICA AND COXSACKIE PRISONER POPULATIONS (1973)

	Some College or Vocational Training School		High School Graduate		High School, Non-Graduate		Elementary (1-8)		Special Classes		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Total
Targets	2	2%	9	9%	48	50%	30	31%	8	8%	100%
Non-Targets	0	0%	10	19%	26	50%	15	29%	1	2%	100%
Aggressors	0	0%	2	5%	25	58%	16	37%	0	0%	100%
Total Populations (Attica and Coxsackie) (N=1900)	84	5%	313	17%	862	47%	561	30%	28	1%	100%

CHI SQUARE SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL

Targets to Aggressors Not significant

Targets to Non-Targets Not significant

OBSERVED TO EXPECTED RATIO

	<u>Some College, Vocational</u>	<u>High School Graduate</u>	<u>High School Non-Graduate</u>	<u>Elementary</u>	<u>Special Classes</u>
Targets to Total Population	.4	.52	1.06	1.03	8.00
Aggressors to Total Population	0	.29	1.23	1.23	0
Non-Targets to Total Population	0	1.12	1.06		2.00

Table 4.20: Civilian Occupation of Target, Aggressor and Non-Target Inmates

	Clerical and Service	Skilled and Semi-skilled	Laborers	No Occupation or Student	Total
Target (N=96) ^a	5%	7%	23%	65%	100%
Non-Target (N=52)	14%	14%	15%	54%	100%
Aggressor (N=44)	2%	11%	5%	82%	100%

^a

When compared to both aggressors and non-targets, targets show a chi square significant at $p < .05$.

Similar percentages of targets and non-targets (about two-thirds of the total), (Table 4.21) come from broken homes. Combined with the data on education and occupation, family background helps to portray the target as a man sharing many of the social characteristics of other prisoners. Ethnicity and geographic origin may cause targets to look and act more "middle class" than others. This classification, however, lacks other objective referents. Education, occupation, and family background show targets to be just as "lower-class" as non-targets.

Convictions and Sentences

Except for moderate differences, explained by the influence of age and sentencing county, length of sentence and numbers of adult convictions fail to distinguish targets, aggressors and non-targets (see Tables 4.22 through 4.24).

Mean sentence length (Table 4.22) indicates that targets, overall, have sentences about a year shorter than non-targets. But the three target sample groups differ from each other on this variable. Random targets have about the same sentence length as non-targets, while referrals and targets from protective settings have somewhat shorter sentences than non-targets. Where sentence lengths are combined, the difference between targets and non-targets is not significant. Looked at separately, sentence differences are moderate. What this means is sentence length is not a good predictor of target status. Most aggressors and most targets, at the time of the interview, were serving sentences of four years or less, sentences generally associated with youth offenders in New York State. In spite of differences in the threat or use of force accompanying the commitment offense, aggressors received about the same average sentence length as targets. This reflects sentencing patterns in the state, where judges outside of New York City give sentences for non-violent crimes equivalent to sentences given in the City for violent crimes.

TABLE 4.21: FAMILY BACKGROUND OF AGGRESSORS, TARGETS AND NON-TARGET INMATES

	Per Cent		
	Broken Family During Childhood	Intact Family During Childhood	Total
Targets (N=97)	68%	32%	100%
Non-Targets (N=52)	61%	39%	100%
Aggressors (N=45)	80%	20%	100%
<hr/>			
<u>Target Sub-Groups</u>			
Protection and C-2 (N=38)	68%	32%	100%
Referral (N=32)	66%	34%	100%
Random and Cohort (N=29)	72%	28%	100%

TABLE 4.22: MAXIMUM SENTENCE
AGGRESSORS

OF TARGETS, NON-TARGETS AND

Mean Maximum Sentence on
Current Commitment in Months

Targets (N=91)	67.05 Months
Non-Targets (N=49)	81.67 Months
Aggressors (N=41)	77.56 Months

SIGNIFICANCE

<u>Groups Compared</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Significance Level</u>
Targets to Aggressors	130	1.018	Not Significant
Targets to Non-Targets	139	2.62	Not Significant

Target Sub-groups

	<u>Sentence</u>
Protection and C-2(N= 37)	57.41 Months
Referral (N= 30)	65.00 Months
Random and Cohort (N= 27)	84 Months

TABLE 4.23 MAXIMUM SENTENCE OF TARGETS, AGGRESSORS, NON-TARGETS AND POPULATION OF COXSACKIE AND ATTICA^a.

	Maximum Sentence in Years								Total	
	4 or Less		5 - 10		11 - 20		20 to Life			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Targets	68	69%	14	14%	6	6%	10	10%	100%	
Non-Targets	22	42%	19	37%			4	8%	100%	
Aggressors	27	66%	9	22%	3	7%	2	5%	100%	
Total Population (Attica and Coxsackie)	934	49%	500	26%	172	9%	289	16%	100%	
	$N = 1550$									

CHI SQUARE SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL

Targets to Aggressors Not significant

Targets to Non-Targets $p < .05$

OBSERVED TO EXPECTED RATIO

	4 or Less	5 - 10	11 - 20	20 - Life
Targets to Total Population	1.40	.54	.67	.62
Aggressors to Total Population	1.34	.85	.78	.31
Non-Targets to Total Population	.86	1.42	1.44	.50

^aNew York State Department of Correctional Services, op. cit., 1.

*Difference related to targets (concentrated in the "four or less category") being removed from the non-target group. Targets have shorter sentences than non-targets because they are younger.

Table 4.24: Mean Number of Criminal Convictions of Targets, Non-targets and Aggressors

	<u>Mean Number of Juvenile Convictions</u>	<u>Mean Number of Adult Convictions</u>
Targets	.85	3.13
Non-Targets	.57	3.61
Aggressors	1.36	2.98

Significance

	DF	F	Significance Level
Target-Aggressor			
Juvenile	198	4.39	Significant at .05
Adult	199	.405	Not significant

Target to Non-Target

Juvenile	151	2.32
Adult	152	.74

<u>Target Sub-groups</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Protection and C-2(N=39)	39	1.46	38	2.29
Referral (N=32)	32	.72	33	3.30
Random and Cohort (N=30)	30	.97	31	4.4

Incarceration Experience

Targets of sexual aggression, at the time of the interview, were just as likely as others to have served previous adult sentences in jails or prisons (see Table 4.25). A greater proportion of targets than non-targets served time in juvenile institutions (Table 4.26). We have also calculated targets' institutional experience at the time of the incident (see Table 4.27). These data show targets have considerable incarceration experience before incidents. Over half (65 percent) have some form of adult or juvenile commitment before the commitment on which the incident occurred (see Table 4.28).

Times and Places Incidents Occur

While targets come into prison with varied incarceration experience behind them, a more important variable relating to target selection has to do with the amount of time spent in the actual prison (or prison system) where the incident occurs. Newness to a specific prison or prison system may be more important than previous incarceration experience in determining the most vulnerable point for incidents to occur. We examined two variables relating to this issue: the stage of incarceration when the incident happens and the length of time served on the sentence when the incident happens.

Table 4.29 shows the stage of the incarceration process when the incident occurs. Among our sample, not many (13 percent) incidents happened in county jails preceding entrance to state prison. Some men, of course, had served jail time in facilities without tough urban blacks. In New York City, white youths were frequently targets on Rikers Island. These findings indicate that a partial requisite of sexual aggression in an institution is cultural

Table 4.25: Prior Adult Incarceration of Targets, (at time of interview), Non-
Target and Total Prisoner Populations of Attica and Coxsackie

	<u>Prior Adult</u>	<u>No Prior Adult</u>	Total
Targets (N=90)	50%	50%	100%
Non-Targets (N=58)	44%	56%	100%
Aggressors (N=45)	53%	47%	100%
Total Populations (N=1897)	55%	45%	100%

Attica - Coxsackie

OBSERVED TO EXPECTED RATIO

	Prior Adult Commitment	No Prior Adult Commitment
Target to Total population	.90	1.11
Aggressor to total population	.96	1.04
Non-target to total population	.80	1.24

TABLE 4.26: JUVENILE COMMITMENT HISTORY OF AGGRESSORS, TARGETS AND NON-TARGET PRISON INMATES.

	Per Cent			Total
	Juvenile Commitment	No Juvenile Commitment		
Targets (N=99) ^a	34%	66%		100%
Non-Targets (N=58)	24%	76%		100%
Aggressors (N=45)	53%	47%		100%
<hr/>				
<u>Target Sub-Groups</u>				
Protection and C-2 (N=39)	31%	69%		100%
Referral (N= 33)	33%	67%		100%
Random and Cohort (N= 30)	47%	53%		100%

^aWhen compared to aggressors, targets show a chi square significant at <.05.

Table 4.27: Incarceration Experience of Targets Prior to Victimization Incidents
(Including all former institutionalizations for criminal behavior)

Months of previous Incarceration before Incident	Number of Targets	Percent
0-6	45	33%
6-12	28	21%
12-24	14	10%
over 24	49	36%
Total	139	100%

Table 4.28. Commitment History of Targets

	N	Percent
Prior time in confinement	89	62%
First time in confinement	54	38%
total	143	100%

Table 4.29: Stage in the Incarceration Process When Incident Occurs (Juvenile Incidents Excluded)

Incarceration Facility	Number of Incidents	Percent of Incidents
Jail	16	13%
Reception Center	30	24%
First Prison after Reception	65	51%
Subsequent Prisons	4	3%
Temporary Placement in Correctional Mental Health Facility	12	9%
Total	127	100%

eterogeneity.

Because 77 percent of the incidents take place during the first 16 weeks of a man's sentence (see Table 4.30), the Reception Center and first transfer prison are the most likely places for incidents to occur. During these 16 weeks, aggressors test new men to see if they are susceptible to sex pressure. In the meantime, new men adjust to prison, looking for secure ways to live. New men may deter future approaches by joining one of the established cliques, by moving into a protective environment, or engaging in a fight with an aggressor or otherwise deterring him. Until the potential target completes his coping process, he is vulnerable.

Some men have incidents after the first 16 weeks. In these cases, the man has generally failed to develop a prison lifestyle deterring sexual approaches. He may have been involved in an incident where his response failed to inspire respect. He may have failed to join a group or failed to get himself installed in a protective environment. Failing to cope with sexual aggression during the first months of prison may label a man as vulnerable during the months that follow. Some men who fail to resolve the problem in the first few months may find themselves with a public image encouraging sexual approaches. A minority of targets are seen as weak because they cannot fight, as feminine because other men are attracted to them. They are likely to be approached at any time until their release.

Table 4.30: Time of Incident: Weeks After Entering Prison Incident Takes Place
 (New York State Facilities for Adults Only)

Weeks after entering New York State Prison System ¹	Number of incidents	Percent of incidents
One to eight weeks	66	52%
Nine to sixteen weeks	32	25%
Sixteen to fifty-two weeks	19	15%
Over fifty-two weeks	10	8%
Total	127	100%

¹ Mean 17.7. Median 8.3.

Incident Locations Within Institutions

Table 4.31 summarizes the location where the incident takes place. No specific place is particularly prone to being a locus of aggression, considering the relative amounts of time spent by prisoners in these various locations. Incidents occur just about anywhere that men come together. With the exception of bathrooms or showers, there is no relation between the location of the incident and the amount of staff security available. Incidents occur in shops and school-rooms, for example, where prisoners work under the eyes of teachers or foremen. Because of staff presence, however, most incidents fall short of sexual assault and most do not invite disciplinary infractions. If staff were not present, many incidents would probably be more serious than they are.

TABLE 4.31: LOCATION OF INCIDENTS WITHIN INSTITUTIONS

Location of Incidents	Number of Incidents	Percent of Incidents
Cell Block	43	32%
Work or School	22	16%
Recreation Areas	21	16%
Shower or Bathroom	18	13%
Dormitory	7	5%
Messhall	2	1%
Infirmary	2	1%
More Than One (Incident took Place in different locations)	19	26%
Total	134	100%

Summary of Differences Between Targets and Aggressors and Non-TargetsDifferences Between Targets and AggressorsTargets Tend to be:

1. White,
2. From rural areas, small towns,
or small cities.
3. Light in weight,
4. Non-violent offenders

Aggressors Tend to be:

1. Black or Latin,
2. From large urban areas,
3. Normal weight,
4. Violent offenders

Higher percentages of targets than aggressors have :

1. Institutional suicide attempts,
2. Prior residence in mental health facilities,
3. High School attendance in "Special Classes."

Higher percentages of aggressors have:

1. Records of prison violence,
2. Juvenile commitments.

Similarities Between Targets and Aggressors:

1. Both have numerous prison disciplinary infractions,
2. Both are young.
3. Both have low education and occupation levels.
4. Both come from broken homes.
5. Both have prior adult commitments.
6. Both have similar numbers of convictions.

Differences Between Targets and Non-TargetsTargets Tend to be:

1. White
2. From rural areas, small towns, and small cities.
3. Lightweight,
4. Non-violent offenders,
5. Youths

Non-Targets Tend to be:

1. From all races in proportion to their numbers in the population,
2. Part from large urban areas, part from other areas,
3. Normal weight,
4. Violent offenders,
5. Adults

Higher percentages of targets have:

1. Institutional suicide attempts,
2. Prior residence in mental health facilities,
3. High School attendance in "Special Classes,"
4. Records of prison violence.

Higher percentages of non-targets have:

1. High School diplomas,
2. Long sentences.

Similarities Between Targets and Non-Targets

1. Both have low education and occupation levels.
2. Both come from broken homes,
3. Both have prior adult commitments

Influence of Target Sampling on Statistical Conclusions

Difference	Effect
1. Geographical origins: More men from protective settings come from rural areas and small towns than either referrals or randoms. Slightly more referral and random targets come from New York City.	The conclusion remains that targets tend to come from rural areas, small towns , and small cities. Many more non-targets than random or referral targets come from New York City and Buffalo. Men from rural areas and small towns, especially in the youth prison, seem to need protective settings more than targets from larger geographical areas.
2. Weight: Referrals, on the average, weigh more than other targets.	The conclusion that targets tend to be significantly lighter than non-targets and aggressors remains. Referrals are still lighter than non-targets. Random targets weigh about the same as C2 and Protection men. Targets are slight, regardless of sampling pre-defined high risk locations.

Difference**Effect**

3. Force used with crime: Randoms are less likely to use force with their commitment offense than either protection or referral targets.

All target groups show significantly less use of force with crime than either aggressors or non-targets. The conclusion that targets tend to be less violent offenders remains.

4. Suicide attempt: Targets from protective environments and referral targets are more likely to have suicide attempts than random targets.

The difference within target groups calls for lessening the strength of the association between suicide attempt and target but the association continues to exist. Twenty-six percent of random targets have made suicide attempts, as compared to a mere two percent in the non-target group.

5. General Disciplinary Reports: random and referral groups have far fewer average reports than the targets from protective settings.

Eliminates any usefulness in the association. Random targets and referrals have about as many general disciplinary reports as non-targets.

6. Violent Reports: Random targets average fewer than referral or protective setting targets.

The association between targets and institutional violence is lessened but still prevails. Random and referral targets still average more violent reports than non-targets.

Difference	Effect
7. Mean maximum sentence: Random targets average longer sentences than other targets.	Targets should be thought of as having about the same sentences as other prisoners. Random targets average about the same sentence length as others and referral or protective environment targets differ only slightly.
8. Juvenile commitment: Random targets are more likely than others to have juvenile commitment.	Other groups also have higher percentages of juvenile commitment than non-targets. This type of experience does not make one immune to target approaches, although it may call for handling such approach without staff help or without going to Protection or Weak Company.

Conclusion

According to Amir, "rape is ecologically bound."¹⁷ Areas producing high rates of crime against persons produce high rates of forcible rape.¹⁸ In these neighborhoods, black rapists chose black victims because both live in proximity. They are often acquaintances, at least by sight. Propinquity determines that the characteristics of young females in such high crime districts are the same as the characteristics of rape victims. Just as the low income black ghetto in Amir's study has a high rate of rape, so does the youth prison in our study have a high rate of sexually aggressive incidents (most of which fall short of completed rapes because of security measures). Youths from the subculture of violence inhabit both the ghetto and the youth prison. It is they who initiate most sexual aggression in the two settings.

The young black female, living close to rapists, becomes the modal victim in the streets. Similarly, the slight, white youth, designated a female by the aggressors living close to him, becomes the modal target in prison. In the street, social circumstances lock potential victims to offenders. In prison, common incarceration locks potential targets to aggressors. Prisons with concentrations of violent offenders, youthful members of the subculture of violence, are as replete with sexual aggression as urban ghettos. While some prison sexual aggression, like some heterosexual rape, can occur in any setting, victimization seems to be most prevalent in institutions where urban ghetto culture lives behind the walls. Such is the case, for example, of the prisons of Philadelphia or the jails of Washington, D.C.²⁰

Other writers interpret this ethnic pattern as a sign that aggressors aim to humiliate and harm their targets: black prisoners chose white targets in order to get back at all whites for what they have done to blacks. We suggest an alternative explanation (which we discuss more thoroughly in Chapter Nine). We see aggressors choosing white victims for two primary reasons: 1) because whites are seen as weak, and 2) because whites are seen as sexually attractive. The slight, white prisoner, whose physical appearance makes him a more attractive and weaker target than the heavier inmate of his race, thus is most at risk.

The statistical findings we describe in this chapter also help us to understand the types of incidents deriving from sexual aggression. As we will see in the following chapters, certain target responses to aggressors' overtures reflect the contextual data we shall review. We show the typical target to be a lower-class, under-educated youth from rural areas, small towns, and small cities. His culture puts him at a disadvantage when confronted with tough urban blacks. Also, because of his background, he is likely to value highly a masculine image. When he knows aggressors think of him as a "girl," when he doubts his ability to counteract their threats and/or attacks, the psychological impact can be devastating.

Our statistical findings fail to suggest any easy solutions to the problem. Classification, which would be aimed at separating potential targets from potential aggressors, would have the result of imposing racial segregation on public facilities. Such a move at this time would go contrary to the aim

of equal treatment for all races. Increasing security might have little effect, for we have seen how incidents occur even in areas covered by staff. And we must consider the human costs in calling for the greater repression increased custody implies. The harm going along with such solutions must be balanced against the good they will do. This requires an examination of the severity of the problem, a task we turn to in the next four chapters.

Footnotes: Chapter Four

1 Bartollas, et al, 52,79. Davis, 34,48. A study of ethnicity and prisoner breakdowns carried out in New York State found whites predominate in the category of crises caused by fear: Johnson 168. See also Toch (1975), 133.

2 Johnson, 18-19.

3 See Table 4.12 for race and crime of violence. In New York State, far fewer whites than blacks or Latins come to prison from areas supporting violent gang subcultures.
Bartollas, et al, 79.

5 Data from the "Philadelphia Report" also found victims to weigh less than aggressors. 4. In this atmosphere of extreme sexual exploitation, the report noted: "Virtually every slightly built man...is sexually approached within hours after his admission to prison," 3. Bartollas, et al, however, found no significant weight differences between victims and aggressors, 135.

6 To the extent that sexual aggression satisfies status needs, the white target brings the highest status to the aggressor in prison because aggressors' peers admire the potential prize as a sex object and admire the man who can win him.

7 Buffum, 23.

8 Wolfgang and Ferricuti.

9 See Martin Gold: "Suicide, Homicide and the Socialization of Aggression."
American Journal of Sociology 63 (1968): 651-661.

0
Toch (1975), 128.

11
Toch (1975), 51.

12
Bartollas, et al, paralleling our findings, found eight emotionally disturbed boys among a group of sixteen "chronic sex victims," 159.

13
Davis, 4.

14
Wolfgang and Ferricuti, 258. Amir, 51-60.

15
Bartollas, et al, lacked objective measures of social class. However, they observed differences between behavior of "middle class" white targets and "lower-class" white targets. According to the authors, lower-class boys are not as easy to victimize, they have "more mental and physical toughness" and "May be looking for a good fight to move up on the status hierarchy, '80, see also 163. The authors, through psychological tests, found the more normal (on tests) to be more likely to be exploited. This finding, they claim, is related to middle-class whites achieving "normal" scores on psychological tests, 138-39, 267.

16
Unfortunately, we did not collect data on jail time preceding conviction.

17 Amir, 70.

18 Amir, 339.

19 Amir, 258.

20 Davis, Martin.

CHAPTER FIVE: THE TARGET-AGGRESSOR INTERACTION

Every target in our study was exposed to at least one sexually aggressive incident. These incidents differ in the number of aggressors involved, in duration, and in the harm suffered by the target. In this chapter, we describe this heterogeneous range of incidents.

Participants: Number of Aggressors and Activity of Peers

Table 5.1 shows the numbers of aggressors involved in our incidents. Almost half (44 percent) of our incidents had more than one aggressor. A substantial part of prison sexual aggression, like rape on the street, can thus be attributed to aggressors acting together.¹

In only four cases did the targets' peers become actively involved in helping the targets to defend themselves. Targets, for the most part, handled the incidents themselves. In part, the absence of aid reflects a prison norm which calls for personal difficulties to be handled individually. The norm holds that if one can surmount tests of manhood unsupervised, one can assert himself as a man. In addition, targets are often targets because they lack group support.

Table 5.1: Number of Aggressors in Each Incident of Sexual Aggression

	N	%
Two aggressors	29	20%
More than two aggressors	35	24%
Total incidents with multiple aggressors	64	44%
One aggressor	80	56%
Total	144	100%

Shame and embarrassment may also be factors excluding peer support. The target may be a man who finds it difficult to discuss personal sexual problems. His silence may also be reinforced by the risk of defamation. To others, the target of unwanted sexual approaches may be a "punk" or a "pussy." If a target shares his problem with his peers, he risks being labeled a homosexual, which is a dismaying prospect for most heterosexual prison inmates.

About twenty percent of our recorded incidents showed collaborative activity by prison aggressors' peers. Such collaboration included activity to

- a) hold down target (eight cases),
- b) stand around looking (eight cases),
- c) encourage aggressor by laughing at what he does (five cases),
- d) watch for staff (three cases),
- e) help set up target (two cases), and
- f) beat target for ratting (two cases).

We also find a pattern where "primary aggressors" initiate the acts, and "secondary aggressors" are ready to move in if things go right. In addition, some aggressors, especially those who are the most forceful and the most exploitative, have assistants who are members of their peer-centered subculture. Even though such peers may disdain the sexual action, they may loyally aid their fellows in carrying out their plans.

Incident Duration

Just as incidents have attributes determined by numbers of people in them, they have attributes determined by the length of time they take. The

duration of an incident is a possible clue to its character and intensity. A "correct" response can abruptly terminate an incident. A target who mismanages his responses may have an aggressor hanging on him for days or weeks.

Table 5.2 summarizes the duration of incidents. We see that 54 percent of the incidents were single episodes lasting less than two hours, and some only lasted a few minutes. Brief incidents are often terminated by determined gestures:

ARE-4: This black man was looking over towards me and I had no idea what he had in mind and so I was continuing with the pinochle game. Every once in awhile I would hear a remark, "Hi cutie , " or something of this nature. And then he would smack with his lips. This guy began to be annoying after awhile. He kept it up and I finally realized that it was I that he was insinuating his remarks to. And so I finally laid my cards down and went over to him and said, "You're disgusting. Do you get any enjoyment out of that?"

And his exact words were, "I'm going to get into your ass."

And I told him right out, "It's going to be a cold day in Hell before you ever think about it."

He said, "If I have to, I'll hit you over the head and take it that way."

And I said right then and there, "That's the only way you're ever going to get anything like that from me." And since that there has been no recurrence and he has never come back.

Table 5.2: Temporal Duration of the Incidents of Sexual Aggression

	Number	Percent
Single episode lasting less than two hours	72	54%
Two hours to two days (one or several episodes)	21	16%
Several episodes over 2 to 14 days	23	18%
Several episodes over more than 14 days	16	12%
Total	132	100%

C2-28: Well, they leave your cells open all the day in E Block.

This guy came in and he came into my cell. And the officer was out getting medication or something. And there was no one in the ward at all. And when he came in he started jumping on me. He didn't say nothing. He just jumped up on me and started taking my pants off. And I just started beating the hell out of him. His face was all bloody and everything. And then I went out and I said, "Hey, get this guy out of here!" I hollered to the officer. I told him to get this guy out of here and that he was crazy. And that was the only episode that happened in there.

In some longer incidents, the aggressor becomes infatuated with the target.

When these emotions are unreciprocated and forcefully rejected, an aggravating and potentially violent dimension is added to the incident. Infatuation by aggressors may not exclude leveling force or threats at the object of their desire. Their obsession may also lead to other irrational behavior. These types of incidents occur over time because some aggressors seem unwilling or unable to give up their intense attachment for individual targets:

ARE-2: I said, "You're beginning to make me hate you." And there was nothing I could do about it. And then he started asking about me. And he said in due time I would like him.

I might say something to him and then he says something to me and I don't respond to him. Like he might say something

like, "Are you ready?"

And I don't react to him. I just say, "I despise you."

And he takes it as a joke.

He said he wouldn't mess with me no more. And I felt good. And the next day he said, "Come to the yard." And I went to the yard and he said, "I can't do it." And I said, what the fuck is wrong with this guy? He has told me about four times that he wants to leave me alone. And each time he says, "I can't do it. I can't do it."

Some incidents take place over time because physical barriers block aggressors from reaching targets. They have to deliver threats verbally, through bars or across corridors, at whatever chance moments the custody-controlled environment permits. Aggressors with sexual aims may also try to put fear in their targets, trying to coerce them to willingly go to a private location where sex can take place. Some targets, who are intimidated sporadically over time become like animals tormented in cages, never knowing when a persecutor will appear before their cell door:

C2-18: Well, just about everytime that we were locked up for breakfast and stuff like that, they would come around my cell and say that they were going to get me as soon as the C. O. was not around.

I: And what were you saying to them?

C2-18: I was just saying that they would have to kill me first.

I: And what did they say?

C2-18: They just said that they would knock me out and take it.

And I would say that they would have to knock me out or kill me before I would give it up.

I: So how many times did this happen that you were in your cell and they were out there talking to you?

C2-18: Just about every day - for about two weeks.

Use of Violence and Threats

2

Violence can include both physical acts and threats. In our coding, we defined physical violence as instances where one person is forcefully touched by another. Such violence is marked by vehement feelings or the aim to injure or abuse. Playful gestures, along with uninvited caresses, pinches, or grabs are not coded as physical violence. We define nonphysical violence to include verbal threats, threatening gestures, and threats involving weapons.

Table 5.3 displays the frequency of violence used by either the target or the aggressor in our incidents. The table shows that 51 percent of the incidents involve some physical violence. If we expand our definition of violence to include threats against targets, 78 percent of the incidents contain violence.

1

Figure 5.3: The Presence of Physical and Violent Threats in Incidents of
Sexual Aggression

	Percent Yes	Percent No	Total Percent
Physical violence present (N=150)	51%	49%	100%
Violence or threats present (N=135)	78%	22%	100%

1

Includes threats of sexual assault, of non-sexual assault, and threats with
a weapon.

In a later chapter we will examine in more detail the meaning of violence for targets and the relation of violence to prison norms and values.

Incidents where physical violence is present have been divided . . . into categories showing the amount of violence deployed. (see Table 5.4). Because most of the incidents occurred in supervised locations, they were, for the most part, brief. Nonetheless, at least half of the incidents involve fairly high levels of violence, i.e., sexual assault, stabbing, clubbing, or beating. While officers broke up most of the fights quickly, there were still substantial injuries suffered: some men were raped, others had wounds inflicted by "shanks," (improvised knives) or "pipes" (any hard object used as a club). Some had broken bones or teeth knocked out.

The one fatality resulting from an incident was an aggressor who had pro-positioned a 16 year old target who smashed the aggressor with a chair when the aggressor turned away. Like Billy Budd in Melville's story, the target was a stutterer: He was agitated by the proposition, and struck out in rage when his speech blocked. Although the incident is anomalous in its amount of violence, it is typical in other respects; and it illustrates that violence can come from targets as well as aggressors. The incident also shows that the intensity of reactions to aggressors can depend as much on targets' personali-ties as on the type of approach they face.

Substantial as some of these physical results are, they only reflect the intensity of the feelings involved in the incidents. In prison, intimidation is subtle, and rage is often veiled. While homemade prison weapons abound, handguns are unknown, and readily available medical aid reduces the severity of most injuries. If this were not the case, violence related to sexual

Table 5.4: Type of Physical Damage in Violent Incidents

Personal damage	Number	Percent
(in rank order of seriousness)		
1. Death	1	1%
2. Sexually assaulted	11	15%
3. Stabbed or severely clubbed	7	9%
4. Beaten badly (no weapons)	20	27%
5. Harmed with improvised weapons	5	7%
6. Punched, kicked, tripped, slapped	28	37%
7. Spitting in face, grabbed	3	4%
Total	75	100%

aggression would be much higher; the determination of some aggressors and the explosiveness of some targets rival the emotions of standard participants in the most deadly encounters in free society.

Table 5.5 describes types of threats used by aggressors. Verbal threats of sexual assault are the most frequent, and include statements such as:

"Are you going to give it up or get it taken off?"

"I want your buttocks and if you don't give it to me, it is going to be taken."

"We are going to fuck you in the ass."

"I am going to fuck you up and take your pussy."

"If you don't give it up you will get your throat cut easy, I got twenty-five years and I don't give a shit."

"Give it up, Man, or I am going to take it right here and kill you."

"Look, Man, I have got a knife and we want to see what you have got."

"If I hear of you giving it out, then, with anyone else in this institution not only am I going to fuck you, I will make you suck my dick, and I will beat your head right into the ground."

"Well, you want to be a ditty bitch, we got to take this pussy."

"You're going to play what I want you to play."

"What would you do if I just took it and if I pulled your pants down and just took it?"

"I'll play it rough with you and then after you break you'll be mine."

Table 5.5: Types of Threats Levelled by Aggressors Against Targets

Type of threat	Number of incidents	Percent
Threat of sexual assault	29	56%
Threat of non sexual assault	10	19%
Threats with a weapon (non-verbal)	10	19%
More than one type of threat	3	6%
Total	52	100%

Aggressors use all kinds of threats, often promising high levels of force, and even death. Regardless of the aggressors' intent, the target who takes these threats at face value receives the impression that he is in a life-threatening situation:

"I am going to cut you up."

"You are dead."

"Look, you tell anybody what I told you and I am going to stick a knife in your heart."

"If you call the C. O. we will kill you."

"If I find out that you are gay, then I'm going to kill you for not participating with me."

Types of Victimization

Force alone fails to measure accurately the varieties of victimization that are possible. For one thing, targets who are confronted with verbal requests for sex precipitate some violent confrontations themselves. When these men emerge from their fights as "winners," having bolstered their self-esteem and their image before their fellows, the violence does not classify them as victims. On the other hand, mental harrassment can sometimes be more acutely experienced than physical harm.

We have coded aggressive overtures into categories that describe what happened to the target. These codes derive from objective characteristics of incidents, i.e., from the words and actions of aggressors. What these categories of victimization describe is the aggressive behavior which triggers the

psychological responses we discuss in later parts of this dissertation.

As Table 5.6 shows, in about one third of the incidents men were subject to physical harm: they were sexually assaulted, beaten up, or otherwise attacked. In one third of the incidents, the outward indicator of victimization was merely a proposition or request for sex. Even in mild incidents, however, the inmate is subjected to what Goffman calls "interpersonal contamination."³ His "territories of the self," are violated in a number of different ways:

C2-47: Well, you see, we walk through lines and we come down through the mess hall or something like that. The other lines will be standing there and waiting to go up and they will be grabbing at the homosexuals and the weak ones. They will grab their buttocks and feel them up in the buttocks.

* * * * *

ARE-4: One time I was scrubbing the counter and he happened to come by and patted me on my butt. And I didn't even know it was him. Whoever did it was behind me. I don't play around, because I don't want anyone touching me and I don't touch anyone. That was a frontal attack. If I had something else in my hand other than that wet rag, I don't know what would have happened. My first encounter was the stare and I realized that someone was constantly looking at me. No matter where I looked there were his eyes. Then I noticed that he was constantly putting his hands on me, this first individual, you know, kind of scratching my elbow when we were walking, kind of touching me when all of

Table 5.6 : Type of Victimization in Incidents of Sexual Aggression.

(In Rank order of severity)	Number	Percent
Sexually Assaulted (categories below may be included):	12	8%
Subject to physical violence (categories below may be included):	39	27%
Subject to insulting or threatening language (categories below may be included):	29	20%
Physically touched (Category below may be included):	11	7%
Proposed:	49	33%
Other:	8	5%
Total	148	100%

us were together in a group, not in formation or anything but to mess hall where I was working and I would feel a scratching on my elbow.

He kept putting his hands on me and he was touching my shoulder and arm, patting my hand and constantly around, ridiculous crap. But enough so that it would be aggravating.

Aggressors, lacking verbal skills and not wanting to incriminate themselves by an overt forceful move, may communicate intentions through touching. Targets are left to interpret and distort these moves. Some aggressors may approach targets by sitting next to them, say, in church, and, sitting close, may rub their legs against them. When this occurs, the aggressor is protected from accusations of wrong doing because he can claim the contact was accidental. Incidents beginning with casual touching often escalate over time to heightened levels of physical contact. Leg rubbing might be followed by an arm casually thrown around the shoulder of the target, to be interpreted as a friendly action should trouble result. Unless the target reacts with determination to the arm around the shoulder, it may be followed by more explicit and more forceful gestures.

Aggressors also direct remarks to targets that are ostensibly seductive, but are also abusive and insulting. Commonly, these remarks tell the target that he is understood to be a desirable sex object. Men who have customarily viewed themselves as heterosexual find these remarks predictably dismaying:

C2-27: When they would first start saying things to me like, "Hey, baby," I would expect to see a secretary walking by or something, I just could not believe that a male would be saying those kind of things to me. And I looked around and wondered what he was looking for or looking at. And I thought the guy must be goofing on me or something, playing a joke. And I then knew after awhile that if the guy had a chance he would want to kiss me and have sex with me. Which is something you say to yourself, "this can't be true."

* * * * *

AR-10: The minute I walked in there was this uproar. They [inmates] hollered obscenities and all sorts of names. They [officers] told me to walk down the middle of this line like I was on exhibition. I was shaking in my boots. They were screaming things like, "That is for me," and "This one won't take long, he will be easy." And, "Look at her eyes." I had no idea of what to do with that. I was scared. I didn't talk to anyone for awhile.

When one knows he is attractive to other men, one also knows he is vulnerable to sexual attack. Thus, sexual remarks such as the following are calculated to cause anxiety:

"You are cute."

"Damm, You're a pretty white."

"Well, you are a fine looking dude."

"I want you to be my kid."

"I want your ass."

"I want you bad."

"I would like to make you my kid."

Sequence of Moves

Looking at the sequence of moves, we analyzed the physical shape of incidents resulting from the interaction between targets and aggressors. As targets react to aggressors' moves and these target reactions, in turn, lead to certain aggressor counter-reactions, violence can result that has more to do with communication issues than simple exploitation. In these typical patterns of moves, we can see which target responses seem to be effective in stopping short aggressor approaches and which extend them. As we explain in the methods chapter, we diagrammed the moves in the incidents complete enough to allow us to do this (114 incidents). We then grouped these incident diagrams according to the nature of the first move made by the aggressor: incidents begun by propositions, incidents begun by offensive remarks or physical gestures, and incidents begun by sexual attacks or threats. We describe the patterns of moves characterizing each group below:

Incidents That Start With Propositions

We grouped 36 incidents sequentially, beginning with opening requests for sex, or propositions.

Twelve of these incidents evolved

into displays of physical violence and nine into the use of threats. The pattern shows a split between peaceful resolutions and conflict resolutions. In more than half of the cases, there is a tendency for the proposition to escalate into a more serious encounter. This escalation occurs in one of two ways: in the first, the target replies to the request for sex with a polite refusal, or ignores the request. Following this response, the aggressor reacts violently or accompanies a renewed request with threats. In the second sequence, the target, hearing the request, reacts with threats or the use of force. Both of these sequences most often involve multiple sets of moves, reactions, and counter-responses. For example, an aggressor may state a sexual proposition, the target can reply politely, the aggressor can repeat the request, and the target can then respond with physical violence or threats.

In one third of the incidents, the targets responded with threats of their own before any violent or threatening move was made by aggressors. This

show of verbal force served to end the incident in half of the cases, while the others escalated to higher levels of force. Thus the target who responds to a proposition with a threat may end the incident or he may escalate it into a physical confrontation. While we cannot generalize with such small samples, it seems that a target answering a proposition with a threat stands an almost even chance of ending an incident.

Most targets tried ignoring propositions or refusing them politely. In only less than half of these cases (10 of 24) did the attempt to respond peacefully work. In the others, the target response was followed by continuing requests (4 cases), threats (6 cases), or attacks (4 cases).

More than half of the incidents begun by propositions turned into conflict situations marked by threats or the use of force. Physical violence tended to follow an escalating sequence, with verbal threats leading to physical violence. Violence followed an initial period of negotiation. The messages being communicated - that the aggressor wanted the target for sex, and that the target wanted the aggressor to stay away - tended to be confused by the interjecting of threats on both sides, which often escalated into violence. Some targets hear a proposition and snarl back. Others attempt to reason with the propositioner and end up snarling when their reasoning fails. Aggressors, beginning their approaches with requests for sex, are drawn into conflict for varying reasons. For example, a request that is refused may suggest the necessity of developing threats or violence; on the other hand, a refusal may be perceived as insulting. In these cases of violence, the sexual motive changes into a reaction to the sting of wounded pride.

Incident Sequences Begun by Offensive Remarks or Physical GesturesAccompanying Propositions

Incidents can begin with a proposition that is accompanied by an offensive remark or a physical gesture. We grouped 42 incidents in which the first aggressor move was of this type. Since these incidents contain gestures and words that are perceived as offensive, it should not surprise us that they incite sharper target reactions from the onset than do simple polite propositions: twelve targets responded with violence initially and 9 followed with violence later, after aggressors' threatened or repeated their remarks or gestures. Compared to incidents that begin with propositions, more incidents beginning with offensive remarks and gestures result immediately in physical violence. More targets also react to these remarks with threats, which, in turn, can cause aggressors to react violently.

When the first move of the incident is an offensive remark or gesture, the targets' immediate reactions are divided into two categories of equal frequency: there are responses with force or threat of force, and attempts to ignore or politely refuse the aggressors' overtures. When the target maintains the level of conflict in the incident by responding with a threat, aggressors react with more remarks or gestures, make threatening statements back, or react violently. Then, targets tend to escalate from threats to violence.

In fully half of the incidents begun by offensive remarks or gestures, targets respond by ignoring or politely refusing, but in only one case did this type of response end the incident. In the others, the polite response was followed by aggressors using force (4 cases), threatening the victim (4 cases),

repeating the offensive remark or gesture (4 cases), or in making a proposition (3 cases). The tendency, thus, was for polite refusals to lead to aggressors continuing their aggressive behavior.

Of 42 incidents beginning with requests for sex accompanied by offensive remarks and/or physical gestures, 24 terminated with physical violence, 2 ended with threats alone, and 16 ended with no conflict. The target response to this type of approach, not surprisingly, was much sharper than responses to simple propositions. While only one target responded at once with physical violence to requests for sex accompanied by offensive remarks and/or physical gestures; nine responded with threats. When their polite responses were followed by more remarks, gestures, propositions or threatening statements, targets reacted violently. Thus, by the time this sequence had been completed, 21 targets (50 percent), had been provoked into reacting violently.

Incidents Beginning with Sexual Attacks or Threats

We grouped 21 incidents beginning with sexual attacks and 15 that began with extreme threats. Following these expressions of force, six targets, because of the level of force exerted, had to submit to sexual assault. Most others immediately began to fight with their assailants, officers came on the scene, and the incidents ended short of sexual penetration. Where officers did not break up the fights, the attack occurred in a semi-secure location where the aggressor could not directly rape the target but could only coerce him into going to a secure location. Completed rapes depended more on the presence or absence of security (combined with the number of aggressors involved) than on any type of target response.

Most incidents beginning with threats moved directly into physical violence. In four cases violence occurred because aggressors used force when their threats were met with target attempts to withdraw peacefully. In nine cases, targets initiated the violence by responding to the threats with physical force. This set of incidents exemplifies both patterns of sequences resulting in physical violence. Aggressors escalate from threats to physical force, and targets escalate from being the objects of threats to being the initiators of physical violence.

Table 5.7 summarizes target responses to aggressor moves in incidents of sexual aggression. As the table shows, polite propositions are often answered by polite refusals. Attacks and threats are often answered by physical violence or threats. As our discussion of the sequences of moves in incidents has demonstrated, there is a tendency on the part of targets to answer propositions with counter-threats and there is a tendency on the part of aggressors to use threats or force when propositions have been declined. Thus, dialogue escalates to threats and threats escalate to violence.

Incident Resolutions

Incident resolutions, referring to the way the target-aggressor contact is interrupted, describe how incidents end. Some resolutions are successful solutions to a target's problem. Others, while terminating the immediate contact between target and aggressor, may have destructive after-effects. All resolutions relate in some way to norms in the general prison community. Intersecting with social and administrative processes, incident resolutions are shaped

Table 5.7: Target Responses to Aggressor Moves in Incidents of Sexual

Aggression

Target response to aggressor move	Aggressor move triggering the target response			
	Attack (N=35)	Threat (N=34)	Proposition accompanied by derogatory remarks or offensive gestures (N=52)	Polite proposition (N=42)
Submits to sexual assault	20%			
Uses physical violence	71%	41%	33%	5%
Threatens	9%	29%	21%	31%
Ignores		12%	12%	14%
Refuses politely		18%	35%	50%
Total percent	100%	100%	100%	100%

by their environment. They give us clues to the resources in the prison world for planned solutions to the problem of aggression, since these resolutions are the "solutions" that the environment offers.

Table 4.8 shows more than half (56 percent) of the incidents were resolved among the participants themselves through "subcultural processes," the most common of which involves the use of violence. One third of the incidents ended after physical conflict and 10 percent after the targets had threatened aggressors. While violence may lead to other problems, it does cause aggressors to leave their targets alone. "Reasonable talk" resolved only 13 percent of the incidents. Determined aggressors seem not to be deterred by spoken refusals, and the intense emotional responses of targets prevent their use of calm approaches to the problem; ethnic differences between aggressor and target lead to misunderstandings and misperceptions; and prison norms support the use of violence.

As we have seen in Chapter Four, incidents involve targets and aggressors from differing races and differing geographical origins. Attempts to communicate thus flounder across cultural barriers, strengthened by the target's general apprehension of the situation.⁵ Whatever the intentions of aggressors, their feelings and thoughts are seldom communicated in their entirety to targets. Targets are often reluctant and sometimes incapable of sitting down and honestly communicating their abhorrence of the situation to men who, because of cultural differences, are different from themselves. Racial animosity, loosely defined, contributes to the problem. So does the normative idea that to reason is to show weakness.

Table 5.8: How Incidents End: Circumstances breaking the Target-Aggressor Contact

Incident ending	Number	Percent
1. Subcultural endings:		
a. Violence ends incident	41	33%
b. Reasoning ends incident	17	13%
c. Target threats end incident	13	10%
Total subcultural endings	71	56%
2. Planned administrative endings:		
a. Staff action against aggressor	25	20%
b. Target goes to protection	10	8%
c. Target transfers to other prison	3	2%
d. Target changes job, school, or cell within the institution	2	2%
Total administrative endings	40	32%
3. Accidental endings (unplanned events eliminating aggressor access to target)		
a. Aggressor transfers	5	4%
b. Target transfers	5	4%
c. Other official routine	5	4%
Total accidental endings	15	12%
Total incident endings	126	100%

In contrast to the conflict-ridden nature of cross-cultural incident sequences, incidents between members of the same culture tend to be resolved peacefully. For example, the two whites in the following incident negotiate each others' positions on the basis of mutual understanding:

APCC-4: A man with a lot of time, a white dude, came into my room and he sat down on my bed and he said, "George, we're friends and this is as far as it's going to go, this room."

And he said quite bluntly, "I'm going to fuck you in the ass."

And I froze. I said, "Oh, no, not again." This was more or less what was running through my mind. I just came right back at him again and I told him that it's strictly not that way and it turns me off and I have no use for it, so you're counting on a hopeless thing. And I told him that he would have to knock me out and stick a knife in my ribs and what not.

And he said, "No, I'm not going to do that, but if you ever want to, you know that I'm here." And it was a thing where it didn't dissolve our friendship. Because it was a thing where he wasn't going to use force and it would never come to that.

Incidents between black targets and black aggressors also show signs that being from the same culture aids men to resolve disputes in prison peacefully. In part, reasoning tends to be successful because black targets react less emotionally than white targets to threats from black aggressors. They may see

such threats as bluff, or they may feel confident they can deal with threats:

CR-38: I would sit down and say to them, "Look, you got this problem. All the looking at my backside and the whistling and all that shit. I let that go because I don't see much sense in fighting for it because I don't feel like getting locked up for the time being. But what I would suggest is that we really ought to think about this."

* * * * *

CR-15: I told them, "Don't say nothing to me and I won't say nothing to you. If you see me you just turn one way and I will turn the other way." It stopped and that is the way that you have got to do it. You know, you just can't fight with anybody because you are going to hurt both of you: Both of you are going to get locked up. So you talk on a man-to-man basis every day and they see where you are coming from. And you see where they are coming from. These guys ain't all that bad.

* * * * *

C2-2: He would yell across the aisle and ask if I need this, and I would tell so and so to tell him that I don't need anything. So he approached me in the yard and he swung at me, right? And I didn't even back up and he slapped me. So I figured instead of me going and telling the officer, I would handle this myself. And, so, I told him, "Will you step over

to the other side of the yard so we could talk."

And so he starts running this whole bit down to me. "You shouldn't belong to anyone in this institution but me."

And I said, "Well, I don't see it that way, because you like to butch people around to get people to do things for you, you threaten them, and I am not that type of person. If you want to get along with me, then you have to respect me and you can't force yourself upon me."

And he said, "Well, I don't see it like that, you are still going to be mine anyway." We got into this argument about this thing and after awhile we got it straightened out.

Planned staff interventions end 32 percent of the incidents. Since we located targets by staff referrals and in protective environments, however, our sampling causes over-representation of these official resolutions. Still, it is useful to look at these incidents, and we shall do so in a later chapter.

Accidental resolutions end the remaining 12 percent of incidents. These endings follow from aggressors' interrupted contact with targets because of routine administrative transfers. Convict movements are controlled and directed by official decrees. Especially at the beginning of the inmate's sentences, the time when target incidents are most likely to occur, inmates are frequently routinely moved from prison to prison, and from location to location within a prison. Since physical proximity is a necessary condition for sexual aggression to occur, the breaking of contact by fortuitous transfer is

sufficient to end an incident. Similarly, incidents that are ended by the routine presence of a prison guard are accidental resolutions. Here, security interferes with the aggressor's plans and he never regains sufficient access to the target.

Footnotes: Chapter Five

1

Amir (p. 200) found that 71 percent of the incidents of heterosexual rapes he examined involved more than one aggressor. Davis does not break his data down but does tell us "That the total of 156 incidents involved assaults on at least 97 different victims by at least 176 different aggressors," (p. 25).

2

The 1965 California Task Force to Study Violence limited the definition of violence to "assault by inmates using either fists or any weapon which resulted in injury to himself (sic) or others and which was deemed serious enough by the institution to file a report," (Lawrence Bennet: "The Study of Violence in California Prisons," in Cohen, Cole and Bailey, 152). Other researchers extend the definition of interpersonal violence to include threats or expressions of intent to commit harm along with physical acts. See, for example, Sandra J. Ball-Rokeach: "Values and Violence, A Test of the Subculture of Violence Thesis." American Sociological Review, 38 (1973): 736, and Amir, 150.

3

Erving Goffman: Asylums. Garden City [New York]: Doubleday, 1961, 28.

Germaine Greer, reflecting on the female experience, calls such gestures "sexual rip-offs" or "petty rape," Schultz, 383.

4

Since the outcome of these attacks are related to the influence of the custodial setting in which they occur, we cannot make crosstabulations of victim behavior and escape from, or execution of, sexual assault, as Amir has done for heterosexual assaults in free society. Cf. Amir, 169, 171.

For a comparison to the male-female experience in the free world, see
Eugene J. Kanin: "Selected Dyadic Aspects of Male Sex Aggression," in
Schultz, 72. Kanin found heterogamy (class differences) among heterosexual
pairs associated with more offender-offended relationships than when pairs
were from the same class.

CHAPTER SIX: TARGET VIOLENCE

In this chapter we look at the way targets think about violent responses, and we examine the peer and staff supports for these beliefs. (The next chapter discusses targets exploding in anger, an equally important force leading to violent responses.) In prison, force, or its perception, feeds on itself, causing more force or reason for fear. As one man tells us, "I have seen a lot of things go down in the penitentiaries - not only sex acts but people getting beat on and people getting stabbed. The only way to fight it is with violence." This attitude is an important aspect of our topic, for we perhaps see here a prototype for other prison conflicts.

Violence as a Medium for a Message

Defining Sexual Identity

Some targets say they become violent to show others they are straight and mean to stay that way. Most targets dread the gay label. When approached for sex, some avail themselves of the opportunity to attack aggressors so they can publicly demonstrate their disdain of homosexuality. While part of the targets' fear revolves around anxiety about being stigmatized, men also

feel that if others believe they are gay they will be open to further victimization. This fear results from the tendency for prisoners to think of targets as "sissies" or "squeeze," a belief targets themselves sometimes share:

C2-30: It was mostly the same guy and I had to take it out on him because it was getting to a point, you know, everybody in the institution was thinking I was a punk or squeeze or a pussy and stuff like that. I had to do something about it in order to stop it. I had to prove to these other people that I wasn't a pussy or punk or anything else. I had to prove to these other people in my way and their way that I wasn't what he thought I was.

* * * * *

C2-29: And people was thinking, the people that was looking on at the time, that this guy - well, maybe this guy is a pussy or something. This guy is fooling around with his ass. There must be something wrong with him. He must be a pussy.

So I turned around and I caught him fooling around. So I told him, "Do it once more and I am going to bust you in the face." The people, that is the worst thing in this place, the people look on and they always have their ratings. And they have to gossip. They are like ladies and they really build it up and it runs around the institution.

* * * * *

CR-28: The guy right next to me, they grab his ass. He just lets it go by and so they call him a squeeze. I told him, "The next time that they touch your ass, you turn around and swing, or otherwise they are going to think that you are a squeeze."

Showing You Believe in the Convict Code

Those identifying with the convict code feel they must answer threat with threat, especially when the threat comes from a member of another ethnic group. Such a man cannot take the problem of being threatened to staff, for that shows others, whose esteem he values, that he is a rat. Similarly, the sub-cultural inmate sometimes cannot talk to or reason with an aggressor, because he sees talk as a sign of weakness, uncoolness, or as an unacceptable attribute of straight society. Self respect for prisoners upholding the convict code means favoring private solutions. It also can mean that the correct course of action calls for facing a perceived challenge and responding to it:

AUI-2: See, when a guy first comes in a lot of guys will say, "Well, I don't want to hit the guy because I am thinking about the parole board." But, really, that is the very best way to deal with it. You could report the incident but that is snitching and I feel myself that if you have to knock the guy's head off to handle the problem, knock the guy's head off. You have to establish yourself as a man and you have to live with yourself. You have to look at yourself every morning in the mirror.

* * * * *

I: Did you think of any other ways to solve this problem?

AR-41: No, not really. Because what he said was already out in the open. If I talked to him, then everybody else would say I'm trying to cop out. So the only way I seen to solve the problem was to actually get out and fight, prove to him that I ain't going to go to no police and inform on anybody.

Showing You are Tough:

Targets sometimes assert that they are violent because they wish to show others they are tough. Fighting is a way of communicating to all other potential aggressors - not just the men in the immediate incident - that one is not to be messed with. Discouraging the immediate approach becomes secondary to raising one's status. The assumption is that a violent demeanor is necessary for survival in prison, and that an aggressive image is a positive and worthwhile attribute of one's public personality, which must be consciously cultivated.

ARE-2: Now, if you were to go out and hit somebody across the head with a pipe and almost kill them, then people would think twice again. They would say, "That dude is crazy and he might try to kill me if I ask him that." And, so, then you know you can go where you want to go.

* * * * *

C2-23: Now, each and every inmate goes through a trial period here where someone is going to say, "I want your ass." But if he straightens it out himself and he gets into a fight with the guy, it will show everyone that he is not going to take that kind of shit. He will be alright.

* * * * *

AR-41: I felt kind of different because, like, when I walked through the yard there was people in it that went to school also and they were telling their friends, "This little guy will cut you if you even attempt to do anything to him. He's a dude to stay away from." And you see people looking at you as you're walking by, like saying, "Should I approach him, will he cut me too?" Stuff like this going through their minds."

* * * * *

C2-27: I wanted to protect myself and the only way that you can protect yourself is with violence. And it was getting to the point where after awhile I was starting to do pushups every night. And then as I would get tired, I said that I would kick that guy's ass as I got stronger. I noticed that there was a bunch of them around, I thought when he hit me, "This is it, that will show the other guys when I get into a fight with this one that I'm not going to quit." So I fight and get punched a few times and I punch him a few times and they see that I'm a man.

Violence as a Means of Curbing Violence

Violence can be a simple matter of using preemptive self-defense. At a certain point the target makes a decision that the aggressor is on a course escalating toward a forceful attempt at sexual assault. Violence is then deployed by the target to alter the course of the aggressor's behavior. Even men who are approached with a non-violent proposition may project into the future, see themselves as probably victims, and react violently:

C2-43: I was going to grab a bench or a piece of pipe or something and I figured if I hit one of them and they got to bleeding or something they might stop monkeying around.

* * * * *

A-1: A lot of times fear will make you do things like that. The first time that somebody gives you some lip, you stab him. It's a warning: "Look, I don't want to be pushed around." If somebody comes to you, they can say a word wrong and if you don't react to that one word in the right way, you lose something and then they will test you a little further. If you fail then you're in trouble.

Documenting Violence Effectiveness

Violence as a pragmatic solution is a formula upheld by most inmates. But how does this theory work in actual practice? Is violence, in fact, a successful way to meet the violence problem? On one level, the answer is "yes". In concrete incidents, some men have found violence to be a satisfactory

CONTINUED

2 OF 5

ploy, The thinking about violent responses to sexual approaches is reinforced by this perceived effectiveness of the violence solution in concrete incidents. Targets can report violent responses that have curbed aggressive approaches (see Table 5.8, Chapter five). And men who try talking with aggressors may find them unresponsive until a more aggressive stance gets the aggressor to leave them alone. This perceived effectiveness strengthens the norms supporting violence:

AR-1: I stood my ground right then and there and I said, "Look, you just stay clear or else I am going to put a pipe right across your head." And I wasn't fooling. And that is the last time he has ever bothered me.

* * * * *

AR-41: The Spanish dude, after I cut him, he comes back and he says, "Listen, I'm sorry for what I did."

I said, "Do you really mean that? Then I'm sorry for cutting you." I had to put it straight right then, "I'll do it again if you try it again."

And he says, "No, No, everything's alright."

* * * * *

C2-23: He hit me and then I went after this guy, I beat him - I beat him real good. So about a week later he came back downstairs and all of a sudden he shook my hand and said, "Let's be friends." The only way to get respect from them is

to put a foot in their ass.

I: No more sexual remarks to you after that?

C2-23: No more. No more.

* * * * *

AR-7: He went to the hospital and I got locked up. I got a two day keep lock even though the administration knew basically that he was behind it. And after that, we more or less became friends, I suppose. We were talking to each other.

* * * * *

ARE-2: A dude pushed a guy and cut him with a knife. And ever since then people don't do nothing. They talk about it among themselves but whenever he's around, people want to be friends with him.

Negotiating from Weakness

At the same time there are forces pulling men toward violent solutions, there are pushes away from using reasoning. Especially for those on the brink of feeling powerless, the willingness to negotiate may be seen as an additional symbol of weakness, a further step toward vulnerability. Targets also feel that verbal sparring with aggressors can gain them deeper trouble than they are in already. Lacking confidence in their verbal powers, they fear that fast-talking "players" will easily manipulate any conversation to serve their ends:

C2-29: You talk to the guy and he bullshits his way out and says this and that and tries to twist your words and throws them back to you. And it doesn't work. He doesn't listen. And the only way he is going to listen at this point is to punch him in the mouth. You can't do anything else.

* * * * *

A-1: I think they can talk themselves into it deeper. I think that you can talk yourself out of it if you're very slick and if you're mean and have a mean rap. If you have the right eyes, and the right look in your eyes, and the right way of how anger should appear in your eyes, and how hate should appear, and malice, and how to project fear into somebody elses eyes, if you can do that, you can do it, you can talk your way out of it. But the thing is that if you're too scared, then you loose.

* * * * *

C2-23: You try to talk to them - you try to talk sense to them and say, "Now, look, I am an inmate and you are an inmate."

And they will say, "Ah - don't tell me that pussy shit." They will tell you that, you know. So, I figured that talking was no good with this guy. There is only one way to handle him and that is to fight with him.

* * * * *

A-1: I hadn't even tried to talk them out of it, because I wasn't that good at expressing myself and I couldn't project fear into someone. I couldn't project hostility. That was something that I couldn't do.

Support Systems for Violence

The attitudes and behaviors associated with target violence are in part social behavior, learned in prison from other inmates and staff. Targets are generally new to the prison where they are being approached and look to others for guidance. Peers, often men who have been targets themselves, may socialize new men to consider violence favorably. Men who have never used weapons are supplied with "shanks" and "pipes" by their more experienced friends. Others are supplied with arguments through which guilt is neutralized. The target's violent response is an explicit normative expectation of the prison community. This fact is passed on to new men by experienced inmates as part of the process of "prisonization."

AR-23: And I went out in the yard and I told my brother what was happening. The next thing you know one of my brother's friends came up and gave me a shank and told me that if a guy come up at me to stick him.

* * * * *

C2-52: He just told me to grab anything that I can and just beat them. Whether it is a chair or whatever and just go after them.

* * * * *

C2-22: This black dude was going to jump a friend of mine and so I talked to him and I said, "Look, man, the knife drawer is open. Grab one of them butcher knives and bring it upstairs. That is all." He took the knife out of the drawer and put it in the back of his pants and went upstairs and stuck it in the pillow and sewed the pillow back up. And if this dude come over, he would have got stabbed.

* * * * *

C2-28: I just said, "Look-it, you just pick up something and you hit that dude. Or else you go and you make yourself a blade and you stab the dude - do anything." I says, "If the dude is going to rip you off, you kill the dude - that is all."

* * * * *

AR-36: He was the water man and he was pretty straight. He came right out and he told me, "You are a little guy and you can expect trouble, you know, but if anything happens, don't even question it, just crack their skull and it will be over with - that is all."

* * * * *

C2-30: I go over and pull him over in the coynor and talk to him right then and there and tell him "These guys are trying to get-over on you. The best thing for you to do is to hang out with the white guys and try and get to know people. Lift weights - try

boxing and do what you can. Learn how to fight if you can't fight."

* * * * *

C2-23: I told him that the best thing to do, in front of everyone, while this guy was popping shit to him, is to hit the guy. There is no other way that this thing is going to be resolved unless you hit the guy.

* * * * *

C2-44: I don't know how many times I told him, "If a dude run up on you, popping you some shit, just hit him in his face. If you lose, you lose - so what? You get locked up for seven days and you come downstairs and the dude will think twice before running up on you again. Because they are going to know that you will hurt him."

* * * * *

Ar-6: So I tried to talk about it with some of the white guys that was here. They was living on this tier with me. And they tried to give me solutions. The majority of them told me to hit this guy, anybody that come up to you, just hit him.

The advocacy of violence is spread by the old to the young and by the experienced to the inexperienced. Thus, in observing how targets are readied to behave violently, we see a process whereby a subculture upholding violence

spreads its message. Moreover, the learning that occurs in these peer groups is not academic. It answers an immediate problem of pressing concern to the learner.

Staff

Staff members also support target violence so that the square or isolate inmate who identifies with officialdom can learn violent norms just as well as the group member who identifies with his peers. Why do staff uphold violent solutions? For one thing, some staff members have cultural origins similar to those of many inmates in the prison. They are working class men themselves, and hold norms supporting "masculine" responses to intimidation. In addition, staff, like inmates, belong to the prison community. This community, as a norm of its own, holds that a violent response is one of the simplest and most effective ways of handling an aggressive sexual approach. Finally, staff, especially officers, sometimes can think of no options that they know to work as well as a violent response:

C2-20: And the C. O. came in and asked what had happened and I told him that this guy had tried to take me off and I was just protecting myself. So then the C. O. said that I'll shut the door and you do what you think is the best. And so I fucked the guy up and sent him to the hospital.

* * * * *

AR-46: In Attica, they told me to take a pipe to them if they bother you sexually. Take a pipe to them - that was the officers. I was told that in '65 and so I started using one.

* * * * *

C2-51: The officer with me in the hall - he said, "You should have hit him in the nuts."

And I said, "I am not a dirty fighter."

He said, "That don't make no difference, man, you just do that." And I guess after awhile I found out that he was right. So after awhile, after I took it under deep study, I had the trouble and I hit him in the nuts.

* * * * *

Ar-36: He [lieutenant] said, being a little guy, if anything like that should happen, hit the guy with the first thing available and try and knock him down. Try and do it in front of a hack or somebody and then he will come down and break it up. Once they do, you will go to the box. And once you get to the box, tell the hacks that you want to see me. I will come up, see what I can do. That is about the only thing that I can tell you.

* * * * *

I: So you spoke to the priest about this sex pressure, too? Did he offer you any advice?

C2-52: He just told me to do what I think is best and just fight if I have to.

* * * * *

I: You went to your company officer?

C2-23: Right. I went and said, "Look, this guy is bothering me, man. He keeps coming out with these sexual remarks and I want somebody to do something about this guy - tell him something."

He said, "Well, there is nothing that we can do about it, and there is nothing that the brass can do about it, so hit him." He came right out and told me just like that.

Staff advice to the targets to be violent is often given during informal conversations, as when an officer on his rounds pauses to discuss an inmate's problem with him. Staff also advise targets to be violent as part of the formal delivery of counseling services. Administrators, counselors, and even chaplains participate in giving such advice. The message that is communicated through these channels is essentially the same message as the one men receive from their peers. Its content mirrors the themes we have reviewed; violence will win you respect; it will deter future approaches; it will cause the aggressor bothering you to back off. Prison records show staff pleased with such advice, convinced of its effectiveness. When one inmate applied for transfer, his counselor wrote: Because of his youthful appearance, other inmates saw him as a prime material for homosexual activities. Through counseling

and an individually tailored body building program, John has developed self confidence and asserted his individuality.

Having made his adjustment here, he should be able to hold his own in a camp setting.

When prisoners fight, they face staff discipline. Formal procedures can remove privileges and sentence men to solitary confinement. In some cases of sexual aggression, however, informal arrangements suspend disciplinary proceedings, enabling staff to back up their advice with supportive leniency. When staff view inmate violence as justified and practical, formal measures to stop violence may be suspended: Staff may make private arrangements to overlook a fight provided it is in the service of survival. Staff, thus, monitor and even encourage instrumental inmate assaults on other inmates:

C2-37: I said, "Well, there is a nigger wanted to make me a kid." I says, "Before I give my ass up to any nigger, I would fucking kill him."

So he [staff] says, "Well, you have got a point there."

He says, "Yeah, all right, I am going to let you go."

I said, "Any keep lock or anything?"

And he says, "You have got one day keep lock and the next time any nigger or anything comes up on you, you do the same thing."

* * * * *

C2-31: One sargeant told me, "Put a bat across this dude's head and I will go to court and testify that you told me about this shit."

* * * * *

Ar-36: When I went through my orientation, the senior lieutenant told me that if anything like that should happen, "Hit him, and when you go to the box, send the word and I will come up and talk to you. I will do what I can to get you out of trouble."

* * * * *

C2-30: I asked Sergeant Brown. And he told me to go ahead, "Pick up the nearest thing around you and hit him in the head with it. He won't bother you no more."

I went over to another sergeant and I asked him and he said, "Pick up the nearest damn thing to you and just hit him with it, that is all."

I looked at him and I said, "Alright. If I do this I ain't going to get locked up for it am I?"

He looks at me and he says, no, because I am using self-defense.

Problems with Violent Solutions

The violent response to sexual approaches may work for some, but not for others. As Bartollas, Miller, and Dinitz point out, such values, in institutions are "functional for aggressive inmates...the code clearly works to the

1

disadvantage of the weak." Such men carry into prison ideas opposing violence while others have limited experience with violence. Some also have types of personalities that makes violent behavior a difficult - or impossible - solution for them. Norms that prescribe violence create a difficult situation
for inmates to whom violence is "ego alien."
2

A-7: The minute I think about what to do to a guy and how they butcher them and this and that, all that runs through my mind is blood. That scares the hell out of me. I don't like this: I wouldn't want to cut up anybody just like I wouldn't want them to cut me up.

* * * * *

A-7: I am not a fighter, Man, that's not my bag and I won't do it. I hardly did any fighting out on the streets. And they just told me to take a guy, take a club, and club him. And I never did that to a guy.

* * * * *

APC-14: If you are an aggressive person, like a big mouth, you stand a chance of people steering away from you. But if you're reserved, they'll run all over you. But I'm quiet and I don't think that I have got to adjust to them people. In other words, if I have got to be getting up and saying, "Hey, mother fucker," and make up lies that I did this and that, just to keep them away from me, then I could do it. But it's not my thing.

* * * * *

APCC-4: It wasn't easy because I felt that he would see through me. Because I'm not that way naturally. And I thought that he would see through me and laugh at me.

While some violent reactions to sexual approaches are informally tolerated by officials, fear of institutional discipline still restrains many men. They want to avoid punishment, losing good time, or being sentenced anew. Such repercussions are particularly likely when the target exceeds the limits of violence tolerated by authorities. For example, the man who murdered the aggressor who propositioned him received a sentence of five years. Another target sliced a man across the face, giving him a wound requiring twenty-two stitches, and received a sentence of 22 years from the judge in the county where the prison is located. This man also received a wide range of punishments available to the prison administration. He tells us:

Ar-35: They took me to special housing unit called the guard house and they put me in a stripped cell. No bed - no nothing. Just a toilet bowl and a sink. They left me there 38 days - just feeding me - took all my clothes and everything. I didn't have anything except for a toilet bowl and a sink and after awhile I had an inmate sneak me a blanket and when the officers come by I would have to sneak it back to him. Then they took me to court and prosecuted me, assault in the first degree. They gave me 22 years. Before I went to trial, I was placed in a

security cell for 38 days and taken to the superintendent's hearing and was prosecuted. And I had been punished about four or five times for that crime.

The fear of disciplinary infractions or of new charges puts some targets in a dilemma. Should they consider their longterm welfare or fight to alleviate an aggressor's pressure? Peer and staff support may facilitate personal aggression but cannot grant immunity to consequences. This means that the fear of punishment may outweigh the perceived benefits of violence.

Fear of punishment complicates the problem "solved" by the norm of violence. Similarly, the norms are no "solution" for those unable to fight because they are unprepared, socially and psychologically, to meet tough urban sexual aggressors. These men are in especially difficult positions. Unable to avail themselves of the escape provided by the convict culture, they are plagued by feelings of inadequacy, knowing that violence is the "correct" course of action but not being able to implement it. The normative advice cannot help them, and they must seek other, perhaps less attractive solutions to the problem. These are the men who go to protection company, or the men who live in fear throughout their stay in the prison population.

Footnotes for Chapter Six

1 Bartollas, Miller, and Dinitz, 69.

2 Toch (In press).

CHAPTER SEVEN: THE IMPACT OF AGGRESSION ON TARGETS

During the interviews, men who were targets spoke at length about their thoughts and feelings following incidents. We encouraged them to say as much as they possibly could about their emotional state at the time. Hoping to trace impacts on attitudes and behavior, we asked men to describe the psychological meaning of the event for them. We report these findings in this chapter. We trace impacts on emotions, attitudes and lifestyle. We suggest reasons for effects occurring. And we show how the impact of victimization intersects with other personal problems. As our next chapter deals specifically with the impact of sexual assault, the interview excerpts in this chapter derive from incidents marked by lesser levels of force.

Emotional Reactions

Table 7.1 indicates the reported reactions of targets to incidents, as well as failure to report specific emotional reactions. Some of the cases reported in the "No" column are due to emotional resilience: not all targets were deeply touched by the experience. But part of the absence of reported emotional affect also indicates that the interviewer failed to get the target to talk about his thoughts or feelings. Some men, though willing enough, could not talk about themselves with sufficient clarity to allow for reliable coding. Others did not want to talk at all; clinical interviews require a good deal of rapport and that was not present in all cases. Also, men may be reluctant to talk honestly about some reactions to aggression for fear of appearing weak or cowardly. The data in Table 7.1, thus, probably reflect considerable under-reporting.

Fear

Feeling afraid is the most common emotional response to sexual aggression. In spite of the likely chance of under-reporting, in 55 percent of the incidents targets told us they experienced fear, even prior to being threatened.

Table 7.1: Type of Emotional Reaction Following Incidents of
 *
 Sexual aggression

Type of Reaction (categories are not mutually exclusive)	Present		
	Yes	No	Total
Fear (N=123)	55%	45%	100%
Anger (N=116)	42%	58%	100%
Anxiety (N=135)	24%	76%	100%
Crises (N=135)	24%	76%	100%

*These data have been tabulated from statements made by targets in interviews, describing their thoughts and feelings. Responses followed open ended questions.

Men were not asked if they had - or did not have - the types of reactions listed. Because the reaction is not present does not necessarily mean the respondent did not have the reaction. It means he failed to mention it in his recounting of his psychological condition. The categories of emotional reaction are defined in the various segments of the chapter.

C2-52: I was scared when I first come in here. I was shaking.

* * * * *

AC-10: You're going to be scared when you think about how you're going to be thrown in with all these people.

Regardless of the level of force they meet, many men, following incidents, see themselves as candidates for rape. Long after the incident that inspires their fear has ended, these men conceive themselves to be open to attack. A concrete event is not even necessary for men to feel such fear, for the worry that one may be raped can thrive without much evidence of aggression. Targets, however, know that other men are attracted to them:

Ac-10: I think it was just the fear that this type of aggression could happen. That here I had done nothing to this guy, had never even spoken to him, and I'd been selected from all this group of 35 guys, that I had to be singled out of all these.

* * * * *

C2-23: Nobody likes the idea of somebody ripping his pants off with the help of other people helping him and sticking his dick in their ass. Nobody likes that idea, even the thought of it. You figure your pride, your own self-pride, your own ego, humiliation, the pain, whatever. A whole lot of things start to get you and you are not going to let this person do this to you. Use you like you are some kind of animal. And this builds up to a certain point and then it is a breaking point.

* * * * *

Men who conceive fear based on an incident can go on to generalize this apprehension so that it colors their perception of the entire prison environment. They may see danger everywhere. They may believe that encounters with other men are likely to disintegrate into aggressive episodes. Since prison is packed with men, they may see potential terrors in every part of their prison world.

ARE-7: A group of guys would be kidding each other about your hind end. Eventually I realized that they were kidding, but I was taking it serious. I just evaded them and I started being alone and staying by myself. I was never approached but I was always scared. I always had it on my mind. I would watch all the corners. I was really shook at the time they moved me to D Block because I was scared of that and I guess I was scared of the general population.

* * * * *

C2-53: I may be over that point of having to prove myself, but I still watch myself from an aggressiveness from anybody. I guess you can say that I am on the paranoid side.

* * * * *

APCC-4: I just watched myself when I was out in the yard. I would watch everything that was going on. I guess I was just more aware. I was just becoming more aware of my surroundings and where I was.

What inmates call "paranoia" is a common psychological response. Unlike the formal psychiatric term, this persistent fear has a legitimate objective basis in the constant threat of the aggressor, who often remains very much on the scene. While the physical aspects of the incident may be resolved - - the aggressor is no longer "hitting on" the target; they may not even be speaking to each other - targets and aggressors must live together in close proximity. Residual feelings from the incident may make the target believe he has made a permanent enemy. He may believe that contact with the aggressor is a sign of weakness, a sign that one invites more sexual overtures, a signal of peace inconsistent with the required strategy of projecting glaring hatred. Not surprisingly, misunderstandings in prison can become magnified. Prison is a small world and inmates, especially fearful inmates, often speak only to those in their own trusted clique. With communication blocked, seemingly minor interpersonal squabbles can grow to life or death struggles. Since animosity cannot be ameliorated by the antagonists staying away from each other, fear can grow and grow:

ARE-4: You walk out into the yard and you walk in the mess hall and it is not just a feeling because you will turn around and you will look and this guy will be staring right at you. And you will stare back at him for a second and then turn away and then you look back and he is still staring. And it upsets

me. It really does. You don't know then what the guy is thinking. The first thing that runs through your mind is, "Oh, my God, he is looking at me for sexual activity or something like this." And the only way you can describe it is frightening.

* * * * *

AR-36: Whenever I see him around I am consciously aware of it. No matter what I am doing I have to keep in the back of my mind where he is. Not that he would try anything out there in the yard or anything, but the thing is, you never know. He might be a bug. He actually was gone for three months. They had him down to Matteawan and now he is back. I don't know if he might just flip out some day. I will just cross the yard and then he'll come running around, across the yard, and go crazy. I have always got it in my mind whenever he is around to be well aware.

* * * * *

C2-27: When you're in the showers in Elmira, then sometimes there is 20 or 30 people in the shower, and they're always making remarks to you. You don't feel free. I'm used to being on the streets where you don't have any paranoia. Taking a shower is a beautiful thing. Here it's a paranoia thing where they have your back against the wall. And if you turn around and wash your

legs and you're bent over, besides getting remarks, you might get really hurt. I still keep my back to the shower, and I wash my back and watch everything. It's a weird thing, that if you drop something you don't even bend down to pick it up. You say, fuck it, I lost a bar of soap. I'm just not going to bend over and get whistles and remarks... You take your shower in 30 seconds and you feel really stupid. And you just pull your pants down and there is all these guys just waiting for you to pull your pants down. It's a sick thing. Even though the physical pressure is there for a short time, the mental pressure is there permanently. And if you're on the toilet and everybody is just walking by, then it's really an intense thing. I've been to the bathroom in front of people on the streets and it's just nothing at all like it is in here. You just want to say, "Jesus, leave me alone." But you can't close the door. It's a cell and people are looking in at you. You feel kind of helpless.

Anger

Next to fear, anger is the most common emotion we find. While anger, of course, can express itself in physical violence, it can also flourish in unexpressed or even suppressed form. By our definition, targets are recipients of unwanted sexual approaches. Because these approaches are unwanted, and are obnoxious and offensive - they cause frustration. Targets often must suffer frustration for long period of time because some aggressors, playing the pimp role, take pride in their persistance. Because sexual problems are often unshareable problems, men do not talk about them, and they are afraid to vent

heir true feelings to aggressors. Frustration, having no release, dams up until it breaks in a pent-up flood of aggression:

ARE-4: And when he sat down, he had a cup of coffee in his left hand and he put his right arm around my whole shoulders. And when he did that, I looked across the table at my buddy and he looked over at me and he was laughing. And I got so irritated. Nothing would stop him, nothing. Neither threats nor making just sense, or trying to show him my point of view in the situation. Nothing. Nothing would deter it. So he sat down and put his arm around my shoulders and I realized that this was it. I had come to the end of my rope and put up with this crap for long enough. It all happened so fast. I had just come to the end of my rope. And when I jumped up he stood up immediately. I poked at him with that fork, and he backed up because he really thought that I was going to stab him. I was so angry, but I really wasn't going to stab him. I just wanted to make him realize that I could become violent. And like I said, "Back up and if you ever touch me I'll kill you." And I was just ready to enact it. I was at the end. All this pressure just came out at one time. And this guy was on my back. And the other guys were laughing.

* * * * *

C2-23: Oh, I felt like I wanted to break out when I just looked at the guy. I just wanted to walk up to this guy and say, "You have been bothering me a whole lot," and just smash him in the face.

Aggressors often select targets who seem to have emotional problems that make them more vulnerable. This strategy backfires where targets have difficulty managing aggression and hostile feelings. Such men may be locked up because temper control is one of the problems entering into their criminal behavior:

C2-29: The guys were fooling around and grabbing me by the ass. He said I was a pussy and he would want a crate of cigarettes and he is going to break me. So I picked him up and I threw him against the wall. When he come off the wall I just beat the pulp out of him. I kind of just lost my head and I know that if I get in that state I am really going to break because, you know, after awhile it builds up. You can't take it no longer.

* * * * *

Ar-16: He will make a false move and that is when my whole body starts shaking. Like I have got a bad temper and I don't take no shit from nobody. I was close enough to kill one of these dudes around here. I am all nervous and anything could happen.

Of course, confinement can make any prisoner, regardless of his personality, unduly sensitive to irritations. Sexual approaches may impinge on a man already troubled by family worries, resentments over authority, or any of the other possible difficulties of confinement. Sex pressure in some cases caps a

sediment of accumulated aggravations. The target who killed his aggressor thus tells us:

B-6: At that certain time, I had a whole lot on my mind. He caught me at the wrong time to talk to me about that stuff. If it was another time, I don't believe that I would have tried to kill him or would have tried to do anything to him. I had a whole lot of little things on my mind. It was the time.* When I was finished, I felt sorry for him. I really shouldn't have done that, but I did it.

Anxiety

Anxiety, defined as "a state of uneasiness, apprehension, or tension" is clearly present in about one third of the incidents (see Table 7.1). Unrest was often accompanied by signs of physiological stress. Some of these reactions are tabulated in Table 7.2. The table shows that targets reported shaking, crying, stuttering, feeling weak, and not being able to sleep or concentrate. While anxiety can be present without these indicators, behavioral cues are an aid in assessing the impact of experience:

A-8: I don't know where the change was, but I've had numerous people say that I was shaking and scared and trembling. I was nervous.

* * * * *

C2-27: I got so wired up about it that in Elmira I got ulcers from it. I would be throwing up blood and then, out of

* By this he means "time" as "confinement" in the sense of "doing time" or "worrying about the time."

Table 7.2: Somatic Reactions Following Incidents of Sexual Aggression

	Yes	No	Total
Reaction Present (N=107)	31%	74%	100%
Type of Reaction	Number of Incidents for which reaction is mentioned.		
1. Shaking	9		
2. Crying	8		
3. Insomnia	8		
4. Abdominal pain and digestive problems	6		
5. Inability to concentrate	2		
6. Weakness	2		
7. Stuttering	2		

frustration, I would eat a lot. I came in weighing 125 pounds and I don't know if it was psychologically or not, but I just kept on eating and I got to be 180 pounds.

* * * * *

AR-6: I couldn't get myself to write a letter or to play my guitar. I couldn't listen to music or concentrate on nothing.

* * * * *

C2-15: My hands would get all sweatied up and everything. When I am talking about it my hands get all sweaty. When I talk about it I get all tensed up, you know. I go to sleep at night and I would wake up in the morning and I would have cramps and my legs would be crampy and sometimes I would throw up. I have not thrown up in two or three years and here I am throwing up over not something that I ate but how I feel.

* * * * *

APC-11: Once in awhile I would be sitting there and putting a crossword puzzle together or reading a book and I figured that I was calm. And then, all of a sudden, my hand would start shaking and I couldn't stop it for awhile. Once in awhile you will get a few pains in your chest and you lay back and you think you are having a heart attack. I mean it feels like you have lost your breath and you jump up quick like that and try to get your breath.

The anxiety targets feel can extend far beyond the duration of the physical incident, and can sometimes last as long as the man is imprisoned. During this time, relatively minor episodes can set off renewed attacks of

nervous tension. Situational anxiety following incidents of sexual aggression can last months. Even though a man no longer is a target, he still feels like one, and this feeling can become a dominant preoccupation:

C2-6: Ever since the day that I got in here I thought about it and I will think about it until I get out. All day and during the time at night until I go to sleep. It's just something stuck in my head and I have to do something about it. I've tried and tried to do something about it, but no one ever does anything about it.

* * * * *

C2-20: I didn't sleep at night, I had to get some sleep sometime during the day. I couldn't sleep very well. Here I can hear and see down the hall and up there I couldn't hear anybody coming. But now I can hear and close my eyes and hear if anybody is approaching. And if somebody is approaching me like that, then I would jump out of bed and look around and see who is coming near me.

* * * * *

C2-27: There's so much shit in here all the time and you're so keyed up all the time, that when you finally sleep, you lay down and sleep and sleep and sleep. And it come on you, every night. Sometimes I've wanted to wake up and just write down some of the wild shit that I've dreamed about. You never feel at ease. The blacks trying to fuck you and the blacks trying to lower you and trying to fuck you. The whole situation.

I know that personally I would like to let out a few exhales out and just sort of calm down a bit.

It's gotten so bad that about a month and half ago I started talking to the shrink. I said, "I'm really feeling a lot of tension." So he's got me on a drug at night and another drug during the day. And I'm in my cell and I'm fine now. I'm a zombie. I walk around really loaded and it's alright.

Men who bring nervous conditions to prison (who again, may be preferred targets), are particularly driven to anxiety when they confront aggressors. They feel stress more sharply than others, and their breakdown point is nearer.

Crisis

The feelings we have talked about - fear, anger and anxiety - in some cases add up to a crisis state. According to Toch, a man in crisis "conveys ² the message that he is not surviving with integrity in his situation."³ Burgess and Holmstrom see a crisis as "a disequilibrium to an individual's life style." A person "in crisis" can frequently be made visible through change in his behavior. When prisoners face severe problems they are failing to solve satisfactorily, their inner turmoil can show up in appeals for help, self-isolation, suicidal thoughts or gestures.

Most of the men in the "crisis" category in Table 7.1 classified themselves as being in crisis by speaking of themselves as "bugging out," "flying out," "not being able to take it" or "having a nervous breakdown."

C2-14: Well, sometimes when I am in my cell, I feel that this problem is coming. I try to avoid it and I feel like I wan^t to

jump up and just break everything - everything in my cell; but I try to keep my head and calm myself down or do something. Really, I feel like trying to do something - break a wall or something.

* * * * *

AC-10: I was really an emergency case the second day that I was here. I had so many fears and so many worries going in my mind. I felt really such a broken spirit. I guess you might say that all I could do was crawl under the concrete.

* * * * *

A-7: I was all torn up inside with nerves. I was sick, sick, sick, constantly, right straight through for two weeks. I didn't want to be put out in the population. I wanted to be put someplace where I could work with no one around me. Then I would be fine, but I know that you can't do this. There is no such thing like that in here.

Men in crisis may see themselves approaching mental illness. Sensing themselves going under, they look for help. Their condition, thus, can be signaled by requests for therapeutic assistance, or for emergency transfer out of the stress-inducing environment:

ARC-14: I said I wanted to go to protection and he said, "No, I'm not going to put you in protection, not until something happens." And then the next day or something he came around me.

And then I got very emotionally upset. Then he said they would put me in protection.

* * * *

C2-45: He said, "I am going to cut you up."

And so the guard came and I told the guard that I just can't stand it no more, "Put me in keep lock or something. Get me the hell out of here. I can't stand this environment."

Crises, as Caplan indicates, often characterize problems which we can
4

neither solve nor escape. When asking for aid gets nowhere, when one's personal stock of solutions is depleted, men are left with a problem they cannot solve. At this point, some men declare bankruptcy; their fear of sex aggression leads to thoughts of suicide:

CR-26: I was just so confused and everything. Because of that I just didn't care anymore and I felt to myself if they are going to rip me off for my ass, I am going to cut up and go over to the hospital and they can't get me over there. I just didn't care. I had been put away most of my life and half of my life was ruined anyways, so why should I live with the pain and all. I have just been going through pain and heartbreaks ever since I was nine years old, and I was to the point where I didn't care anymore.

When targets in crisis think about cutting their wrists or hanging themselves, they are generally assuming that the aggressor will get to them no

matter what they do. As we have seen, one encounter with an aggressor is sometimes enough to let one believe that his fate as a victim is sealed. When this type of fear becomes combined with feelings of powerlessness, with a sense that one cannot escape what he sees as his fate, the problem becomes insoluble. Toch speaks of such situations on crises of "Fate
5 Avoidance."

A-7: Death. That's all I could think of. I had this fear in me and I thought that one of these days I was going to be surprised and I didn't know who was going to do it. So that is why the fear got in me and went deeper and deeper and then it got so that I would shake and shake. And when it got to that, then I was really scared. This [suicide] did occur to me. I said they would never bring me back here alive. I said that I would never come back here again. I'm not adapted to doing a bit at all. And I could never do time. I never want to do time again. I would beg for the electric chair if I had to do time. I wouldn't want to stay here. I can't do time. I can't walk out there without worrying if someone is setting me up.

* * * * *

C2-18: I was thinking about cutting my wrists and then I was trying - thinking about trying to hang myself.

I: Why was that? Why were you thinking about that?

C2-18: I figured that when I was locked out that sooner or

later the blacks would get me. If I stayed up in that division they would get me one way or the other.

* * * * *

C2-45: The dude in the shower felt my ass. I figured that I was going to be a goner, that they would take my manhood or something. So I just cut up and then I chickened out. I wanted to kill myself or some stupid shit like this.

I said, "Fuck it man." I went to my cell and I took my mirror and I just slashed through. I didn't cut very deep but the blood was still running and then I said if they send me to Mattaewan then it will be on my record that I bugged out and that I cut up and I said, "Piss on it." And I wiped it off and I went through some pain for about two weeks and then it healed up, without anybody seeing it.

For about 20 percent of the incidents, targets told us that they had thought about suicide. However, only a few men actually reached the point of injuring themselves. Some of these men felt hopeless and just wanted the peace of mind they saw available in death. Others hoped that staff would remove them from the danger they were in. They hoped to be transferred immediately, for example, to the mental hospital maintained for prisoners by the state. (Ironically, former inmates of this mental hospital told us it had the highest level of sex aggression in the state.)

Most targets in crisis deal with their problems through less drastic means, by requesting protective housing. Even though Protection in the adult prison means confinement in a single cell for twenty two hours a day, and men in protection are generally put down by others, such sanctuaries offer safety and allow a man to restore his equilibrium. Some staff, when they learn of the inmate's problem, help him by transferring him to a different job or living area. Staff frequently made such transfers without letting everyone know what the problem was: sensitive to men's needs, they attempted to avoid the isolation and stigma that are the corollaries of flight strategies.

Crises combine many of the feelings targets tell us they experience. Fear is the root cause, to which is added anxiety and tension. The pressure builds up when men cannot solve their problem, i.e., when they cannot find a way to feel safe or self-sufficient. Suicidal thoughts and gestures may come as men look for escape. Most crises are resolved with the help of staff or by moving to established protective environments.

Impact in Context

Most incidents occur relatively early in men's sentences, at a time when inmates are also worried about separation from their families. Entering prison, men feel great concern for the life they have been forced to leave behind: especially acute can be tension arising when men who formerly took care of others are now rendered helpless. Not being able to do anything about problems at home, all the inmates can do is worry about them. The entry period can also be a time when guilt and remorse bother men. Burdened with problems, new

prisoners find confinement no House of the Dead, although they may wish for a tranquil place to mend their wounds. Prison is a tumultuous, stimulus-filled environment, a world where complexity is heightened by the enigmas of unfamiliar cultures. Responses to sexual aggression can thus become mixed with responses to other difficulties of confinement:

AC-10: People would come up to me and ask me about my crime and what I had done and this is a terrible part of my life and I don't want to talk about it. I had terrible regrets. And then this black guy came in and he was telling me that they would be selling me for 20 cartons a piece....and certainly it frightened me. And also having to bear the fear and the anxiety of being in prison and being confronted with an environment that I was totally unfamiliar with. Not knowing what was going to happen and then be surrounded, actually flooded with this kind of conversation.

* * * * *

ARE-4: I have a wife and two kids and she's living with her mother and no car right now. Everytime that my wife comes up to visit me and she goes home again, her mother calls her a half-time mother and a part-time mother. She is trying to discourage my wife from coming up and seeing me and she discourages my oldest boy. She is telling him that you don't have a father and things like this. And now this starts to bother me. But when you have to cope with a situation that arises in the institution as far as homosexuality,

this puts another burden on top of another burden and there are just so many things that a man can cope with before he breaks.

A man does have more problems than he came in with, without adding to them. And then you get into a situation like this and before you can really get into the program and get relaxed - because it is a heck of a shock to come into a place like this - before you get a chance to do this, you've got another problem built up.

* * * * *

AC-10: I was just so totally saturated with fear. Also being very upset over finding myself in prison, having to even try to figure out how I allowed myself to get into something that I would have let go this far.

I was so overwhelmed with so many fears and so many problems that I was confronted with, plus trying to adjust to finding yourself locked in a cell so many hours a day, that it was very difficult for me to even try to figure out things, or to try to get any kind of plan as to how I could cope with the future. It was almost a day to day groping, really, of trying to muster through all the fear and anxiety and depression that I had. There did not seem to be any way of having a little extra corner of your mind that you can say, well, this is used for planning and plotting your way through. I was just so overwhelmed by all this.

Lifestyle Changes

When a man is a target, the incident can affect the way he lives as much as the way he thinks. As we have seen, targets in crisis often must move to a new location in addition to facing the direct harm aggressors cause them (Some call this "secondary victimization.") Most targets (87 percent) reported disruption of their lives following incidents; men who became violent were disciplined; non-violent men stopped going to certain places in order to be more secure. While targets in crisis may seek the total seclusion of Protection, less traumatized men quietly cut off certain activities. They trade a certain amount of freedom for increments in security:

AC-10: I just go to lunch and that is all. And I manage then to do my own thing as far as breakfast and dinner is concerned.

* * * * *

APC-11: I didn't go out in the yard or nothing. I just stayed in my cell and went to work and went right back and stayed in my cell. I never went out in the yard. I didn't ever even dare to go out in the yard, really.

The most common change in life style is some degree of self-isolation. It can be formal, as in Protection or Keeplock, or informal, as when men stay in their cells whenever the prison routine permits them to do so. Self-imposed isolation is a voluntary response to the threat of victimization. In some cases it is routinized, and entire classes of target-prone men may

consign themselves to degrees of confinement more severe than those under which others live.

We interviewed all the men living in formal protective custody status in several prisons, and saw the role of "segregation" in the management of inmate fear.⁶ About a third of Attica's protection population was there because of sex pressure. These men were more brittle, and more traumatized, than the other targets we interviewed. They reacted to incidents by opting for 22 hour a day of lock up, totally removed from prison activities. It was a seemingly harsh solution: the men were denied movies, school, church, work. Other prisoners looked down on them for living in "pediatrics," called them "punks" and "pussies." Because other prisoners thought they had been consensually raped, targets in Protection were also called "homos." Because other prisoners thought these men had shared their troubles with staff, they were called "rats." In a gallery that is shut off from the rest of the prison, Protection men had to stay locked in their cells for all but a small part of each day. Nonetheless, in spite of the obvious liabilities of Protection, most targets declared themselves satisfied with the arrangement when compared to the dangers they would face in Population.

In the youth prison [Coxsackie], C-2 or "Weak Company" was the functional equivalent of protection. Having existed in the youth prison for as long as veteran staff could remember, Weak Company was a systemic response to the need for giving special protection to youths who were bullied by others. The existence of the "Weak Company" is further evidence that sex aggression is highest among youths. At the time of our interviews, Weak Company (90 percent white)

held about a quarter of all white prisoners. Most Weak Men, like other whites, had been targets of sexual aggression at one time or other.

In addition to the shelter offered by Weak Company, the youth prison was more protective because it was run more strictly than the adult prison. Men were marched to and fro, were locked in their cells except at activities, and always were well controlled. Because life in the youth prison is more rigid, less flexible, and because free choice and free movement are limited, targets under pressure had to isolate themselves less often than in the adult prison. In the adult prison, informal self-isolation was a common response to sex aggression. Like the elderly in the South Bronx, some adult targets only go out at certain times when they feel safe, and then only when it is absolutely necessary. Potential amenities of life are sacrificed for peace of mind. Paradoxically, the prison reform that makes things looser, that gets men out of cells and gives them more freedom of movement, can also result in making prisons more dangerous. It induces, for some, more isolation than they experienced before. Locks and bars and guards serve to protect men as much as they keep men from escaping. As the following examples show, the target experience causes men to stay in the shelter of their cells even though they could leave if they wanted to:

AP-10: Well, like, if I ever did come out of my cell I usually stopped at my door and looked this way and that and made sure everything was clear before I even moved. If I had the faintest idea that somebody was watching me, I just closed my door and went back in. Because I didn't take no chances on anything.

* * * *

ARE-4: And I started not going to those places, the mess hall or the recreation room at night or the yard. And I kept to myself in my room.

* * * * *

AR-36: The first week in C Block, I stayed in my cell. I only went out for one meal a day and I didn't want to bother with anyone. I would go to work and come back straight to my cell.

Isolation, caused by fear of sex pressure, can cut some men off from constructive programs that are designed for their betterment:

A-7: I've almost talked myself into going back to school, but I'm too scared. I have that fear that some guy will get me, And I can't go. When I was working, I was alright, but then I had to quit my job because this other guy was trying something with me too.

For some prisoners, adjusting to prolonged cell time is easier than adjusting to the physical presence of aggressors. Isolation, bad as it may seem, restores personal equilibrium. Choosing isolation themselves, men not only adjust to it but appreciate and value it for the safety and privacy it offers. 7

Social Relations

After being troubled by a sexual approach - or even if they just feel afraid of sexual approaches - men can become suspicious and distrustful of other prisoners, seeing them as potential victimizers ready to exploit people. By decreasing their human contacts, these inmates reason, they are decreasing their vulnerability:

ARE-7: If they talk to me then I have the feeling "What does he want and what is he after?" Lots of guys I work with will offer you something and then automatically I think, "What does he want or what is he after?"

* * * *

AR-10: You can't be open and honest with people here because everyone has got a little game going. No matter how honest an individual is to a person in here, it is a game to the extent that you don't find very many people here that are real.

When I do run into someone who wants to talk to me, I do try to keep the conversation to a minimum. Certainly my experience with inmates being friendly is not just their wanting to talk to be friendly. There seems to be ulterior motives there. So that's why I just usually don't talk to people.

Part of adjusting to prison, for all men, not just targets, is learning who to associate with because you need them and who to stay away from because they can harm you. Targets often go through an extreme form of this selective adjustment where they develop suspicion of almost all other inmates. After learning how prison players try to score, i.e., the fact that aggressors try to make friends with their targets, doing them favors, and then "slipping slick maneuvers under their belts," these men will cut themselves off from all possible companionship. They can internalize distrust to such an extent that it

becomes a generic attitude change, lasting through their sentences and possibly beyond:

A-7: That will always stay with me. That has always been with me since I've come in here and gone through that experience. That's what I'm afraid of all the time. That's why I won't trust anyone anymore. Because they're sly about it and they slide right in there.

* * * * *

AR-6: I don't think I am really being myself. I think I am not being my real self because I can't be my real self in here. If I was my real self I would manage to speak like Mister Nice Guy out on the street. And some people would take advantage of me, And that is the biggest thing. That is why I am defensive now. It is, like, if I do any favors for anybody, they will take advantage of it.

Like taking in violent attitudes and values, the growing suspicion and distrust of others is part of the social learning process in prison. Sexual incidents make a contribution, as does the standard advice given to men who look like they may be targets: "Don't accept gifts or favors," "Friendly men are players running a game," etc. Some men, who are inner-directed, ignore this advice. Others, however, who are lost in unfamiliar surroundings, take this sort of guidance very much to heart. Staying away from others can become a policy responsive to one's perceived fragility as well as to social norms and peer influence:

A-10: When I came from reception in Sing-Sing, someone there told me that I would have to be very careful who I talked to, and that I would find out that a lot of inmates would try and be my friend, and then you find out that all they are doing is spreading gossip or rumors. And so the best thing that you can do is try not to talk to anyone and not associate with anyone. Stay to yourself as much as you can. So that even when I came in here that was what I was trying to do.

Lack of trust has its costs. How can a gregarious man with a life sentence, survive without friends? When the drive for safety cuts one off from others, one must suffer in his loneliness. Self-imposed solitude can prevent one from not only gaining companionship but from building supportive ties that help reduce the anxiety connected with fear.

AC-10: I was beginning to feel that you can't really talk to anybody: there's no one that you really can talk with. Even just to clear your head, to air things and to be able to relieve the tension that you feel.

Prison is a man's home and community; most essential needs must be satisfied with the resources men find behind the walls. When one needs people but cuts himself off from others, victimization is standing in the way of one's psychological survival. For example, we interviewed a 19 year old urban black target serving a life sentence, who was used to being with others on the street,

and found his self-imposed social life in prison hard to bear. But, he tells us:

ARE-2: I just got tired of people confronting me with it, you know. I can't talk to nobody in here unless it's about sex. And I get tired of talking about sex. I'm really a friendly person and I get along with anyone. My character was changing. If I feel like I can't talk to nobody unless it's about sex, then I don't want to talk to nobody. I have a long time to be here. And if I have to be here for a long time I might as well get to know somebody, because I can't do it by myself. And there is kids in here that I can talk to without sex being the main part of the conversation. But then again it leads to that inevitably. And then I don't talk to them anymore. Because he was just thinking about that. And then I stay in my cell.

Cutting himself off from others can increase a target's physical vulnerability and reduce his psychological capacity to cope with sex pressure because aggressors tend to hit on weak-looking men who are alone, and look resourceless. To avoid other inmates - which is seemingly a protective move - may therefore, paradoxically, increase one's risk. The drive toward isolation, the development of suspicion, may result in a target creating for himself a public image which attracts aggressors. Unless a man meets a group from his home neighborhood or from a previous sentence, he must mingle in prison if he hopes to be part of a clique that will offer him physical security and psychic support. A man who becomes a target partly because he enters prison with neither "homie" nor ethnic support,

can thus further increase his risk when isolation and suspicion keep him alone:

ARE-4: One guy will tell this guy, "Oh, this guy is no good - stay away from him. He is not wrapped too tight," or something like this and it runs right down the line. Before you know it, you are being completely ignored and you are alone and this is the worst place in the world to be alone.

* * * * *

AC-10: I'm told that if you are by yourself those are the people that turn out to be real preys of these other people. Because the guy who is a loner, they know that he doesn't have anyone to run to his aid if anything starts.

While sexual aggression causes some targets to isolate themselves, it causes others to band together for protection. Fear, in prison, promotes the growth of cliques and gangs, which may be defensive groups with exclusive memberships. Whites in New York State prisons generally band together out of fear of blacks. Threat of sexual abuse is part of that fear. In seeing outsiders as potential enemies, feelings about others can become related to who is in the "safe" group and who is outside the group. Here, the impact of the target experience can be compounded by the influence on targets of the groups they join for protection. The secondary effects of group process on fearful men are unavoidable so long as some men see joining a group as a necessity for survival.

Just as some targets who need social stimulation still stay alone to avoid aggressors, so others who need privacy must stay with others for protection.

Social capability, the ability to become a member of a group offering protection, is especially important in determining whether one's coping style will tend toward isolation or toward group involvement. Both styles, however, reflect similar feelings: fear, distrust and suspicion of others. Both styles separate men from true community involvement: one by restricting them to the walls of a single cell; the other by cementing the barriers of a tight peer group. To the extent that life is enriched by contact with others, sexual aggression, by limiting associations, interferes with the quality of a man's daily existence.

Racial Attitudes

As we have seen, most aggressors are non-white and most targets are white. It is not surprising that many targets tell us that they grow to hate non-whites as a result of their experiences; generalizing their feelings about specific aggressors to the aggressors' group, targets talk about a deep racial prejudice that develops for them. Fueled by fear and by the perception of the whites' relative powerlessness in prison, reinforced by anger and the violence generated by sexual approaches, racism is a corollary of the target experience:

C2-27: When I was on the streets I knew a few and when I saw them it was, "How are you, Brothers." And we shook hands. But in here I don't even like to talk to them. I'm sure that they're all evil and I don't like them. They stink. They're all sick. If I had the chance I would really try to do something to them. It's intense. And the only way that I can see for them to do something about it is to make segregated jails. There is so much pressure

in here. The blacks - I can't even talk to them. I have nothing but hate for them.

And so I figure that the day that I get out, then I don't know, I don't know what it's going to be like to free myself. I may be going down the road and see a nigger and try to hit him or run over him. I might say that he's one of them. And I know now that I can't talk to any blacks. They're all the same to me. There may be one or two of them that are alright, but they're all the same to me.

* * * * *

C2-37: All the time, all I could think about was killing them niggers because of their attitude towards the white dudes. Every-time a nigger sees a white dude, they say, "I am going to make him my kid." That kind of stuff really makes me sick. I just want to kill them all.

White targets who tell us they come to hate all blacks as a result of sexual incidents, claim no prior prejudice while on the street. They see victimization as having changed their attitudes about race. It may be, however, that other factors in prison life are equally responsible for this change in racial attitude. Men who tell us that target experiences cause them to hate all blacks may have been prejudiced all along. The general resentment all inmates may feel as a result of incarceration may be focused by some whites onto blacks. Targets forced to live in close proximity with different ethnic groups may find blacks offensive simply because they are different from themselves. Nonetheless, we

still must consider the "face validity" of targets' statements, that they were not prejudiced before their target experience and that the incidents have altered their view of blacks:

C2-46: I used to work with the blacks and I really liked them. I really trusted them and they helped me and everything. I had a friend; I use to go over to his house and play with his little girl and his little boy and everything. And we would get together once in awhile. But now I have the attitude that it will be a long time, even on the outside, before I ever trust one again... ever:

* * * * *

C2-52: I was never prejudiced on the streets and there was this black family - only one black family where I come from - and I used to hang around with them. And when I got in Elmira, Man., I started getting prejudiced. Now I don't talk to niggers.

Attitudes about Violence

Another attitude change we see in our interviews is the turn toward violence. As in the case of ethnic attitudes, part of the evidence we have for such change is that of targets saying they have changed their ideas about violence. Data from other studies, however, show that attitude change does not always amount to change in behavior; thus, we cannot claim that the move toward endorsing violence results in targets acting more violently than before. On the thought level - not the action level - men say they come to prison with non-violent

attitudes but learn in prison that their former ways are a liability to survival. They describe a process whereby they learn to act tough and to look tough in order to deter aggressors. We have termed this, in our chapter on violence, part of the socialization which occurs in confinement. Among our sample men see these encounters with aggressors as a major force leading them to believe that they must be violent in order to survive. And in some cases, there seems to be a clear line between believing in violence and acting violently:

C2-45: If someone wrote to one of my friends and told him, explained to him what I am like in jail, he would write and laugh at them. Because they would say that Bob ain't like that at all. He is a great person and you know he would do anything for anybody. He don't fight. He never fought in his life. I am a violent person now. I would fight anybody. I don't give a shit - not no more. It is necessary, I average maybe one fight a week - maybe two.

* * * * *

A-4: I am more mature. I am sure of what I can do and what I can't do. I am sure that if a man approaches me I can stick a knife in his heart. Before I couldn't do that - I was 17 years old and I couldn't seem to do it. I didn't have no violence in me. I don't worry about it because I know that I have confidence in myself. I hate thinking this way. But I know that I can do it

if the situation should arise. And it is a bad feeling to know that you can do it.

Beliefs Affecting Impact

Because of the physical setting, much of what we call sexual aggression never goes beyond rough talk or relatively mild physical encounters. Nonetheless, targets react strongly to these messages. In part, their reactions are linked to sexual ideas and beliefs. For example, a theme running through our interviews is fear of forceable sodomy. In spite of the official presence, many see this prospect as a horrifying possibility. Part of this panic and dread is based on belief that the victim of a sexual assault suffers a permanent loss of masculinity. The argot term for homosexual virginity is "manhood" or "hood." Some see losing manhood as the ultimate danger, which they view as unalterable transfiguration.

ARE-4: I wasn't going to be a changed man. And I don't want to walk out of here and be a homosexual. No way in the world.

* * * * *

C2-45: I wouldn't be no good to my son - I couldn't face him knowing that they actually took it without me wanting to give it. Forcing me to give my manhood is - anyone would tell you - you would rather die.

* * * * *

C2-9: If someone came up to me and told me that they were going to take me off, I would try my best to kill him because if I don't,

I loose everything that I have got.

* * * * *

A-7: I know darn well that if I become one, I could do my whole bit with no sweat. Just as easy as can be. This is true. Because as long as you came across, nobody would bother you. You'd be well protected. This I would know ahead of time. I would have everything that I wanted. But I could not turn around and walk out in that street into this other world and face my people knowing that I'd done this. And face a woman and marry a woman knowing that I had done this. Possibly there is changes that homos go through. that when they become a homo they don't want to know a girl again. But I don't want this to happen to me. I'll stay with my regular life and this is it.

Another belief that goes into the impact of the target experience is the myth of the powerful and successful aggressor. We have seen no cases outside of gang rapes where aggressor strategies really pay off. Nonetheless, the myth widely prevalent among prisoners is that sexual aggression pays off in erotic rewards. This myth is a misunderstanding affecting both aggressor and target behavior: some aggressors thus act violently when their expectations of success are snubbed, and some targets collapse emotionally because they expect that threats must lead inevitably to sexual exploitation:

AR-41: They, [the aggressors] see that the guy [target] wasn't

getting no visits and no money from home and so forth. They would come up and furnish the tobacco and cigarettes. He [target] realizes that he can't pay back and at first the guy will say, "okay." Then he comes back maybe a month later with another carton and he says, "The last time it was alright." But after the second or third time he tells him that you owe me some money and that is when this all starts up.

And he says, "Well, a little sex act and we will be even." And the guy is scared that he is going to hurt him because he [aggressor] might say, "Well, I am going to cut you if I don't get my money." And the guy is scared and so forth. A lot of people there realize that you don't go to the police because you could end up getting killed or messed up or something. And so the guy just goes and says, "Okay," and that is it.

* * * * *

CR-5: The guy comes in and 2 or 3 guys get together. They see him in the shower and, "Wow," they think, "I wouldn't mind getting down to him." And so they wait for the guy. Then they walk up to him, especially if it is a young kid, they go directly to him and they tell him that they are going to give him this. They just talk to him and they find out what kind of a person he is. They see that he is a kid and he is ignorant of this ever happening in the system at all. He is just ever so weak. And they are sure to get him, you know, slowly but surely.

* * * * *

CR-29: I told him, "Don't go their way. They are going to be offering you candy, cigarettes. They are going to get you into gambling and they are going to get you into debt." They got another dude here and he is in debt for about 70 crates and he can't pay so they are looking for a shot of life. So he is trying to cut himself up and really injure himself bad so that he can get out of here and be shipped out of here. Those things you just don't fool around with because they are going to get you one way or the other.

The myth of success comprises the standard scenario of victimization: the target accepts gifts that are interpreted by aggressors as loans implying the lenders' right to sexual access. Once the victim accepts these gifts, his fate as a victim is sealed. In our study there is only a single incident where the scenario was played out. The importance of the story lies in the fact that it is believed, not that it is true.

The reactions to sexual aggression are caused in part by fear of being harmed. But the reactions are also caused, in part, by dislike of homosexuality. Lower-class white men come to prison with staunch taboos and traditions against homosexuality. Their stand against homosexuality is more a moral belief than a statement of personal preference. They hate homosexuals as others important to them hate homosexuals. And they do not view sex among men as casual behavior but as activity marking a man with a deviant identity: a homosexual is a "queer." When one is propositioned or attacked for sex, the anger and emotional uneasiness reflects, in part, the general disdain of the activity they are pressured to engage in:

AR-23: This guy thinks that I am a homo or a punk kid that he could fuck me. I think it was my own hang ups - there wasn't that much fear mixed in with it. Not physical fear. Except for the normal physical fear that you would have if you were going to fight somebody, like you might get hurt, but I consider that normal. The thing was homosexuality, in my head. This guy was trying to fuck me and I was hung up over that.

* * * * *

ARE-2: I guess what it is is pride. He has to tell his woman out there that he fucked this man in prison. And I can't see myself saying that to somebody. And I can't see it at all.

* * * * *

C2-53: I myself don't like homosexuality. If one guy comes up to me - I mean a homosexual - if one had come up to me and he wanted me to perform a sex act on him, I would try to kill the dude. I have beat the heck out of one homosexual that had come towards me.

* * * * *

APC-11: This is just something that you don't do - that is not right even though you are locked up in here the rest of your life - to me, this is just not right.

* * * * *

C2-52: I don't like to say it but I have got an uncle that is a homo and I have threatened to kill him a lot of times, me and my brother, and that is why I don't like it. If I could kill him, man,

that is what I would do because I don't like it.

Floundering for Solutions

Because targets struggle awkwardly to extricate themselves from their fate, because they stumble and hesitate, the impact of the experience is increased beyond what it would be if the problem could be addressed smoothly. Doubt, indecision, not knowing what to do, mulling over equally distasteful options, drags out the incident and intensifies its emotional shock. We coded interviews for the presence or absence of "floundering." i.e., for statements about confusion, paralysis and inability to respond, about loss of control of the situation. Using this definition, floundering occurred in about a quarter of the incidents. For example:

APC-11: I shut the door when he would come up and start bothering me. I was trying to tell him that I don't do those things.

He is trying to tell me that it is not going to bother me, and it won't hurt at all.

So I am saying, "You know, I don't want to do that."

And he says, "Well, you are going to have to."

Talking to that one guy, it just seemed as though he couldn't see my viewpoint. I was going to tell the guards a couple of times but then I thought - well, maybe I had better not because they would find out and then maybe I would have a whole gang after me.

They just started bothering me a little bit more, and I have never been in a fight in my life but if anybody tried I would just have to try to hurt them. I wouldn't want to have to hurt nobody -

I don't want nothing like that to happen. Getting him to leave me alone, I said, "Let me think about it." Because I was scared, really scared. He would go away for awhile. Then come back a little while later. When I was afraid I wanted to go into protection, I wanted to talk to somebody.

Failing to take action can lead to aggressors continuing their approaches. Inmates who are generally non-assertive have a special problem because their attempts to communicate resistance bogs down. Yet, even the most forceful "no" often gets targets nowhere. As they look for other solutions, targets can become disturbed because all available options seem to have strong arguments against them: the ignoring of aggressors or doing nothing wounds one's pride and may encourage overtures; fighting will get you in trouble with the authorities and make a dangerous enemy of the aggressors; one doesn't talk to staff because they want inmates to rat out. The feeling that something must be done combined with the fact that one doesn't know what to do, adds to the turmoil of the target experience:

C2-47: Well, the one thing that I was thinking about was escaping. The other thing that I was thinking about was fighting and going over and saying to this guy, "Look - if you want me, let's get it on . . . and get it settled right here and now." And the other thing I was saying in my mind was if I fight this guy - this is going to happen if I do fight him and that is going to happen if I don't fight him. So a lot of things told me to go to

to the C.. O.

And if you go to the C. O., it is not good in prison. It is not good at all because they can help you. Sure they can help you but they are going to harm you in the long run.

* * * * *

AR-36: I was helpless. I had to sit there and there was nothing that I could do about it, I started to figure out what the consequences would be if I didn't make any aggressive move back and make the guy back up. Then I kept on trying to think how much that would magnify the situation. By building up and building up I would actually have to hurt the guy. And I wasn't sure. What I was trying to do was to try and understand what the best way was. I just couldn't come up with anything.

* * * * *

ARE-1: This may sound funny, but sex in a way is a hard thing for me to talk about, and I am in here for rape. Even when I first was talking with Miss Morris, about my problems and stuff, it was actually hard to say rape or sex or anything like that. It is hard for me to talk about homo stuff even when someone brings it up down on the block or something. It is hard to bring the word homo out.

Summary

Fear is the most commonly mentioned emotion accompanying the target experience. Fear can be a general feeling or a specific apprehension of being physically harmed, sexually assaulted, or killed. Fear can shift from the arena of the incident and its players to encompass feelings about the entire prison milieu. Fear is intensified by targets' inability to easily remove themselves from the presence of aggressors, and by their propensity to worry about the consequences of aggressive moves. Regardless of the level of force in an incident, fear can be an intense emotion, persisting over time and governing subsequent lifestyles. Not all men emerge from incidents feeling fearful. About 50 percent of our targets said they did, although we suspect under-reporting. And the shape of the targets' fear differs from target to target, depending on their personal characteristics.

Anger is also a common reaction, and includes accumulated frustration resulting from persistent unwanted approaches. Men who have trouble controlling feelings are particularly sensitive to this response. Other prisoners are likely to be vulnerable because confinement causes frustration to which the sexual approach must be summated. Anger can result in explosive reactions or can be narrowly held in check, contributing to the inmate's tension and anxiety.

Anxiety was reported for about one third of the incidents. The stress accompanying this tension frequently was signaled by physical indicators. Fear was the primary feeling bringing on anxiety, which could persist far beyond the end of the incident. Men with previous mental health problems seemed

particularly vulnerable.

Crises can follow from sexual approaches as men react to their fear. These crises are commonly signaled by emotional upset along with requests for medication or isolation. Suicidal thoughts and gestures sometimes accompany these crises when men feel their fate as future victims is sealed or when men wish staff to move them to a safe area.

There is an impact on social relations. Men's lives are disrupted and they commonly end up isolating themselves to avoid contact with aggressors. Men also join with others to form defensive groupings.

Racial attitudes are affected with men telling us that they come to hate non-whites as a result of their experiences. Attitudes toward violence are also affected and men report that they become more violent after being targets.

The impact of sexual aggression seems to be accentuated by inmate beliefs that sexual assault leads to permanent identity change, that aggressors are successful, and that homosexual activity is reprehensible. These beliefs add to the intensity of the target experience. In our final chapter, we discuss the implications of this experience.

Footnotes: Chapter Seven

1 Burgess and Holmstrom, 298.

2 Toch (1975), 322.

3 300.

4 In Burgess and Homstrom, 109, (Work not cited).

5 Toch (1975), 51. See also Johnson, 126-132.

6 Lockwood (In press)

7 Toch (In Press)

8 Harold E. Pepinsky: "Need a Policeman's Lot Be an Unhappy one?" Journal
of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 14 (1977):137.

CHAPTER EIGHT: VICTIMS OF PRISON RAPE

The experiences of male rape victims - although similar in many respect to those of other targets - differ enough to warrant a separate chapter. Also, since the prison literature is replete with unfounded comments about sexual assault, our interviews can contribute to the topic by providing, possibly for the first time, some clinical material about the male rape victim. Such material offers us a useful contrast in looking at the female victim experience.

We looked at 15 incidents of sexual assault. Only one victim came to us through the random sample, leading us to conclude that sexual assaults, in our research setting, are relatively rare in comparison to other types of target-aggressor encounters. Nonetheless, these incidents are clearly important. Even a "low" rate of sexual assault (say, one or two a year out of a population of two thousand) may make the sexual assault rate in a prison higher than the rate of heterosexual rape in the free community, a rate many find justifiably intolerable. The possibility of rape adds to the intensity of all types of target experiences, since most prisoners know about rapes occurring in the institutions where they are living. As a consequence, many inmates perceive themselves to be living in a dangerous environment. The occasional occurrence of sexual assault also tells us about a type of behavior that is likely to occur if security is relaxed.

A Case of Sex Assault

We have mentioned that prison rape is an unusual event. Yet, for all the complexity of institutional life, aggressors are always waiting to move in, and atypical situations allowing rape to occur are bound to happen at times. The following case illustrates this:

The victim, a new inmate, was transferred to the prison mental hospital for evaluation. Placed on an open dormitory where about 40 men live, no special classification procedures recognized his potential for victimization. Guards may have been indifferent and the dormitory was dominated by a gang of aggressors who routinely assaulted all young white men. The incident is not representative of normal conditions: rather, it illustrates what can occur when official procedures break down. The target, a middle-class 19 year old from a Long Island suburb, tells us what happened:

C2-16: The sex pressure started the second day. Some guy came in and said, "You owe for cigarettes, Man, and do you want to give up your ass tonight?"

And I said, "No, Man, and anybody that comes in here talking about that, I am going to hit him with a chair or something." So then I seen them doing it to kids at night that were scared. I was thinking of taking a mayonnaise jar and breaking it in half - in case they tried it against me - and using it as a weapon. But then I was thinking if I do that then I will get more time and that is all I could think of - more time. And I did not want to

get more time.

Well, I was lying on the bed and I was half awake and half asleep. It was hard to sleep that night because the officers would not keep these guys in their room. After 10 o'clock you are supposed to be in your room. Because there aren't any doors they can walk the halls all night. They came when I was sleeping and one guy shook me and he said, "Come with me to the room." And I said that I was not going no place. And then this one guy who weighed about 240 pounds started twisting my arm - and it really started to hurt. And I figured that this guy would really break my arm so I am going to do it. And that was that. They took me in a room that was two rooms away from where I was. They closed the door and a couple of them stood outside to see if the officer came by.

So I went into the room and I lied on the bed and they gave me all this bullshit. They told me that it won't hurt and that I was not a homo and don't worry they won't tell anybody. So, I had about two or three guys that were hanging on top of me and I was very upset that night.

I was in there about 20 minutes because I did not scream or anything. I just let them do it and that was it. These guys they work very fast. They just get on top of the guy and they do it in like 3 - 5 minutes maybe. So that was that.

I felt depressed. At times I did think of suicide but that was just a passing thought. I was getting a suicide thought because I say, "Hey, Man, I am going to be doing this night after night." Like it was just at the beginning of my time and I had not even gone to my parole board. I was really confused and I cried at night and I was upset. I was thinking about that - suicide. When you have got four guys every day that are going to fuck you in the ass every night, it is nothing to look forward to.

I never thought about killing anyone or anything in my life but like I was just thinking about going over with a jar and then hitting him and the whole thing would be over. In that week myself I changed so much. I had all these hostile thoughts. The violent thoughts were that the next time they came over to me I am going to make an example. I am going to take a jar and hit some guy in the back of the head.

I am thinking what would a real man do in situations like this. I was thinking that I should have taken a chair or I should have taken a jar and I should have just smashed one of these guys. That is what I was thinking because it kept happening over and over. I am thinking if I know these guys they are going to come again and they are going to screw me and if I let them, then I am at fault, if I let it happen and I know it is going to happen then it is my fault.

Well, I was upset because first of all, most guys consider themselves a man and you always say that in jail no one is ever going to do that to you. I was very upset about it for about four or five months afterwards because I thought that I had lost my manhood.

It was just a very painful thing that happened. You just start to get over it - and you say it was just not my fault. You just say to yourself you were in an abnormal atmosphere and it just happened. That is about the most painful part of my time.

I had thought of telling the officers but they had told me when it happened that if I told the officers - even if I did go to protective keep lock - that they would run a wire on me and get me in the cell down there. Because this was my first time in jail and I did not know what was happening.

Why Rape Can Occur

Some incidents of rape may occur because proper custodial supervision is lacking, as we see in the example we have just reviewed. But other assaults occur in closely supervised surroundings. Here, the aggressors work out careful plans to lure the victim to a spot where rape can take place. The victim is a "mark" in a con game. He must be induced to cooperate to a certain point in the incident. In these types of assaults, the location where the victim is lured lacks security, so that the incident can take place. To be sure, modern prisons and jails are designed to protect inmates from each other and allow

for constant custodial supervision. Nonetheless, aggressors find ways to circumvent (on rare occasions) the most rigid custodial routines. For example, in one case we reviewed, the victim was told he could purchase marijuana if he accompanied an aggressor. The aggressor and the victim then walked together through a steel door, which was opened a few minutes to allow a group of inmates to pass through it. Once in the cell block area, other aggressors appeared and dragged the victim under a bed in one of the aggressor's cells. The steel door should have prevented the victim from entering an improper area. Yet security systems are never in complete effect all of the time, and aggressors may learn to circumvent these systems.

A similar incident occurred in a small room off a gym where sneakers are kept. The officer supervising the gym could not see into this room. The victim was lured into the room by an aggressor who asked him to play handball. The other aggressors were hiding in the room when the victim entered it to change his shoes. In this incident the victim, an urban black, was an acquaintance of the aggressors, who were urban blacks from his city, and the victim knew beforehand that these men were sexually attracted to him. The victim took no extraordinary measures to protect himself because he believed that the institution could protect him at all times.

Victims of sexual assault are invariably targets of aggressive sexual approaches before they are assaulted. Generally, however, they do not tell staff about these approaches nor do they take any other extraordinary means to protect themselves. They feel a part of the prison subculture or are afraid of retaliation, and they keep their problems to themselves. They also tend to feel that

the situation is one they can manage themselves. After all, many inmates are targets but very few become victims. The probability of any target becoming a victim is thus relatively low. Just as some men over-react, believing they will be victims of rape after they become targets of aggressors, others under-react when they are approached. It is thus true that targets receive warnings before they became rape victims. The problem they have is to assess the significance of cues, and to estimate their own capabilities:

AU-4: I thought to myself just like what every other inmate thinks. I can handle one or two of them if they want to fuck around with me that much. I can handle one or two of them, you know. But then it come down to six and then I didn't know what to do.

Inadequate classification is always at issue. In one incident, a 16 year old defendant was placed with adult sentenced prisoners in a large county jail.

The victim complains that:

C2-22: They just stick guys in where they had an opening. Like, say, you just come in, and you didn't have time at all and you are supposed to go on the east side. The west side is for the sentenced guys. I was not sentenced at the time. They put me on the west side and stuck me in the kitchen.

A prison or jail security system may tax the patience of both staff and inmates. Routines established by security-minded administrators may appear petty inconveniences to those who must carry them out. For example, inmates are supposed

to keep their doors closed at all times. But in some prisons this rule is regularly relaxed to permit a more comfortable atmosphere. An officer faced with a peaceful tier may no longer see sense in warding off the exceptional event the security measure is designed to prevent. The rareness of sexual assault is itself an ingredient in the inevitable entropy overtaking well planned security systems. The difference between custodial theory and practice explains why some sexual assaults can take place.

Once a victim is trapped with no officer around, the most important circumstance allowing the rape is the amount of force or threat of force leveled at the victim by the aggressors. If the setting allows extreme violence to be employed, any man is easily overwhelmed. All rapes in our study were thus carried out by groups of aggressors, often aided by associates who held men down but didn't actually assault them:

C2-22: I took a shower that night and all of a sudden I came out of the shower and there was two dudes standing there. And they told me, "Look, Man, I have got a knife and we want to see what you have got."

I told them, "Look, I ain't got nothing. I ain't got no candy or cigarettes or nothing like that." I said, "What do you want?" That was the first time I had ever been into a place like that. All of a sudden two of them came in my room and jumped me and this one guy was watching for the officer because they make a watch check every half hour. They told me, "If you call the C.O. we will kill you." And like this man had a spoon sharpened.

* * * * *

ARE-1: I was working and then I got hit in the back of the head. And then 5 or 6 guys are holding me down and it didn't take but say 60 seconds from the time that I was hit on the head until the time that I was on the floor. There was three of them that did it but the rest were their friends. You can say that it was rough. Scared, sure you were scared, But it's the realization that there is nothing that you can do about it. You can stand there and fight and fight, but within five minutes they're going to have it. And there is just so much that you can do. There is nothing that you can do about it. And you can throw a few punches and if you're caught totally by surprise then you're through before you start. The numbers alone were enough to defeat me, the surprise, though, didn't help much either.

Immediate Reactions

Physical reactions are generally experienced directly after the event. Along with pain from the rape itself, secondary medical ailments may cause both discomfort and uneasiness:

AU-9: I felt like vomiting - just vomiting - that is all. Like, my insides were destroyed and there was a great deal of pain.

I: So you were in a great deal of physical pain also?

AU-9: Exactly. Well, outside of when having bowel movements I passed blood, and I continually had something like diarrhea and I was taking kaopectate to settle down the diarrhea but it was still painful.

Worried about physical damage, victims may feel a compelling need for medical help, a need which forces them into sharing their problem with staff. As one victim tells us, some men are reluctant to ask for aid but their physical condition forces them to:

AU-4: Well, for one I was in all kinds of discomfort. My ass was bleeding and everything. And I was thinking, "I should go to the doctor." And then I said, "No, I can't." And then I said, "I guess I should because it could get infected and I could get all sick and everything." And what happened, I did get sick. I got real sick. I couldn't even walk hardly. So, I told the lieutenant about it.

The emotional impact, even relatively close to the event, is tied to concern about social stigma.

C2-16: I was upset. Shame. The whole thing was shame. The whole thing.

* * * * *

C2-22: I was hurting. I mean physically and mentally. Well, then, if the man did this here to me everybody in this institution is going to know about it. I can't walk around and face these people, you know, with this here going on. So I just like closed myself off from everybody else.

Like other targets, victims of rape experience a personal crisis. But the crisis following rape differs from crises following other target incidents

because rape victims are harder pressed to deal with the social meaning of their victimization. Some victims feel that the rape has socially slaughtered them, that they will now be scorned because they will no longer be seen as men. Turned inward, the belief causes victims to despise themselves. Viewing themselves as pariahs, as objects of scorn by their own as well as other's standards, the crises these men go through includes not only fear but self-hate and doubt about future social and self-acceptability:

ARE-1: If I lost again in a situation like that I would step down and hang up. I don't have enough desire to live with myself with another incident like that. I can't and I won't.

* * * * *

C2-22: I said, "When I get back out on the streets, Man, I am not going to be able to face nobody." So I thought about committing suicide. And so I went down to the shower and took a rope and tied it up and put it around my neck and I was going to jump off.

While there is no evidence that homosexual rape actually causes change of sexual identity, victims are concerned that others will think of them as homosexual. This can cause the victims to assume they will attract more attackers because they see undefended homosexuals fair game in prison. Similar to other targets, the victims' crises can be increased by fear that they will be victims again. A composite crisis can follow which includes concern about the psychological implications of one's experience:

AU-9: I was thinking, "Wow, my parents." I couldn't even call them but once a month, I just didn't have time to explain anything

to them and I just kept saying, - "Look, Mom and Dad - I don't think I will ever be able to come back home." That was the only thought that was in my mind, I may die in here.

I despised everyone that I seen. Even those that come up and asked me what happened and, "What can we do?" I told them to go to hell and to drop dead. And the only thing I though about was hiding and destroying myself. Like this was the crossing of the bridge, whereas, Wow - I am on this side of the fence now. And I am in a world all by myself. I don't want to be like those other people, swishing and walking up and down the galleries, not knowing what is going to happen to me. Now I am in this prison and the word is going to go around and it is going to happen again and again and again.

In recovering from rape, men follow strategies congruent with the meaning the event has for them. For example, to the extent that the victims see the rape as an event fixing them into a public role - that of a weak sissy - part of recovery may be to reject that role by putting on an exaggerated tough guy front. This is how an associate describes a victim after a rape:

C2-28: He was trying to make himself act like more of a man than what he was before. To me, like, he was alright before, when he talked to me and everything. But then after the rape he tried to act like, well, "I am bigger than you are," and stuff like that. And he just went at it from that angle. And he just went on acting bigger than he was.

Once the initial shock is over, victims look for ways to prevent being raped again as well as ways to restore their self-image. Not surprisingly, some try to establish a fierce demeanor, both as a way of deterring future attacks and as a way of saying to themselves and to others that they are not punks or sissies. In trying to understand why they were raped, the men arrive at the answer that others did not respect them because they had no reputation for violence. As a young victim from Long Island says, "I kept thinking, what would a real man have done in a situation like that?" This sort of self-doubt can cause victims to act with violence:

AU-9: I sat down and I started to build up my reputation. This may be somewhat psychologically impaired as far as my outlook, but I truly definitely feel that if an individual has had any type of physical contact with an individual of his own nature, he makes a projection somewhat to say like - "I done it and who is next." I mean, he is prone to this fear that, God, it has happened to me and I wonder if I have this halo on me. So I started walking around cursing out at individuals and pushing on them and shit like this.

* * * * *

ARE-1: They had a code in the prison on the chow line that said no man should cut ahead of you in the chow line. And this man passed me a couple of times in the line and he knew that I was aware of what he was doing. If I failed to do what I was supposed

to do here, then I was lost again. So the next day, when they come through the chow line, when this guy cut in front of me, I hit him in the head with a tray as hard as I could. And when he went to the ground I hit him several more times before the guard could reach me. It is regretable, but it is the only way that you can handle it. And I didn't want to do it, but I did what I had to do to protect myself. It was self-preservation, the first law of nature. I had to do it.

I would fall prey to anyone who had the strength - who thought they had the strength to defeat me. And if I hadn't done something there to boast my own mental morale, it would have been much easier to do. I had to increase my own mental morale because I couldn't walk around the yard without fearing what would happen to me. And I had to do something. And that was approximately about a week and a half after the incident in the powerhouse [the rape].

Seeking safety, some men also prepare to fight to protect their reputation:

AU-9: The word had got around what had happened, so the individual who had befriended me, says, "Yeah. Man, they are down and the word is spread."

And I said, "So what, I am ready for them now. I can fight in here and by the time they get back they won't be so wise. I will get some razor blades together and things, you know, and the first dude that walks up to me-----".

This was the feeling that I continually had - if I am going to die, let me take one of them with me.

Prisoner rape victims alter their lifestyles as much as their behavior toward others. Like other targets, they often enter protective housing after the incident. Some occupy safe niches in the prison where they are doing time. Most of these efforts are successful in stopping subsequent victimization. Victims are victims once. The safety conscious circumscribed manner in which they live after being attacked prevent repeated attacks. And in no case in our sample did the reactions of victims extend to their becoming homosexual partners of aggressors or other men.

Long-Range Effects

Victims continue to be affected months after the event. Flashbacks of the incident may cause crying spells. Nausea may occur sporadically. Victims report being generally bothered by memories of their rape. Some seek psychiatric aid in attempts to cope with what they initially perceive as a new identity. Others find it difficult to perform as they are expected to:

AU-4: That has been fucking with me. That fucked me for about two months. Every time I get a little thought about it - about that knife coming up in the air or something-it is like a flashback. I think of that knife up to my throat and stuff and I get in my cell and will be thinking about it sometimes and I will start crying.

I was actually sick. I was sick to my stomach all the time because of what happened. I started thinking about it and I would get nauseated. I would feel like I had to puke up but I never puked

up. I think about it at night in my cell here. Yeah, tears come to my eyes and stuff like that but I don't talk about it to nobody, and I don't say nothing to nobody about it.

* * * * *

C2-22: It has fucked my head up quite a bit. I still got it in my head now: I will be down and reading a book in my room and this will go through my mind and it will blow my mind apart. I will say, "Damn, I have to start thinking about this fucking shit again." I want to forget it and say past is past.

Managing stigma - or potential stigma - is a long range concern of male rape victims. These men worry a great deal about what will happen if others find out what they have experienced:

C2-22: I got a girl out there with a kid and, like, I don't tell her nothing. She don't even know that this happened. Like I said before, I was embarrassed. If I ever told her what happened, I don't know what would go through her mind....You see, because, if I tell her, I am afraid that she is just going to pack up and leave and take the kid and go on their way. If I keep it hidden with her then things might be better off.

* * * * *

AU-4: I was thinking, "What if guys come down here from Elmira and see me down here and start saying that I am a homo?" I couldn't go for that. I was thinking, "What if I go back out in the streets?"

Because I told my father about it - I told my father what happened.

I was thinking, "If I go back out on the street, will my father accept what has happened to me?"

The victim of a prison sexual assault finds it difficult to re-integrate himself into prison society. Other inmates (and staff) may misunderstand the event and assume the victim of a sexual assault, "gave it up" willingly. Being labeled a homosexual is a dismaying condition for most young working class men. Victims may worry about having a future and may contemplate suicide as they see themselves facing scorn wherever they go. Socially dislocating incidents (secondary victimization) may occur in the months following the assault. The victim may over-react to perceived approaches, and may precipitate fights to stop what he views as another assault in progress. Victims may also fight with men who taunt them. If they have sought staff aid they may feel that others will assume that the victim has told authorities the names of his aggressors, so that the victim will not only be viewed a "punk" and a "pussy" but also a "rat."

AU-9: I go inside to sick call and he sits over across from me and says, "Hello, Miss Brown." I didn't do nothing. I go and ignore him. I had a book with me and I was reading.

He pushes my book down and I says, "What is your bag, man?" and he says, "I heard about you, you are sweet, real good." And I looked at him like he wasn't even fucking talking to me and he

said, "Are you trying to boof me out. I know you are a homo."

And I said, "Look, Man." And then I got up and I hit him and I knocked him down.

And the officer runs over and he says, "What is the matter?"

And I said, "This punk tried right here and I am going to bust his jaw."

And the guy says, "You are a fag, you are a fag."

And the officer is sitting here and he says, "Look, Brown, you got to stay out of trouble - this is about your fifth fight."

"I don't want these punks harassing me," I told him.

* * * * *

AU-4: This guy comes up to me while I was in Albion. He was one of the guys that was in on it. They shipped him down there with me, and I didn't know that it was him because I couldn't identify all the guys. I identified three of them. And he says to me, "Man, you did that for us and you did it for nothing, Man - you is a homo."

And I go to him, "Hey, man, stay away from me because if you don't I am going to drop a dime on you and get you shipped out of here."

And he said, "Man, you can't do that - you ain't got enough heart."

And I said, "Oh, yeah." And I walked right over to the

administration building and told them about it, about him being down there, so they sent me to camp, to Camp Monterey. That added to it, thinking that he might spread something around, a wire around in that institution, and he did. He talked to two guys, and he told them about it. Those guys started to give me problems too. They say all kinds of things. Like when I walked by: "Hey, you homo...He's a homo," asking questions like that. He says, "Are you a homo?", all sorts of shit, so that was added to it.

The interviews fail to show long term permanent effects of the experience on victims with the exception of some men testifying that they became more violent as a result of the experience. At first, victims worry about their sexual identity, as time goes on, however, they learn that sexual assault does not alter one's commitment to heterosexuality. It appears that eventually the trauma of the event wears thin. Men report being bothered by thoughts of the incident for months and years afterward but they are able to cope with this memory, which is not disabling. Eventually, even while the victims are still in prison, they restore order to their social lives. The crisis following sexual assault declines sharply with time and is most acute at the time of the event. The psychic recovery of the victim is essentially complete after a period of months:

C2-16: It was upsetting and everything but, like, the way I look at it, in jail anything can happen. I have seen guys really hurt

in jail so I figure it is not anything to be ashamed of. I have accepted jail as an abnormal atmosphere where they have guys in here that have murdered people and have carved and chopped people.

I figure that the worst thing is if you are cut because if you are cut you have to wear that for life. This is something that is cruel and unfortunate, but I can put it out of my head. It is not a physical thing that you have to wear for life.

* * * * *

AU-4: I started looking at these people like these guys are going to help. I started talking to them more and more and more. And I come out of the nutshell that I was in. I am trying to keep it off my mind and I am trying to have fun and be happy with people and be nice to people and that way I have kept it off my mind.

If we can detect long-range effect of prison rape in our interviews, it is that the experience of being a victim trains men to raise the level of violence they have been accustomed to employing. In this regard, the effect of being a victim is similar to the effect of being a sexual target. While our study does not establish the extent of this effect of prison on men, we have statements like the following which show clear instances of victimization leading to lower thresholds for violent behavior and explosiveness:

ARE-1: I would walk around a corner and I would wonder if something was going on. If the corner was over here then I was over there and making sure that nobody was behind me. And I constantly carried a weapon and I got into fights. But they didn't try it anymore because they knew that I was carrying a weapon. And I had a sadistic attitude at the time and I didn't care anymore. When you don't care it don't matter how many people that you chop, you just try to get as many as you can, if they come at you. And this is the only way to solve something like this. But it hurt me just as much to have the attitude that I had as to have the attitude of weakness. So, even the attitude that "I'm going to kill this dude when he comes up to me," that doesn't help at all. Because when I got out in society I had the same attitude and it took me years to get over that attitude.

Even though I defeated fear with hate, I destroyed myself. When I came out of the penitentiary, it was sickening. If somebody would say hello to me and they would say it in the wrong frame of voice, it was - it was terrible. I knew why I was doing it and I couldn't stop it. You can control hate and you can control fear, but if you come to the point where it controls you, then either way you're losing.

When I first came out of prison, I lost a job because of something that I said to the boss. The boss said something that I didn't

like, so right away, without even thinking about it, I told him, "Hey, look, if you want to square off then let's go out and get some wood and square off. But leave me alone otherwise." And that is bad when you come out and you can't control yourself. It's no good. That is bad as having a fear of the penitentiary. I lost control of myself.

CHAPTER NINE: EXPLAINING SEXUAL AGGRESSION

In this chapter we provide a demographic profile of prison aggressors, and present a typology of aggressor approaches using targets' descriptions of incidents. We describe the aggressors' mode of operations, inferring some values supporting it, and illustrating some needs aggressors tell us sex aggression satisfies. Our data sources here are less rich and less complete than the material we have presented on the target experience, and our conclusions are probably less well documented. Aggressors are hard to find, and are harder to talk to. In light of these difficulties, we relay the best picture of aggressors we can without wandering into directions for which we have no data to guide us.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

Few theories that explain male sex aggression against women have been thoroughly tested. Some imaginative interpretations either remain unverified or have only been tested with special clinical samples. The main problem in this area has been that most men are unlikely to discuss feelings and thoughts about illegal, immoral, and perverse acts. We, too, ran into the obstacle of informant reticence: it prevented us from systematically evaluating plausible-sounding psychiatric hypotheses. Because of this problem, we limited ourselves to testing hypotheses that could be tested using background variables from the institutional files. Our literature review (Chapter Two) indicates that the subcultural interpretation (Amir's thesis) adapts to this purpose. Our major research question,

therefore, is: Do the background characteristics of sexual aggressors support the subcultural interpretation of sexual aggression?

Amir presents statistics showing the similarity of rapists to other violent offenders, and goes on to apply to the issue of sex aggression the general explanation for violence laid out by Wolfgang and Ferracuti in The Subculture of Violence: The subculture is presumed to carry values and traditions supporting aggression, norms opposing non-violence. Norm-adoption is the psychological process linking the background variables (proving subcultural membership) to the aggressive activity they are correlated with.

One of the primary psychological motives thought to direct subcultural members toward aggression is "compulsive masculinity." Lacking male identity figures in the home, and access to economic or educational indices of status, some lower class males turn to outward toughness to prove their maleness to themselves and others. Jackson Toby lists "testable predictors" of the compulsive masculinity hypothesis:

1. Boys who grow up in households headed by women are more likely to be violent than boys who grow up in households headed by a man.
2. Boys who grow up in households where it is difficult to identify with the father figure are more likely to be violent.
3. Masculine ideals emphasize physical roughness and toughness in those populations where symbolic masculine power is difficult to understand.

2

4. Aggressors come from low socio-economic groups.

To Toby's predictors, we can add the variables Amir discusses in linking the cause of rape to the subculture of violence thesis:

1. aggressors would be young;
2. aggressors would come from the same areas producing violent offenders,
3. aggressors would have a history of crimes of force against persons; and
4. aggressors would be black, since most of Philadelphia's violent offenders are black and lower-class, black culture is the main carrier of the subculture of violence in the Northeast.
3

The presence of the above factors (Toby's and Amir's predictors) would lead us toward accepting the subcultural interpretation. In addition to testing that major hypothesis, however, we can also test several minor hypotheses with tabulated background variables:

1. A finding of the Philadelphia report was that aggressors in that city's prison system were, on the average, heavier than victims. In our study we can see if physical size makes a difference.
2. According to Irwin, aggressors are formerly institutionalized boys. Reformatory experience has "stamped" their sexual behavior. Kinsey has a similar view, along with Ward. If training school experience does lead to subsequent adult sex aggression, we would expect to find aggressors disproportionately having records of juvenile commitments.
4

3. A popular notion sees aggressors as long-timers, "hardened convicts" who have spent years in adult prisons. If this is so, we would expect to find aggressors with more prior adult commitments and longer sentences than other prisoners.

METHOD

As we mentioned in Chapter One, we found 45 aggressors by taking documented cases coming our way (availability sampling). We can call 28 of these men "sexual pressurers." In approaching their targets, these men use threats or force but no sexual assault takes place. Security provision may deter them, the actions of targets may discourage them, or they may have no intentions of completing rapes. We call 17 men "sexual assaulters." They have been convicted of sodomizing fellow prisoners, were caught by officials, turned in by victims and had clearly raped other men.

In Tables 9.1a and 9.1b characteristics of sex pressurers and assaulters are presented. The data are useful in portraying the modal or typical characteristics of each group, and in determining whether the two groups may be merged to facilitate analysis. In general, there is a close similarity on most characteristics, covering the range from personal characteristics

Table 9.1: Selected Characteristics of Sex Assailters and Pressures:

Mean Values

<u>Mean Values</u>	<u>Sex Pressures</u>	<u>Sex Assailters</u>
	<u>Mean (N)</u>	<u>Mean (N)</u>
Height	70 (28)	69 (17)
Weight	163 (28)	160 (17)
Age	23 (28)	23 (17)
I.Q.	91 (28)	91 (16)
No. of Juvenile Convictions		
Maximum Sentence (Months)	73 (24)	83 (17)
No. of Disciplinary Infractions	13 (20)	11 (16)
Infractions for Violence	2.9 (21)	1.9 (14)

Table 9. Selected Characteristics of Sex Assailters and Pressures:
Percentage Incidence

	Sex Pressurers*	Sex Assailters*
Ethnicity		
White	18%	6
Black	79	76
Latin	3	18
Marital Status		
Single or divorced	96%	95
Married or Consensual Union	4	5
Family Background (Origin)		
Intact Family	25%	12
Broken Family	75	88
Women Head of Household (origin)		
Yes	63%	82
No	37	18
Hometown Population		
Over 50,000	82%	70
Under 50,000	18	29
Commitment County		
New York City	68%	65
Other Counties	32	35

*For most characteristics, N=28 for Sex Pressurers and 17 for Assailters.

Table 9.2 (con't.)

	Sex Pressurers ⁿ	Sex Assailters [#]
Juvenile Commitment		
Yes	50%	59
No	50	41
Prior Adult Commitment		
Yes	43%	71
No	57	29
Reason for Commitment		
Rape and other sex offense	14%	41
Robbery	54	35
Burglary	14	12
Homicide	7	6
Assault	7	6
Forgery	4	0
Force Used with Commitment Offense		
Yes	86%	94
No	14	6
Suicide Attempt		
Yes	18%	18
No	82	82
Life Sentence		
Yes	8%	0
No	92	100

such as age, height, weight, and I.Q., social characteristics such as race, area of residence, and marital status, and some prison behavior , such as number of disciplinary infractions. A few differences emerge which should be noted with caution because of the small number of cases involved:

1. The pressurer group shows an average of one third more violent infractions than the assaulter group. Sampling bias is at work here since we found many pressurers through disciplinary records, and they had been written up for fighting with targets.
2. A much higher percentage of assaulters had served prior adult commitments than had pressurers. In part, this, too, reflects sampling bias since five assaulters were identified by convictions for first degree sodomy committed

while they were serving a sentence in a local jail. However, to a degree, assaulters do lean toward patterned recidivism slightly more than pressurers.

3. The family background of assaulters supports the compulsive masculinity hypothesis more than does the family background of pressurers. Eighty two percent of the assaulters came from homes headed by women and 88 percent came from broken families. Pressurers, while still tending to come from broken families (75 percent), were less likely than assaulters to have come from a family headed by a women (63 percent as compared to 82 percent).

4. A much higher percentage of assaulters were serving time for sex offenses. The difference is one of sampling bias. since some assaulters were now serving time as a result of an assault in an institution. Comparing only percentages committing sex offenses on the street, the two groups are roughly similar.

Other differences between the two groups are slight, and are possibly the result of chance. Pressurers are somewhat heavier than assaulters, have slightly more disciplinary infractions, are somewhat more likely to come from New York City. Assaulters, on the other hand, have slightly longer sentences, are more likely to have juvenile commitments, and have used more force with their crimes. Since these differences are small, the groups can be safely pooled, though the following variables require interpretation with differences in mind: "violent disciplinary infractions," "prior adult commitment," "family background." and "sex offenses."

The pooled data from the two samples are compared to a random group of inmates selected by procedures described in Chapter Four. This method, while superior to looking at aggressor characteristics alone, results in some problems of analysis. For one thing, there may be

aggressors in the random group. Although we removed two randomly selected men who had been written up for sex pressuring, others may still remain. For another thing, our major hypothesis for sex aggression is also an explanation for violent crime. To the extent that men in the comparison group have been convicted of violent offenses, we would expect them to share the characteristics of aggressors. We err, thus, in only looking at the differences between the two groups. The absolute characteristics of aggressors, standing alone, can themselves confirm the subcultural hypotheses.

Can this strategy lead to a conclusion that the majority of prisoners (i.e., those possessing the characteristics satisfying the subculture of violence thesis) are actual or potential sex aggressors? It can, and this is a weakness in the approach. It only helps us to discuss necessary - not sufficient - conditions that may produce a sex aggressor. Using background variables, we can discuss the likelihood of an aggressor coming from a certain culture, but we cannot talk about why some members of that culture are aggressors and others are not.

Findings: Background Characteristics and Research Hypotheses

Physical Size

The physical size of aggressors and inmates in the comparison group differs only slightly, (Table 9.2). Aggressors have about the same height and weight as other prisoners. They are distinguished from others by social and psychological factors - not physical factors.

Table 9.2 PHYSICAL SIZE OF AGGRESSOR GROUP COMPARED TO RANDOM NON-AGGRESSOR GROUP

	Mean Weight	Mean Weight
Aggressor (N=45)	162 lbs.	70 inches
Comparison (N=86)	160 lbs.	69 inches
$F_r =$.09 ^a	2.43 ^b
df =	129	129

^aNot significant.^bNot significant.

Age

The average age of aggressors is less than that of the comparison group (Table 9.3). This statistically significant difference supports the subcultural interpretation. Aggressors are in the same age range as most violent offenders; like heterosexual rapists, the prison sex aggressor tends to be young. Wolfgang suggests that "physically aggressive behavior for this group [young man] converges with notions about the masculine ideal."⁵ Encouraged by culture norms, younger men are pressed by peer group processes, such as in gangs. They are unrestrained by commitments to educational or vocational goals.⁶ Age specific, most aggressors probably mature out of their behavior by their mid twenties.⁷ Among the factors related to their developmental stage is probably the fact that youth is a time of heightened sexual interest.⁸

Ethnicity

Our findings with respect to ethnicity support the subcultural hypothesis (Table 9.4). Aggressors tend to be black far out of proportion to the representation of blacks in the prison population. While about 50 percent of the populations of these prisons are black, 78 percent of aggressors are black. Latins as well as whites are under-represented among aggressors. This finding allows us to parallel our interpretation to Amir's, for he, too, found blacks over-represented in the rapist category. According to the subcultural view, lower-class black culture carries norms relevant to violent behavior. Members of the subculture are segregated and pushed into ghettos, where they learn norms and traditions primarily from other subculture members. "Differential association" works to maintain the culture's values more than among the white lower class: lower-class black culture is thus less watered down by white middle-class influences. The

Table 9.3: AGE ON DECEMBER 31, 1975 OF AGGRESSOR GROUP - COMPARED TO RANDOM
NON-AGGRESSOR GROUP

		Mean Age in Years
Aggressor (N=45)		22.73 years
Comparison (N=86)		27.17 years
F ^a		8.60 ^a
df ^a		129

^aSignificant at .01

Table 9.4: Ethnicity of Aggressors, Comparison Group and Total Population of Attica and Coxsackie

	Ethnicity				Total
	Black	White	Latin		
Aggressors (N=45) ^a	78%	13%	9%		100%
Comparison group (N=86)	50%	36%	14%		100%
Total population (N=1877)	51%	38%	11%		100%

^aChi square between aggressors and comparison group is significant at $p < .01$.

theory denies any "genetic specificity" or "biological proclivity" tending toward violence. Rather, it views aggression as an outcome of "learned responses and social conditions contributing to criminality."⁹

Cool, hard, and hip white and Latin prison sex aggressors resemble young ghetto blacks. In the way they walk, in the way they talk, in the way they fix their eyes and set their facial muscles, white and Latin sex aggressors demonstrate that they share the subcultural norms of their black counterparts. They have learned their mannerisms living in similar neighborhoods, or in training schools. Unlike other inmates of their race, they have run with black cliques. They are often intimate associates of blacks they have met in training schools or reformatories. Prison sexual aggression does not come from a black subculture; rather, it comes from a unique lower-class, black-dominated subculture. When whites and Latins are sufficiently close to the subculture, they can become members of it.

Geographical Origins

Data on commitment county and hometown population support the subcultural interpretation (Tables 9.5 and 9.6).

While a third of the aggressors come from areas other than New York City, most of these communities like New York, have concentrations of lower-class black culture. Most small cities that aggressors come from are strung along the Hudson; they are places like Newburg and Kingston. It is not large urban centers which produce aggressors, but the fact that members of the subculture of violence live there. If members of the

CONTINUED

3 OF 5

Table 9.5: Commitment County of Aggressors, Comparison Group, and Total Population of Attica and Coxsackie

	New York City	Other Counties	Total
Aggressors (N=45)	67%	33%	100%
Comparison Group (N=86)	49%	51%	100%
Total Population	42%	58%	100%

Table 9.6 : Hometown Populations of Aggressors and Comparison Group
(in thousands)

	<u>Less than 10</u>	<u>10-50</u>	<u>50-500</u>	<u>More than 500</u>	<u>Total</u>
	(and outlying suburbs)				
Aggressors (N=45) ^a	7%	16%	11%	67%	101%
Comparison Group (N=86)	14%	5%	27%	53%	99%

^a Chi square between aggressors and comparison group is significant at $p < .05$.

subculture live in a smaller city, say, Kingston, aggressors come from Kingston. The values and attitudes leading to prison sexual aggression reside where the subculture resides.

Record of Violent Behavior

Aggressor uses of force in the past supports the hypothesis (Tables 9.7 and 9.8), but the issue is clouded by the fact that the random group also exhibits considerable evidence of past violent behavior. We find almost the same percentages of force accompanying the commitment offenses and prior convictions in the aggressor group as in the random group. Among the variables we have listed for violent behavior, the only significant difference occurs in the record of violent disciplinary infractions (Table 9.9): aggressors have accumulated an average of five times more "tickets" for fighting than did the comparison group. (While pressurers fought more in prison than did assaulters, assaulters still fought far more than men in the random group). The prevalence of force used against persons among aggressors' crimes places them squarely in the subculture of violence. Compared to the random group, however, they are distinguished only by prison disciplinary infractions; but the difference on this variable is quite large. Prison behavior may be an indication that aggressors have more violent dispositions than other prisoners, even other violent offenders.

The street crimes of aggressors parallel their sexual behavior in prison. We detect patterns of continuity, leading us to see the exploitation of weak practitioners as part of an overall pattern of predatory violence. As we see by Table 9.10, more aggressors have been convicted of robbery than of any other

TABLE 9.7 . FORCE OR THREAT ACCOMPANYING COMMITMENT OFFENSE OF AGGRESSORS,
COMPARISON GROUP, AND TOTAL POPULATION OF ATTICA AND COXSACKIE.

	Force or Threat used with Crime	No Force or Threat with crime	Total
Aggressors (N=45)	84%	16%	100%
Comparison Group (N=83)	77%	23%	100%
Total Population of Attica and Coxsackie (N=1136)	73%	27%	100%

Table 9.8. Force or threat of force used in prior conviction offenses by aggressors and members of the comparison group.

	<u>Force or Threat</u>	<u>No Force or Threat</u>	<u>Total</u>
Aggressors (N=29)	69%	31%	100%
Comparison Group (N=67)	62%	38%	100%

Table 9.7 DISCIPLINARY INFRACTIONS OF AGGRESSOR GROUP COMPARED TO RANDOM NON-AGGRESSOR GROUP

	Mean Number of Disciplinary Infractions	Mean Number of Violent Disciplinary Infractions
Aggressor	12.97 (N=36)	2.49 (N=35)
Comparison	5.48 (N=79)	.54 (N=80)
F _{1,83}	12.75 ^a	54.21 ^b
df _{1,83}	113	113

^aSignificant at .01

^bSignificant at .01

Table 9. 10. Commitment Offenses of Aggressors and Comparison Group

Reason for Commitment	Aggressors		Comparison Group	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Robbery	21	47%	33	38%
Rape and Forcible Sodomy	11	24%	8	9%
Burglary	6	13%	11	13%
Homicide	3	7%	13	15%
Assault	3	7%	4	6%
Forgery	1	2%	0	0%
Drugs	0	0%	7	8%
Non-violent sex offense	0	0%	6	7%
Other	0	0%	4	4%
Total	145	100%	86	100%

Chi square between aggressors and comparison group significant at $p < .05$.

offense. While these robberies are vicious, they are juvenile in intent and in execution. They are the petty preying behavior of unsophisticated youths, taking advantage of the opportunities and vulnerabilities around them. They are simple, direct crimes calling for little skill, and generally occur in or near the areas where the offenders live. The robberies are serious because force is used but the potential gains seem pitifully small. Similar to the sexual incidents we have examined where aggressors use physical force or threats, the usual pattern of these robberies is for an aggressor to attempt to gain what he wants by causing the victim to fear for his safety or even for his life. For example:

CA-28: Two weeks after release, robbed man at knifepoint of wristwatch, jacket, gloves, and sneakers in apartment building hallway.

CA-10: Robbed man - alleyway - armed with gun and knife.

CA-11: Robbed proprietor of newsstand - night-armed with knife.

CA-20: Robbed cab driver-taxi-parking lot-night-armed with knife.

Looking at these robberies, it . . . seems the aggressors try to begin encounter with the odds heavily in their favor. Indeed, the way some of these crimes are executed makes one wonder how they can be seen as demonstrations of "toughness" or "masculinity," as subcultural norms are presumed to interpret them. Aggressors generally chose victims far weaker than themselves, and they are frequently accompanied by accomplices. They often confront their victims with weapons. While this sort of behavior may be effective exploitation, it seems to demonstrate little daring and courage. The way aggressors select victims in the street, however, clearly parallels the way they select

weaker inmates in prison. For example:

CA-1: In 1970 he and five others robbed a woman of a pocketbook and kicked her downstairs. In 1971, accompanied by an accomplice, robbed a young boy on the subway: "stomped on his feet, ruffled his hair, and punched him about the face, fracturing his nose and causing his hospitalization."

CA-15: Snatched purses, Robbed elderly woman of pocketbook during course of burglary.

CA-9: With two accomplices, forcibly entered apartment - day - assaulted and robbed elderly female occupant. He and accomplice, at gunpoint, robbed a woman of her pocketbook.

CA-27: While on work release, stabbed and robbed woman - subway - night - with knife. Came up behind and put his hand over her mouth, Took her wallet "in a very hostile and aggressive manner."

The subcultural interpretation of sex aggression views sexual exploitation as only one part of a general pattern of violence. In order for this theory to apply to our data, we must find aggressors who have carried out acts in the past indicating violent dispositions. The crimes we have been describing meet this description and substantiate the hypothesis. Not only are the crimes generally similar to each other, but in specific details they suggest a carry over of former criminal behavior into prison life. We see this clearly, for example, in the way some aggressors chose weak victims. Prison sexual incidents

may also resemble aggressor's criminal incidents in the immediate, physical contact the aggressors have with their victims. Most of us, in the middle-class world, have inhibitions against using "natural" weapons such as teeth, arms and hands. While we may operate sophisticated weaponry, we recoil at the thought of holding knives to the throats of other men. Aggressors, on the other hand, seem to lack such inhibitions. Some robberies thus feature the same kind of direct physical force we see in the prison "gorilla" sexual approaches:

CA-19: Attempted to rob grocery store - day. Grabbed both of the proprietors about the shoulders and neck and told them to give up their money.

AA-9: Killed victim by strangulation and stole cash.

CA-33: Assaulted and robbed another student while in High School. Student was severely beaten and hospitalized as a result.

Another substantial category of aggressor commitment offenses is for rape and forcible sodomy, though this percentage is inflated by sampling error. If we remove the aggressors convicted of first degree sodomy committed while they were prisoners, we reduce the percentage of aggressors who have committed rape to 16 percent, which is about the same percentage as the proportion of rape convictions in the random sample. Such rape of women follows patterns we would expect to find among members of the subculture of violence, and has on the face of it little to do with sexual disorders. For example, the sample contains several cases of gang rape by adolescents. Amir sees this type of rape as the purest example of subcultural sex aggression: it is motivated by peer processes

as much as by individual needs. It is a reflection of a peer dominated society. Moreover, such events may be part of the cultural tradition of the group. For example:

CA-31: Gang rape of 16 year old girl - night - armed with knife.

CA-16: Accused of acting with 2 others to rape a 14 year old girl in a clubhouse at night and also assaulted and threatened complainant with a whip in an effort to compel her not to testify against them.

Burgess and Holmstrom call another type of rape committed by aggressors the "impulse rape."¹⁰ Such rape generally accompanies another crime such as burglary, where the rapists take advantage of the control they have gained over victims in the course of their crime. Impulse rapists fit best into a subcultural interpretation because this theory predicts rapists will have engaged in a wide range of activities employing violence to achieve goals. The following are examples of impulse rapists in our aggressor files:

AA-1: Entered apartment and attacked woman - night. Attempted to rape under threat of knife....choked her and caused her to fall downstairs.

AA-11: Armed with knife stole travelers checks and cash from woman and forced her to submit to sexual contact - day.

AA-14: Assaulted, robbed and raped and committed anal sodomy on woman, armed with knife.

Three aggressors in our sample were doing time for raping adult or adolescent males on the street. In prison they simply continued their pre-prison career. While these men are few in number, the crime they are convicted of is rare. We would not expect to find three such offenders in any other group of 45 inmates. The existence of the category shows that there may be some connection between male sex aggression in prison and homosexual rape in the street. These men, unlike most aggressors, are sexual deviates, though they still came from the subculture of violence. Their background enabled them to employ force in the service of their deviant sexual needs. Here is an example of such a career:

AA-7: 1962 - armed with knife stole a wristwatch and 25¢ from 14 year old.

1965 - armed with knife, forcibly engaged in acts of anal and oral sodomy with 16 year old boy.

1972 - assaulted young man with his fists and a cane, threatened him with a pistol, stole \$37, and forcibly attempted to commit an act of sexual intercourse.

1973 - beat boy, 13 years of age, demanded he remove his clothing, and attempted to perpetrate an act of deviant sexual intercourse on him.

Social and Economic Class

Data on education and occupation are summarized (Tables 9.11 and 9.12).

Looking at the table on education, we see that only a small number of aggressors finished high school, and 37 percent only went as far as the eighth grade.

TABLE 9.11 . Pre-Prison Education OF AGGRESSORS, COMPARISON GROUP AND TOTAL POPULATIONS
OF ATTICA AND COXSACKIE.

	High School Graduate or Higher	Some High School	Elementary Only	Special Classes	Total
Aggressors (N=43)	5%	58%	37%	0	100%
Comparison Group (N=82)	16%	52%	30%	1%	99%
Total Populations of					
Attica and Coxsackie(N= 1900)	22%	47%	30%	1%	100%

Table 9.12: Pre-Prison Occupation of Aggressors and Comparison Group ^a

	Clerical, Skilled, and Semi-skilled	Laborers	No Occupation or Student	Total
Aggressors (N=44)	14%	5%	82%	100%
Comparison group (N=82)	27%	21%	52%	100%

^aChi square significant at $p < .05$.

Our aggressors' failure at education places them in a position meeting the requirements of the subcultural hypothesis, which calls for violent men to lack "legitimate" or "symbolic" expressions of masculinity. However, since low educational levels are more generally associated with offenders, aggressors differ only slightly from the comparison group. Aggressors are part of a population of men with low educational levels; failure at school may help to explain their behavior but the factor must be seen operating along with other variables.

The table on occupation does show significant differences between the aggressor and comparison group. Most aggressors are in the "no occupation or student" category. As in Amir's study, most of our aggressors depended on their families for support. They are young and jobless, have no work experience, get by on petty thievery or meager handouts from welfare mothers, and thus share social and economic conditions that are common to most violent offenders in our society.

Family Background

The data on family background support the subcultural hypothesis (Tables 9.13 and 9.14). Most aggressors came from broken families and from families headed by women, as predicted by the compulsive masculinity hypothesis. A higher percentage of aggressors than of men in the comparison group come from broken families and from families headed by women. As we explained earlier, however, the sex assaulters and sex pressurers differed on this variable. Pressurers were closer in family background to the comparison group while assaulters fall in the direction predicted by the hypothesis. Almost no assaulters come from intact homes or homes with a consistent father figure. We cannot make much of these differences, however, because our sample sizes are too small.

TABLE 9.13. FAMILY BACKGROUND OF AGGRESSORS AND COMPARISON GROUP.

	Broken Family During Childhood	Intact Family During Childhood	Total
Aggressors (N=45)	80%	20%	100%
Assailters (N=19)	88%	12%	100%
Pressurers (N=28)	75%	25%	100%
Comparison Group (N=79)	66%	34%	100%

Chi square between aggressors and comparison group not significant, Phi = .16.

Table 9.14: Family Structure of Aggressors and Comparison Group

	Woman head of household <u>during part of childhood</u>	Father figure present in home during entire childhood	Total
Aggressors (N=44)	71%	29%	100%
Comparison Group (N=85)	61%	39%	100%

Prior Commitments and Length of Sentence

Institutional history and sentence length may not bear on the subcultural hypothesis, but they relate to other explanations for sex aggression. Irwin, for example, calls aggressors "state raised youths." These are youths who have spent periods of adolescence in reform schools, where their sexual outlook becomes aggressive and predatory, and where males become acceptable sex objects. Kinsey, Ward, and Lindner also mention the possibility of training school experience stamping the sexual values of aggressive youths. As we see by Table 9.15a, significantly more aggressors than men in the comparison group have spent time in juvenile institutions. While the few whites in our sample must make us cautious in generalizing, it is of interest to note that four out of six white aggressors experienced juvenile commitment, as compared to 20 out of 49 blacks. This finding tends to confirm our statement that whites often become socialized to the ways of aggressors in training schools, where they are in contact with subcultural peers (see Table 9.15 B). This may be slight evidence that the training schools affect future sexual behavior, but we also must take into consideration the probability of boys being sent to training schools because they are more generally aggressive than other boys.

Another explanation for aggressors in prison sees them as long-timers. Our data clearly disprove this notion. While most New York State prison sentences are "long," more aggressors are serving shorter sentences (four years or less) than inmates in the comparison group. Few aggressors serve life. (Tables 9.16 and 9.17). Because these inmates are young, because their crimes are petty (though violent), aggressors avoid types of sentences given to older, more sophisticated recidivists. About the same percentage of aggressors as men in the comparison group have served previous adult prison sentences (Table 9.18), but half of all aggressors never stepped inside an adult prison until entering it on the sentence being served while they were sexually aggressive. The "new jack" can be a "booty bandit" to the same extent as the experienced convict.

TABLE 9.15A JUVENILE COMMITMENT OF AGGRESSORS AND COMPARISON GROUP.

	Juvenile Commitment	No Juvenile Commitment	Total
Aggressors (N=45)	53%	47%	100%
Comparison Group(N=84)	29%	71%	100%

Chi square between aggressors and comparison group significant at $p < .001$.

Table 9.15B. Juvenile Commitment of Aggressor and Comparison Groups by Race

	<u>a</u> <u>White</u>	<u>b</u> <u>Black/Latin</u>		
	Juvenile Commitment	None	Juvenile Commitment	None
Aggressor	4	2	20	19
Comparison	9	21	15	39

^a
Phi = .28

^b
Phi = .24

TABLE 9.16. MAXIMUM SENTENCE IN YEARS OF AGGRESSORS , COMPARISON GROUP AND TOTAL POPULATION OF COXSACKIE AND ATTICA.

	4 or less	5-10	11-20	20 to life	Total
Aggressors (N=43)	66%	22%	7%	10%	100%
Comparison Group (N=84)	44%	29%	13%	14%	100%
Total Population (N=1550)	49%	26%	9%	16%	100%

TABLE 9.17. LIFE SENTENCE OF AGGRESSORS, COMPARISON GROUP AND TOTAL POPULATION.

	Life Sentence	No Life Sentence	Total
Aggressors (N=43)	5%	95%	100%
Comparison Group (N=86)	6%	94%	100%
Total Population of Attica and Coxsackie (N=1897)	8%	92%	100%

TABLE 4.8 . PRIOR ADULT CRIMINAL COMMITMENT (at time of data collection) OF AGGRESSORS, COMPARISON GROUP AND TOTAL POPULATION.

	Prior Adult Commitment	No Prior Adult Commitment	Total
Aggressors (N=45)	53%	47%	100%
Comparison Group (N=86)	56%	44%	100%
Total Population (N= 1897)	55%	45%	100%

Do the Background Characteristics Support the Hypotheses?

When we look at aggressors alone, without comparing them to the random group, the data support the subcultural interpretation of sexual aggression. In all variables that help to support the hypothesis, relatively high percentages exist. Our certainty weakens, however, when we compare aggressors to the random group. We find significant associations that relate to the hypotheses for age, ethnicity, hometown population, commitment county, violent disciplinary infractions, juvenile commitments, and occupation. Other variables show only slight percentage differences.

The similarity of sexual aggressors to other prisoners with violent convictions weakens the strength of our conclusions. With such reservations, however, our data help to explain aggressors' behavior by reference to their background characteristics. Young men entering prison with well-established patterns of forceful exploitation, propelled by social factors believed to govern violent behavior, sharing norms and values common to their subcultural peer group, pressure targets in prison in the same manner they have pressured others in the street. They continue cultural expressions learned in their communities.

What our analysis fails to explain is why certain prisoners with given background characteristics become aggressors. In other words, while we establish some necessary conditions for prison sexual aggressors, we can say little about sufficient conditions - factors that in all cases lead to sexual aggression. Based on the data we have presented, we have little power to predict who will become an aggressor (Unless we consider young black males with an out-of-prison record of homosexual violence, who only account for a small part of our sample). To obtain a more differential picture requires us to look more closely at aggressors' behavior and attitudes. While our interviews

do not allow us a systematic inquiry, they help us to explore this area.

Typology of Aggressor Approaches

From targets' descriptions we can derive a tentative typology of aggressor approaches, which classifies the modus operandi used by the aggressors in each incident as he approaches his victim (Table 9.19 gives the frequency of each approach).

Gorilla Approach

The category is made up of tactics that rely exclusively on force or threats. "Gorillas," also known as "booty bandits," "asshole bandits," or simply "bandits," are prisoners who pounce on other men and attempt to forcibly sodomize them. In this category, attempts to seduce or proposition are absent, although the Gorilla may take care to set his target up to trick him to go where he can be attacked:

AU-4: I went to rec and this guy says, "Hey, Man, a friend of mine wants to talk to you."

So I didn't think nothing of it. I looked around and I didn't see nobody else so I just said, "Okay.: You know, I was kind of dumb to even go for it.

So then he said, "Sneak through the door and go around. He is on the other side, waiting for you. He wants to talk to you - he has found something out for you."

I was trying to find out a way to get some smoke in. I figured I knew what he was talking about. So I got to the door and two dudes jumped out of back of the door and one of them took and put his arm around my chest and put a knife up to me - a shank -

Table 9.19: Classification of Aggressor Approaches in Incidents

<u>Approach</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Gorilla approach: force or threat only tactic	48	35%
Player approach: force or threat accompanied by verbal propositions	40	29%
Propositioning approach: verbal propositions only	48	35%
total	136	99%

a big long shank. And there was three dudes down the other end and there was a dude standing by the cell door - all black - all six of them. It was all set up. They threw me into the cell and ripped my clothes off of me and everyone of them took me off.

* * * * *

CR-28: I was cleaning the shower and this big black guy came in and grabbed me by the throat and said, "I want some of your ass, and if you don't give it to me I am going to kill you."

* * * * *

C2-43: When I was talking to a dude, a colored dude came up behind me and yanked me and got me into a hold. He took me and dragged me down to another dude's cell and the guy was reaching his hand out and feeling my ass and stuff, I couldn't move.

Player Approach

The Player approach combines force and threats with verbal tactics. Like the pimp on the street, the player prides himself on his ability to get what he wants through smooth talking, but threats or physical force always wait in the background. They stand ready to supplement the rap. In the words of a prison player:

C2-51: So you run up on the dude and say, "Well, yeah, I just heard from so and so that you gave it up on Rikers Island, Man."

"What you talking about, Man?"

"I heard you did this."

"What you think I am?"

"Come 'on, Man, come and be my kid."

He say, "No, Man."

So you make your voice softer and lower and you say, "I will make sure nobody messes with you. Nobody gonna mess with you.

Com' on, Man, dudes around here tell me you been taking dicks up your ass, Man. I will make sure nobody mess with you. You be my kid, if you need anything, sure, Man, just ask for it." And you start with that pimp line, shooting sweet melodies under his belt, "Oh, Man, you are a pretty thing."

But, like, when you go up on a person and ask him if he was a squeeze in a certain place and he tries to deny it - then you bring a tool along and you say, "Com' on, Man, if you deny it I am going to beat the shit out of you." Then you put a little fear into them.

The player strives to equal the big city pimp. He imitates an ideal type, a paradigm residing in the culture from which he derives. Just as gorillas resemble the aggressors who rob citizens in the street, the style of the player resembles the way pimps are supposed to operate. Both the gorilla and the player thus illustrate the continuity between prison sexual aggression and normative subcultural styles prevalent on the street.

Like the pimp, who works at "turning out" women into money making whores, the player spends much of his time trying to convince targets to be his "kid." Life centers around this hustle.

As we know from our study, most targets of players are straight. Yet the player's ideal mate is a prison queen. Among the aggressor peer group,

conquering a queen gives status. And trying to conquer queens, like running games on naive white targets, gives adventure and purpose to life. A black inmate from New York City describes players as follows:

CR-14: These dudes read these Iceberg Slim books and walk around and put themselves on a pedestal and say they know this and that about pimping. As far as the homosexuals go, they like to be playing and be up to no good. So all they do is talk about the jail-house bitches in the yard.

When players pursue targets who are not queens, they often put a female label on the man who interests them. In previous chapters we have seen how this approach upsets the targets themselves, who know themselves to be heterosexual. For the player to operate his game, however, he must "feminize" his object of interest. We must remember that in prison, queens are considered women, not men. As a consequence, the prisoner who dominates a queen is seen as a "man." Players live according to norms that place men who play female roles in submissive positions. One of the aims of players is to place naive new prisoners in such positions, i.e., to "turn them out." The happy conclusion, as the player sees it, is for the target to become a "girl" under his domination, a receptacle for his penis and a female companion to accentuate his masculinity.

The pimp ideal calls for success to come through virtuoso displays of intelligent and self-confident talk. In prison, however, this ideal approach often breaks down. Players are used to violence (as we see by their crimes) and fall back on force and threats when their rap gets nowhere. The player category thus includes a mixture of verbal persuasion and threats backed by physical

force. As an aggressor peer tells us:

AR-21: One guy will say, "Well, I'm a pimp on the streets, I can rap this out of this guy and I can do this and that." And he'll try to force them on the side, which doesn't require any frantic game from anybody. And once the guy gives in, then he runs back and says, "Yeah, I used all this, I was into Freud and this and that."

Propositioning Approach

About a third of the aggressors' approaches are requests for sex. No threats or use of force are present. Some of these approaches may be made by gorillas and players who fear authorities or who mean to move in later with force or threats. Other approaches, however, may aim at consensual homosexuality: men may be approached politely for sex and perceive themselves to be threatened. Aggressors are here created by target reactions. Despite this possibility, the propositioning category is still an important one, for men using this approach are often aggressively seeking a relationship where they will be men and the target will be women. The absence of blatant threats or force can still leave the approach a very threatening one:

ARE-2: He got started in the E Block. And he said that somebody had told him my name. And then, anywhere I went, he would go. And he said, "I'm just curious. I'm just watching." And he said, "If I find out that you are homosexual then I'm going to hurt you for lying." And the dude told me once, "Hey, you're not gay, right? If

I find out that you are then I'm going to kill you for not participating with me." So now he just watches me. He inquires about what I'm doing. And I tell him it's none of his business. And he sends me crazy letters.

* * * * *

C2-6: The first night that I was there two tie boys came down to my cell and said that the practice while you were in prison was to go with a homosexual, do things for other people and then other people would do things back for you. And I told him that I couldn't be part of the system. So he said, "You're in trouble now."

It is difficult to generalize about the motives and intentions of men carrying out propositioning approaches. The category contains a mixture of men and, like the other categories, classifies bits of behavior rather than people. Certainly, some men who carry out propositioning approaches are benign persons looking desperately for warmth and sexual stimulation. But even such men, when obsessed , may be traumatizing.

Group Process in Sexual Aggression

Working together in about half of all the incidents, groups of aggressors are most common in gorilla attacks and in forceful player approaches. Aggressors' friends look out for guards, set up targets, or hold down victims. Acting to please peers, caught up in the excitement of a common adventure, sexual aggressors can be explained in part by group psychology. Examining aggressors'

crimes reinforces this view, for in the street, as in prison, aggressors often carried out violent exploitation in groups.

Amir believes group rape helps to place sex aggression in the subculture of violence. In Amir's study about the same percentage of victims [43 percent] met multiple aggressors as did targets in our study [44%].

Only some prisoners, of course, join sex gangs; most avoid them. For some inmates wanting to be accepted by their group, participation in sex aggression may be required, just as in the street, drug-taking, gang-fighting, or stealing may be expected. Differential responses to group processes can help to explain why only certain men with the background characteristics required by the subcultural hypothesis become aggressors.

The plausibility of this interpretation is increased by the way prisoners in our random survey, who are members of the aggressors' culture, describe peer processes leading to sex aggression:

AR-12: And then you have got the type of dude, he don't do nothing - work every day - maybe don't participate in no sports - don't do nothing. The dude may come up to him and say, "Come on, Man, let's drink some wine."

He will say, "No, I don't drink,"

"Come on, let's smoke weed."

"I don't smoke weed."

And the next thing you know they will say, "He is a square - don't fuck with him. He is a chump. He don't come down with us."

And then you have got another type of dude that wants to be

down with everything. He wants to hang out. He wants to be the showboat. He wants to then be the pretty boy of the crowd. He wants to be everything. So he is automatically accepted. He can play any role. He can play the role of the bandit and be accepted.

* * * * *

AR-6: It is like a gang thing. If one guy sees a homie, - "Hey, so and so and so," - well, see, already he just commits himself right there because from that point on he is going to go right into that road where his friends is at.

* * * * *

AR-5: Let's say that you have a bunch of friends and they get to talking about it was good and the person that they had the sex with. And if they are constantly talking about this, you don't have anything in common if you haven't done it. So what do you do - you do it. So that you can have something to relate with.

Within the community of prisoners, gorillas and rough players live somewhat apart. They are feared by targets and scorned by ethical prisoners, but they also repel men who want to stay out of trouble. To the same degree that prison security protects weak inmates by controlling sexual aggressors, they are also protected by the fact that men are concerned about getting out, keeping good time, getting parole, and thus avoid joining aggressor cliques. Most prisoners we interviewed put down aggressors who use force, describing them as deviants and fringe members of society. It is only the immediate members of the

gorilla gangs who provide a supportive group climate for the behavior:

AR-12: The first thing you probably hear is, "Stay away from him. He is a bandit." This follows the person any place he goes. Any institution he go to there is always going to be someone that knows him from another institution, you know, and everytime you walk out in the yard or something, someone is going to point at him and say, "See, that guy there - stay away from him and watch him - he is a bandit."

Less physically abusive aggressors may be accepted by other inmates. The player who wins a target through intelligent rap may be admired for his resemblance to the successful pimp. Still other aggressors may not be seen as aggressors by anyone but their targets. These men are not put down by others because they are seen as respectable and ethical men who cope with long-term sex deprivation by seeking consensual affairs. A long-timer tells us:

AR-12: Just because you are locked up, that doesn't mean you haven't got no morals. But like the fellows in the institution, they don't frown upon it. The only way they frown upon the dude is if the dude that takes them off really rough them up. Like a young kid might come in and he just go and beat him up, and take something from him. Then everybody frowns upon that.

A Group Rape

The following narrative by a participant brings out

group themes

in sex aggression. The incident takes place on the adolescent side of an urban jail. The aggressors are urban blacks, who are convicted prisoners serving sentences. The victim is an American Indian:

AR-12: Say, like, one time, a couple of guys wanted to rip a kid off, and both of them was smaller than I was. They could see that I was down with that crowd so they just used me and they said, "Well, we are going to go into the guy's cell and you just come in there with us." ...It was just a spur of the moment thing, we was all just like children. We never really planned anything. We might be sitting around and talking. Like the idea would hit one of us and we would say it to the rest. Then everybody would go along and that is what we did...

Well, see what you have is a long gallery and now the officer sits at the end of the gallery at a desk. It is behind a wall. If he happens to have to get up and look around the gallery, he can see what is going on. But the officer, he don't care. He is an old guy and he is reading his books and paper and what not. He was at his desk, just sitting there, and me, Bill, and another friend of mine go into the empty cell - like, all the cells are open.

This is about mid-day. And Audie stands out since he is the smallest. He stands out there in front of the cell and he calls the guy. And so the guy comes down to see what he wants. This other dude and I snatch the dude right into the cell and then they start telling him to undress. He sees me there and, like, you know,

he can get scared, right? And I am not saying nothing to him, I am trying to put myself in the position, like - if he decides to go to the police and tell them what is happening, if he tells the truth, he can't say that I did anything to him, threatened him or what have you. As long as I don't say anything to him, and I don't put my hands on him... So the guy sees me there and so he starts getting scared. What they did was use my presence to get what they wanted from the kid. Getting directly involved, I don't think that I could handle 5 or 6 years for something like that...

He just undressed. I guess that he feared that he would get beat up for not having sex with another man. And so after they have sex with him they unlock the cell. He didn't tell. He just tried to stay away from everybody as much as possible. And he left and he came back and he didn't stay very long, only about two days because when he came back the second time his mother died or something and he had to go to a funeral so he went out and didn't come back....

He was only 17, right, but like he seemed to me to be a lot younger than that. He acted a lot younger than that. He was quite naive and it seemed like it might have been his first time to come into jail. And he didn't know anything about how to do this and how to do that. He was just what I call him, a kid. Not that I was that old at the time, but I matured a lot quicker than a lot

of dudes my age, and I was ahead of these dudes. I would suspect that he didn't bring it on himself - but he was more physically attractive than anyone else would appear at that time, because, like, it takes something to motivate that type of action, you know, and the way a dude looks has a lot to do with it. If you come in and you look like a girl, well, sure, they are going to want to have something to do with you.

He was a kid, but, like, he wasn't small by any means. He was mild like and he was heavy but he wasn't built strongly. He was tall and kind of heavy but you could look at him and tell that he was soft because a lot of times we would be out playing basketball and quite a few times he played with me and I told him, "Look, don't let the man just shoot the ball like that." And the guy would just run right over him - just like that - and he was just weak.

The example summarizes many of the ideas we have been discussing. Easily influenced by peers, this youth looks upon an assault as a kick, a spontaneous adventure. Similar to the phenomenon Amir found with heterosexual rapists, the group is marked by different degrees of involvement. We even see specialization, as the group members use different abilities to set the victim up and intimidate him. The victim is chosen because of his perceived weakness and his physical attractiveness. Interestingly, the informant chooses the victim's performance in a basketball game to describe attributes contributing to his perceived weakness: The victim lets other players "run right over him." The aggressors know

that the victim is an easy mark because he fails their test of masculine strength, which is assertiveness and physical aggression. In this incident, aggressors have background characteristics, group formation and a stereotypical target. The guard, on the gallery but inattentive, allows these factors to lead to a concrete event. His laxity, along with the aggressor and target characteristics, explain the rape.

Aggressor Sexuality

Male and Female Roles

Aggressors desire women. Along with some men in the random group, they tell us that after a certain period of time they begin to view certain male prisoners as desirable females. The targets, they tell us, arouse sexual desire. For example:

AR-18: Some men look feminine and looks are enough alone for a man behind these walls to attempt to try and get him. It is a hell of a thing to say, but here you are another man and you are behind these walls and before long another man begins to look like a woman to you.

* * * * *

CA-2: We have these young ones and they have still got baby skin and long hair, you know, and they resemble a woman - as close as they can get it.

The whites, among the younger generation, have got long hair, they have still got baby skin, they are soft, you know - like woman. They resemble a woman and you just start to watch.

Some of them have feminine ways. You begin to watch those with feminine ways. They don't have homosexuality within them, but still they have feminine ways. You watch them just to take your mind off women. And there ain't nothing you can do about it.

Seeing targets as female, aggressors conceive themselves to be male and heterosexual. In sexual terms, this translates into the "man" being the active partner in the relationship. A sophisticated target tells us how he confronted an aggressor by questioning this premise:

C2-15: I was sitting down at a table and playing poker with this guy. Some guy comes up to me and taps me on the shoulder and says, "I am going to fuck you in your ass."

So I just turned to him and I said, "What are you, some kind of faggot?"

He said, "Well, if I fuck you in your ass, you are the punk and you are the faggot and I am the man for being able to do it." So I asked him if he knew the meaning of a homosexual?"

He said, "No."

And so I usually have my poem book - I always carry a dictionary - and I pulled it out and I looked up homosexual and I said to him, "Read that."

He read it and he said, "That don't mean nothing."

Aggressors, along with other members of their group, view passive sexual behavior as shameful. An associate of two aggressors thus reported that he

caused his friends to desist from trying to rape another prisoner by first asking, "How would you feel if someone rolled on you and did that? You would feel very ashamed." He claims that he then pointed out to the aggressor what might happen if the authorities caught them raping, and communicated the fact to their mothers: "We don't want these people writing home and saying that you got caught in sexual acts, see, because it doesn't tell who is doing who."

By any definition relative to self-concept, the prison sexual aggressor is heterosexual. He prefers women, and places men in female roles. The folder of an inmate aggressor notes:

Counselor's Report: It was reported that Jones had been making alleged homosexual advances toward another inmate employee of the Mess Hall. Mr. Line referred Jones to the Mental Health Unit for evaluation to determine the possible need for therapy. Jones was subsequently administered an intelligence test and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory by Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith reported that although this individual's personality characteristics showed immaturity, hostility, rebelliousness, poor socialization, poor morals, poor standards and impulsiveness, that he could not be considered a homosexual.

Sex and Violence

The idea that violence is an end in itself, which is mentioned in the rape literature, has little supporting evidence in our study. Aggressors are used to getting what they want through threats and physical force, and continue these

patterns of exploitation in prison. From the limited data we have, it seems that the violence that aggressors employ in prison is either instrumental (i.e., it is used for subduing or intimidating targets) or it is situational (comes from forces in the interaction between aggressor and target). Violence for its own sake is not explicitly present, although it may be implicit. We do, of course, find aggressors using violence when victims resist. Aggressors who threaten victims may also use violence when threats do not work, or when they feel snubbed or rejected.

Sexual Deprivation

We spoke with aggressors who told us that they pursue other men because of strong sexual urges. One man, for example, who sexually assaulted a fellow prisoner two weeks before our interview, describes how it feels for him to be sexually deprived, and how that feeling (as he sees it) leads to aggressive episodes:

CA-2: Like you have so much time to think about these things, like you lay up in your cell for this certain time, for a certain amount of time you get tired of reading. And you get tired of listening to the radio so all you do is think. You think about women all the time that you are in your cell. But when you come out all you see is men. So you say, "That is just the next best thing." You are not just going to push the thoughts of women out of your head because it is impossible. You are a man and you have got to think about it - about women...It gets to the point where you say, "I have just got to stop thinking about it." It seems to bug me,

you know. You will be thinking about it and all, you know, like one thing leads to another. You get a letter from your girlfriend, and you think about all the other girls. And then it starts to build up until your head is filled with thoughts, but all you see around you is men, men, men. So you just say, I have got to get.... I am going to start messing with the homos. I am going to start messing with the queens.

Aggressors who spoke openly about their behavior sometimes expressed guilt and remorse over having been driven to such lengths. On the other hand, they saw a peremptory sex drive behind their activities, and blamed the prison and other external forces for creating the pressing problem which inevitably forced their actions:

CA-2: Everybody, is after somebody but it all boils down to the same thing: They want sex - they want sex. You get to the point that you don't care no more and you get it from them. I feel, like, it is just something crazy to be attacking another man or trying to take his manhood from him when you wouldn't want yours taken from you. You came here as a whole - you should go home as a whole. But it is just something that certain people get to the point where they can't avoid this no more. You get to a point to where you just don't care no more. How can you cope with being sexually deprived for three years, for two, for even five years at a time?

CA-19: It makes you into a sick person. It turns you into a sick person. Like, you are crazy over men - you want men. You go on the side with the men and things like this. You crave over men, and you go in your cell and you masturbate about three or four times a day. And then you look at men. It really turns you into an animal. When you go into prison, and then you go out with your people, you don't even know how to act. You even look at your mother. It really turns you into an animal. Sick. They should give you something for you to control it or something.

* * * * *

AR-5: It is being deprived and dreaming and plotting and scheming: "What I am going to do when I have the opportunity." It makes you mean, evil, and scheming. It does terrible things to you. I am so cognizant of what it has done to me. It has affected me in more ways than I can even explain. It has taken some of the humanistic qualities which I know I would have continued to possess if I had not been deprived. It has made me callous in respects.

I can stand and watch a person being sexually assaulted and it wouldn't bother me a bit because I have seen so much of it. It wouldn't be a shock. It has done certain things to me. It has made me permissive in certain ways that I know I wouldn't have. It just takes away some things. I guess it is a constant viewing of these things that just tears down the horror of seeing it for

the first time. The first time it is, "Wow, these guys are sick." You know what I am saying? After you have been in for awhile, you say, "I haven't had no sex either."

Paradoxical as it may strike us, aggressors can thus not only justify their acts but can argue that they, ultimately, are the real victims.

Chapter NINE : Footnotes

¹ Jackson Toby: "Violence and the Masculine Ideal: Some Qualitative Data." in Marvin E. Wolfgang (ed.), Patterns of Violence, The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 364 (1966), 20-22.

² Toby , 20-22.

³ See Chapter Two (Literature Review, 26-27).

⁴ John Irwin: The Felon. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Kinsey, 224. Ward, 302.

⁵ Wolfgang and Ferracuti, 258.

⁶ Ibid., 260.

⁷ Ibid., 260.

⁸ Kinsey, 307.

⁹ Wolfgang and Ferracuti, 264.

¹⁰ Burgess and Holmstrom, 32 .

¹¹ Amir, 201.

¹² Miller.

CHAPTER TEN: STAFF PERSPECTIVE

Probably no aspect of our topic is treated in the literature with more accusations and unfounded exaggerations than the role of staff. Friar and Weiss, for example, claim that:

Officials find rapists particularly useful...authorities frequently encourage prison rape and very rarely prevent it...Most prison authorities have no intention of stopping it...Can anyone deny that sexual terror is the policy of
the American prison?

Scacco maintains that sex aggression is a major concern to prisoners but that "administrators and staff treat it as non-existent." Scacco maintains that staff ignore inmate complaints, and support victim isolation by pretending that the problem does not exist.²

Work based on more thorough research paints a less accusatory portrait, but one which is still in many ways dismal. Describing how juvenile targets get "meaningless" advice from staff, Bartollas, Miller, and Dinitz talk of staff advising existing scapegoats not to "let anyone push you around."³ Bartollas, et al also note that staff sometimes blame targets for bringing victimization on them-selves by failing to fight aggressors. When boys bring the victimization problem up, reformatory staff often advise the boys to strike out in self-defense. Toch, in his study of prison breakdowns also notes organizational obstacles to effective staff intervention: traditional roles discourage officers from helping men; staff concern for custody results in neglecting subjective and psychological consequences of management.⁴

Staff Knowledge of the Problem

Staff know quite a bit about the events we discuss. If we ask whether some prison employee knew about any given incident our targets reported, we find that that knowledge was there in two out of three of the incidents.

This, of course, does not necessarily mean that any action was taken to help the target, nor does it indicate the number of incidents in which targets requested help. What it means is that at some point in almost two out of three cases a staff member found out that the incident had taken place. The number gives us an idea of the degree to which staff share at least some awareness of the victimization we discuss, however incomplete their view may be. In more than half of these cases, the prisoners reported the incident to staff. In most of the other cases, staff observed the incident or part of it. Of course, since our sample includes referrals and men from protective settings, our findings on this point lack representativeness. But if we consider the size of our sample, we can safely say that targets are frequently either observed in their problems or inform members of the staff about them.

When an incident involves violence, as about half of our incidents do, staff are especially likely to learn about the facts because they are brought out in the disciplinary process.

Some prisoners,

of course, conceal the true nature of their fights. But in 70 percent of our violent incidents, staff knew that the fight involved a sexual approach.

Staff perceptions of sexual aggression parallel some of our findings.

For example, staff have accurate stereotypes of the prisoner who is most likely to be approached for sex. A captain tells us, "any good-looking white boy will be pressured, but small, young, country boys have it the worst." Deputy superintendents, counselors, and officers have told us the same thing. Their predictive indicators include both objective and subjective indices. The following, for example, are excerpts from inmate files:

Vocational Education Report: Observed as rather meek, mild and gullible youth that could become a "target" of the hardened and aggressive inmates if not closely supervised.

* * * * *

Attica Classification Evaluation Summary: His physical makeup could create problems for him in population; he is very reserved and young looking.

* * * * *

Elmira summary: It should be noted that he looks much younger than his chronological age and does impress as one who could be easily manipulated by aggressive inmates.

* * * * *

Coxsackie Record: Very immature, naive and rural type youth. Will experience some peer pressure here.

How Staff Learn About the Problem

Some information about inmate problems flows to staff while they carry out the duties of their jobs. Officers on duty, just like policemen on the street, openly observe misbehavior. More detail is added, behind closed doors, as

custody administrators interview targets and aggressors, carrying out their duty to investigate possible crimes or disciplinary infractions.

Mental health issues often crop up when targets ask to be moved to another job, housing block, or institution. Targets may not want to share incident but information with staff / may be forced into some revelations in order to undergird the legitimacy of transfer requests: crisis requests thus may reveal crisis conditions:

Psychiatric Report: He said he is thinking quite seriously about getting a transfer because he is pressured by inmates and tired of running. He just feels that sooner or later he is going to fall victim to some man who is pursuing him.

He did state that if anyone here at Attica attempted to rape him, he would really seriously think about committing suicide. States he does not want to come to the Psychiatric Unit unless he is forced to come here.

* * * * *

C. O's Report: Started throwing his bed and furniture around... says he cannot take it any longer in B-1 div...requests to be moved to C-2.

Staff, as part of "classification," interview newly arriving men. Here, fearful prisoners, worried targets, have an opportunity to open up to staff, providing that the interviewer can draw out the information and that the inmate is willing to talk. Classification is where prisoners are tested, evaluated

and observed; it is one of the most obvious occasions for men to inform staff about their adjustment problems. In the following "Case Analysis" we see how a sensitive "classification analyst" learns about a man's problem and makes out a "program" in response to special needs related to victimization:

Case Analysis. Elmira: States that individuals currently confined at Elmira Reformatory both assaulted and sodomized him while he was at Rikers Island....does appear to be a victim of rather harrowing experience, i.e., his problem while confined at Rikers.

The writer, with the cooperation of the company officer and Service Unit at the Reformatory, checked into the matter and there is a possibility that his claims are valid. However, there is no recording of the incident available. However, it would most likely be in his best interest....that he not be transferred to Elmira Correctional Facility."

He is a rather pathetic type individual and talks to a great extent about the trauma he suffered while at Rikers Island. The most important aspect of his future adjustment would appear to be placement in a secure situation where he would be able to pursue a program....and where his experiences at Rikers Island could diminish in their influence. Therefore, what appears most important here is placing this individual in a situation where he might be able to participate in the program free from his main problem , that of fear itself.

Some staff, especially officers and work supervisors, have sufficient informal contact with prisoners to hear about some of their problems. We learned that such communication occurs especially between younger inmates and older officers who have established reputations for being fatherly.

Positions of Staff Learning About Incidents

We asked men what staff members learned about their incident. Table 10.1 summarizes the responses. We see that more officers than other types of staff members learn about incidents. The next highest frequency is made up of the officers' supervisors, custody administrators - sergeants, lieutenants, captains, and superintendents (and their deputies). Clearly, the custody division of the prison, numerically at least, is closer to the victimization problem than are other staff members.

Custodial officers have more daily contact with prisoners and it is their job to interfere in inmate disputes. As we have seen, different kinds of officially defined misbehavior often accompany the target experience. This tends to throw the problem into the lap of custody administrators, who have primary responsibility for enforcing the rules governing inmate discipline. In addition to disciplining prisoners, custody men nowadays also have the mandate to help them. Thus, through the "adjustment committee," or prison court, staff administer assistance along with punishment. For example:

Adjustment Comm. Report: Inmate admits other inmates are after him for sex and that he owes 2 cartons of ciggs. to inmates in DI. [Recommendation]: Change of program and transfer to C-2.

Table 10.1; Positions of Prison Staff Who Learn about Incidents

Staff Position	Number	Percent
Officer	53	36%
Custody Administrator (Sergeant, Lieutenant, Captain, Deputy Superintendent or Superintendent)	38	26%
Counselor	24	16%
Mental Health Staff	14	10%
Medical Staff	8	5%
Chaplain	8	5%
Teacher, Work or Recreation Supervisor)	8	5%
Total	147	103%

The line staff, who supervise prisoners directly, prepare reports for the adjustment committee. Based on their observations and their understanding of the problem, officers send (or neglect to send) information that a man is a target. This function can be seen as part of a referral system. An officer, observing a discipline problem based on sex aggression, can initiate a process that can culminate in a troubled man being helped. For example:

Misbehavior Report: Kessler was involved in a fight with Johnson. Johnson slapped Kessler in the face. The cause of this confrontation is unknown to me. However, Kessler seems to be involved in a lot of disputes in C-2. He is a weak inmate and is easily led by the stronger inmates.

* * * * *

ERC Company Officer's Report: He has the constant feeling that other inmates are always out to get him....I feel, at the transfer facility, Morrison will need guidance and counseling, and possibly close supervision.

Table 10.1 shows that a wide variety of program staff learn about the problem. Counselors and mental health professional have job duties that call for them to learn of and manage inmate difficulties. But we also find staff departing from their usual roles to become concerned about individual inmates, at least to the extent of putting others on notice that here is a man who needs special attention:

Physical Ed. Report: A very weak and timid acting individual who appears to be rather fearful of his surroundings.

* * * * *

Vocational Education Report: Mentioned he has been bothered by the usual type inmates that enjoy picking on and bulldozing this meek, defenseless type youth.

* * * * *

General Education Report: Claims blacks have threatened his life because of his resisting attempts at sexual activity. He has been unable to see himself surviving in this environment... [needs] situation that has sufficient support so that he could at least feel as non-threatened as possible.

How Staff Understand the Problem

Staff view targets in two general ways: 1) from the mental health perspective, which worries about the individual's capacity to cope and 2) from the custody perspective, which is concerned about the physical danger a man is in. We have seen examples of staff in various roles reacting to the target's psychological condition. Crisis requests and classification interviews are especially likely to bring forth the target's mental condition. Staff, observing a man's severe reactions to fear, often make a psychiatric referral, which is in itself an action indicating that the staff member sees the problem in mental health terms.

Once a psychiatrist is brought into the picture, a formal diagnosis concerning a target's reaction to the situation is generally made. In their diagnoses, psychiatrists, on learning of the target's fears, emphasize the inmate's reaction to the outward stimuli more than the stimuli itself. Consequently, the recommendations frequently include "medication," such as tranquilizers, enabling the target to cope with anxiety. The following are examples of psychiatrists' diagnoses and recommendations:

Psychiatric Report: Psychiatric episode at Elmira is, in my opinion, a dissociative reaction precipitated by the stress in incarceration. Only recently that his anxiety has subsided concerning other people hurting him.

* * * * *

Memo. Reception psychiatrist to superintendent: Most likely he seems to be a desirable person to be victimized by the other inmates. Uneasy, tense, nervous and having trouble sleeping at night...Valium 10 mg. is recommended.

* * * * *

Psychiatrist to superintendent: [Referred because wanted to do entire bit in protection]: He seems to be very much concerned about the other inmates that approach him to poke him in the rear end. This idea of other people taking advantage of him seems to create a great deal of anxiety as well as tension. He says he cannot take it anymore....his tension and anxiety is mounting to

the point he feels he is going to "flip out - go crazy - or have a nervous breakdown". At times he gets shaky, fearful, and during interview, while talking about it, he is almost on the verge of tearfulness. His eyes get red.....

Although his reality testing still remains intact, however, over all his defense mechanism becomes very blurry and tenuous. He is not fully psychotic at this time. However, he is a problem, requires constant supervision and support. Recommendation - Serox, 30 mg. TID - Reasonable support - supervision and observation.

While the mental health view looks to men who are troubled, the custody view handles men who are in trouble. In relation to target violence, for example, staff sometimes overlook or encourage fighting when it serves inmate self-defense. Another manifestation of the custody perspective is the concern for guilt and innocence that is contained in the custody view of sex aggression. Important questions are: Did the prisoner invite the sexual approach? Have the aggressors committed a legally definable crime?

A concern for physical safety marks the custody approach. Is the man in danger? If so, what can be done to guard him? While psychiatrists apply medication, custody men must apply physical barriers and human surveillance to manage the problem. These measures, for the most part, accomplish the limited objective of providing a relatively safe environment for most men.

Aggressors, as we have seen, persist in subtle behavior that is possible even within the strictest discipline. But if aggressors go too far or become too blatant, staff generally move in rapidly.

Staff are most successful, and are most diligent, in handling the types of aggressive sexual behaviors defined as legal crimes. In cases of alleged rape that are known to staff, the process begins with a thorough "administrative investigation." From the law enforcement point of view, these investigations are handled professionally. The following lieutenant's report is a case in point:

On Friday afternoon, at approximately 3:00 P.M., C.O. Stuart, Block Officer, informed me that inmate Figliani #11176, an F Block worker, had been reportedly been having oral sexual relations with a number of inmates. This was reported to Stuart by another inmate. I instructed C.O. Stuart to question Figliani and let me know the results.

At approximately 3:30 P.M., as I was leaving the Adjustment Committee, C.O.'s Dell and Stuart called me to F Block where they were talking to Figliani. At this time, they informed me that Figliani had told them that he had been sexually assaulted in C Block the previous night, November 21, 1974, at about 8:15 P.M. He stated that he had gone to D Block for Night Rec., with I Block, and while there was thrown into C Block by black inmates and assaulted sexually. This would have been approximately 20 hours before he reported this.

I asked him if he was bleeding or was hurt, and he stated that he did not know. I ordered Figliani placed in S.H.U. for protection and instructed the officers to obtain any further information they could.

At this time, I proceeded to my South Mess Hall assignment - time was approximately 3:40 P.M. After arriving at the South Mess Hall, I notified Lt. Hutton, Acting Captain, of the incident and my actions. I called the count desk and instructed the Sgt. to inform Lt. Williams, Tour #2 Lt., to arrange for Figliani to be examined medically as soon as possible and filled him in on the situation.

After the count, approximately 5:00 P.M., I stopped at the count desk and checked with Lt. Williams to be sure he was fully informed of the situation. He was, at this time, talking to R.N. Weber on the phone. Lt. Williams indicated to me that R.N. Weber had some questions concerning the situation and I asked him to let me speak to her, and I did. Because of the lapse of time between the alleged assault, R.N. Weber indicated that it would not probably be useful to examine the subject. But after further discussion, I told her we would send the inmate to the Hospital for an examination. I wanted it to be a matter of record that the inmate was checked medically for further evidence and for treatment, if necessary. I then left duty and was off Saturday and Sunday.

When sexual assaults occur, administrators generally assume that established procedures were not being followed. A door, supposed to be locked, was left open; an officer, supposed to be up and about, was taking it excessively easy in his office; Prisoners, supposed to be in one place, somehow were allowed to wander. Having enacted custody measures designed for total control (and total safety), administrators blame sex assaults on failures to carry out these measures. Yet, officers and their supervisors carry on a constant guerilla action against prisoners determined to break rules. No matter how diligent staff may be, no matter how professional, the war continues unrelentingly. While staff control prisoners most of the time, sex assaulters, as we have seen, always manage to score a few victories. More importantly, much aggressor activity - unless it results in fights - barely violates institutional rules. Most formal custody procedures only cover acts by gorillas (and possibly by some players).

Informal, as well as formal measures, to control aggressors are taken. A captain in the youth prison, getting "wolves" names from complaining targets, keeps a special list of these men. Their movements are monitored, and some jobs and housing areas are not available to them. They become informally classified as "maximum custody" and are treated with more attention than other inmates. The captain himself, when he knows of aggressors being active, calls them into his office and tells them to "lay off." This measure works, or so the captain tells us.

A current trend, in both the youth and the adult prison, is to refer an aggressor, regardless of the level of force he has employed, to a psychiatrist.

While the psychiatrist is presumably called in under the questionable assumption that the aggressor needs treatment for his "perversion," such action probably has a deterrent effect. The psychiatrist's report goes in the file, warning the aggressor that his behavior may affect both his institutional treatment and his release date. Aggressors, of course, seldom talk openly about their actions. Even when faced with overwhelming evidence, they tend to completely deny their guilt, and they effectively turn treatment sessions into adjudicatory trials.

When staff notice a man becoming a target, they often get other staff with whom the inmate is in contact to watch him. They may do the same for aggressors involved:

Case Analysis: During interview at the Reception Center claims he has been threatened by other inmates who are trying to get cigarettes from him and also attempted to force him into acts of sodomy. He gives the names of the two worse offenders as 12314, Bocci and 11781 , Walker, Apparently officers have been alerted and are watching them closely.

* * * * *

Progress Evaluation Report: Supervising personnel report that inmate is a very good worker and requires less than the average amount of supervision. However, because of his slight stature, it is feared that he may become the target of homosexual attacker. Inmate does not have any inclinations in this direction.

Therefore, various supervising personnel report that they keep an extra eye out in order to prevent any such situation.

* * * * *

Entry by Counselor: Resident came to counselor complaining about Robert Gibson, 11684, who had been making advances to him in the kitchen. Counselor called mess hall. They said, Mr. Gibson is indeed a homosexual who tends to favor younger males.... they keep an eye on him because of this.

Another major way in which staff help targets is by arranging for their safe housing. An employee may be effective at cutting through red tape by making a few calls. He can talk convincingly to the right administrators, and in a short time can pull a desperate prisoner out of a dangerous setting and place him in a safe one. Sometimes a similar process takes place even before a man is threatened. In the adult prison, authorities sometimes place vulnerable inmates in protective niches. Such a niche may be, for example, a job in the officer's mess or a housing assignment offering protection from attack. Formerly, this process was more open. Then staff could isolate weak inmates in "sissy companies." Now, however, in the adult prison, every attempt is made to mask efforts to place convicts who are vulnerable to sexual attack in special housing or job assignments. No notice of this sort of action is made in the inmate's file. The inmate may not even be told of the reason for the assignment. The purpose of this secrecy is to prevent the vulnerable inmate from being labeled "weak" by other convicts. Through this

process, a diligent and sensitive staff can reduce the incidents of sexual assault. Moreover, the identification of the vulnerable inmate, and his assignment to a setting that offers him more security than other settings, can reduce both violence and the use of protective segregation.

Preferably, a vulnerable convict must be identified while he is in reception awaiting classification. This identification is an informal decision and may be subject to error. We have found, for example, that staff often assume that all blacks can "make it" in the general population. Our research shows that some blacks are just as vulnerable as whites. The problem here is that determination to treat a man differently because of his potential for victimization is based on physical cues or characteristics. Fair skin, youth, effeminate ways, and small size are the usual standards.

Staff, especially, experienced line officers, have a stereotype of the "weak" inmate which is most often correct, but is sometimes mistaken.

The second problem comes from the obstacles to providing protective niches to everyone who needs them. Many targets have not been aided by informal procedures. Either they have not been identified as needing help or there was no protective setting available for them in the population. In one prison, for example, a certain job training program serves as an enclave of security for "weak" inmates. Yet, this training program has entrance requirements relevant to vocational rehabilitation—not to safety. Inmates who need the safety the area provides may not meet the criteria for admission to it. Similarly, in the same prison custody concerns prevent targets who are violent offenders from assignment to the "farm," a less threatening environment than the cell blocks behind the walls.

In the youth prison, we observed an institutionalized, formal way of extending safe housing to targets and potential targets: Close to 40 men are effectively separated from aggressors without limiting the access of those safeguarded to regular programs. Stigma is the only liability that is associated with residence in Weak Company, and staff feel that it is a low price to pay for protection. Block officers, reception staff, and others refer inmates to Weak Company. Some inmates resist the move. They don't want others to call them "homos" and are generally afraid for their reputations. On the other hand, any man who wants to get into Weak Company is admitted automatically, once his record is checked to make sure he is not an aggressor. If the population gets too large, another tier takes the overflow, and also receives special care.

We learned of various idiosyncratic approaches to the problem. In the adult prison, a psychiatric caseworker brought an aggressor she trusted, a man on her caseload, together with a target. Getting the assignment board to transfer the target to the coal gang where the aggressor worked, she aimed to change the aggressor by getting him to identify with the target's difficulties. In the meantime, the target was being schooled by the aggressor to avoid dangerous situations. In another case, a counselor quietly transferred a target to the block where the target's best friend lived.

Issues Concerning Staff Action

The law enforcement approach to the victimization problem generally stops when physical safety, i.e., protection from sex assault, is insured. Beyond

this, few custody-minded administrators recognize the condition as calling for improvement. Because custody prevents sex assault, they believe the problem of sex aggression in their prisons is controlled.

The following exchange of memos highlights this view, and contrasts it with the mental health orientation:

Counselor to Superintendent: Resident indicated a fear for his life...according to him, this stems from the fact that inmates have been placing their hands on his body, spitting in his face, generally harassing him with sexual overtures as well as physical threats. After interviewing this resident, I interviewed an inmate who also is a member of B Company and he stated that many of the problems of this individual were brought about by his own actions...Resident's present complaints are based on his inadequacy and manner in which he attempted to alleviate his fears on the gallery. Not in danger of severe physical harm...does not normally fit the criteria of one who....is in a protective problem.

[Recommendation]: 1) Refer to psychiatrist, 2) Remove from present protective situation. The inmate should not be allowed to be placed in such a comfortable situation which only appears to reinforce his desire to remain out of population.

And the superintendent replies:

Superintendent to Counselor: Please counsel the inmate that we do not have idle company and if he wants to shorten his incarceration, he must show positive participation in programs. If

he is afraid of other inmates, advise him to co-mingle only in areas where supervision is constant.

As we have seen, the perception of aggression can be as troublesome as aggression itself. If custody is only interested in trouble, and not in troublesomeness, a portion of the real problem receives no attention.

Even where the mental health perspective predominates, obstacles can stand in the way of some amelioration efforts. For instance, public policy places sharp restrictions on racial segregation, a move that many staff know would make fearful whites feel better. Of course, segregation occurs anyway, to a certain extent. Week Company is a predominately white division, and informally in the yard, there are ethnically homogeneous cliques. Prison jobs and housing areas, however, must remain integrated unless strong mitigating factors call for segregation. Since there are, at least in the youth prison, few whites to go around, the strongest whites, or the ones assumed to be strongest, are sprinkled around the prison. Some tiers have 3 or 4 whites among 30 to 40 blacks and Puerto Ricans: numerous targets come from this pool. Indeed, there is some logic in having at least some whites working in the kitchen rather than having all of them working as clerks under the eyes of officers. But the integration issue takes flexibility away from staff.

Another obstacle is the size and complexity of the prison organization. An individual prisoner's physical existence is directed by numerous staff members, some who never physically see him. When a problem is perceived by

one staff member, the route may be long and twisted before anything is done about the problem by another staff member, especially for concerns viewed as not matters of life or death or physical health. Staff who achieve solutions must often be persistent, vocal (and to other staff, obnoxious) advocates of prisoners' welfare.

As we have seen, prisons contain staff actively involved in handling the problem of sexual aggression. The problem is recognized, and there are formal and informal procedures in effect to manage it. The question remains how much we can blame on staff, as some commentators generously do. Carroll, paralleling Scacco and Friar and Weiss, states, for example:

It seems unlikely that they would pursue a vigorous policy of prevention. Guards have a strong interest in the maintenance of atomization and conflict among prisoners. As long as each prisoner "does his own time" or conditions approach a "war of all against all," there will be no effective challenge to the position and power of the custodians. It is thus in the interest of the guards to adopt a lax posture with respect to
6
biracial sexual assaults.

Our research implies a different interpretation of the staff role. We have suggested that sexual aggressors often enter prison with well-defined patterns of violent behavior. Prisons are crowded, and management and program needs call for inmates to intermingle. Considering that the factors that attract aggressors are always present in the population, some level of sex

aggression seems to be almost inevitable in any prison with the usual combination of inmates (potential aggressors and potential targets). The costs of custodial solutions, in terms of civil rights violations, extreme controls, and movement restrictions, must be considered as part of the intervention. We turn to this problem in our last chapter.

Footnotes: Chapter Ten

- 1 Friar and Weiss, 121.
- 2 Scacco, 30, 31, 46.
- 3 59.
- 4 125.
- 5 (1976), 73, 75, 313-14.
- 6 Leo Carroll: "Humanitarian reform and biracial sexual assault in a maximum security prison." Urban Life, 5 (1977), 426.

CHAPTER ELEVEN: SOME ISSUES RAISED BY THE RESEARCH AND SOME IMPLICATIONS OF
THE FINDINGS

The Issue of Violence

About half the incidents we discuss feature physical violence. Of this violence, half comes from aggressors attempting to coerce targets; the rest comes from targets reacting to threats or perceived threats. Violent reactions are instrumental for targets in the sense that they end more incidents than any other reactions. After the fight, targets tell us, aggressors leave them alone, and they can move around the prison with less fear, and can feel better about themselves.

Most men we interviewed hold attitudes and values supporting a violent solution to the problem of being a target. Many inmates see violence as the medium for the message that one is straight, uninterested in sexual involvement, or that one is tough, and not a prospect to "get over on." Others say that violence is the best self-defense available, because it unambiguously lets the aggressor know the consequences of his behavior if he persists. In prison, target violence usually leads to an improved self-image and a more favorable status among other prisoners. Fellow inmates, looked to for guidance, school new inmates to accept this solution. Staff support target violence and back up their counsel with a flexible disciplinary process, exempting some inmates from punishment when they fight to uphold their manhood.

Other psychological factors complement these values and favorable attitudes toward violence. As we have seen, anger is characteristic of the target emotional response, and the irritation caused by aggressors can itself lead to targets exploding in unscheduled and uncalculated ways. As in ethology, we see a link here between fear, anger and aggression. Threatened men, angered men, can become aggressive and turn aggressors into victims.

Aggressors, of course, initiate as much violence as targets. We trace this "exploitative violence" to cultural patterns learned on the street, in the communities that aggressors come from, where aggressors are members of "subcultures of violence." Part of the impact on targets relates to the targets confronting, often for the first time in their lives, unfamiliar high levels of violent behavior. In facing aggressors with their violent connotations, the targets perceive themselves to be in danger: feeling that they may be raped or killed, they experience stress reactions caused by fear.

If prisons are supposed to treat criminality, men being socialized into upholding violence defeat such an aim. If prisons are to fairly punish, their punishment falls unequally and unfairly when milder offenders suffer fear of violence at the same time as more hardened offenders enjoy exploitation. If prisons are presumed to incapacitate, the goal is mocked by criminal violence thriving behind the walls. Yet prison staff can only do so much. Part of the problem of violence (target reactions) appears to be an adaptation to prison life, a way of coping with possible victimization. Another type of violence (aggressors' exploitation) reaches back into the social history of a group making up the prison population and is reinforced in prison.

The Issue of Impact on Targets

Most commentary exaggerates the rate and impact of sexual assault while underestimating the importance of lesser forms of sexual victimization. Our interviews with victims of sexual assault show that crises and social stigmatization attend the event and that, for a time, victims are hard-pressed to cope with what has happened to them. We do not find, however, the sexual identity change or chronic victimization assumed in the literature. Nor do we find victims expressing the embitterment toward society that some writers attribute to them.

What we do find is impact on all targets - not just victims - in the shape of rage, fear, tension, crisis, self-isolation, and suspicion. Attitudes about race and violence seem to change. But we know little about the long-range effect any of these relatively immediate responses may produce. This is an area of inquiry that students of penology must look into by means of longitudinal studies.

A major conclusion of this work is that impact is not directly related to the level of force deployed or to the "objective" danger of the environment. Players, pimps, propositioners, as we see, seldom get anywhere with their approaches and custodial staff and single cells protect almost all men from gorillas. Virtually all targets, even by the most inept actions, avoid being pushed into homosexual activity by fast-talking players. Threats seem to bring compliance only in rare situations when targets are cornered, cannot escape physically, and no staff are around. Yet, targets still react to threats and propositions as though they could be victims. To a great extent, the impact of the experience is based on the perception of danger rather than danger itself.

Concern for reducing violence related to target reactions could thus focus on increasing targets' confidence in being able to handle the situation without the drastic measures currently employed. If, indeed, most aggressors to fail/achieve sexual aims, yet targets think that there is a likely chance of their being victims, then violent target reactions , coming from fear, are based on misreading the situation.. To the degree targets can be convinced their environment is not as dangerous as they think it is, violence - and damaging emotional reactions as well - will be reduced.

Administrative and Policy Issues

Our survey, along with others like it, shows a rate of sexual assault in well run prisons approximating the rate of heterosexual rape on the street. Nowadays, administrators are generally able to protect most men from sexual assault. In its less flagrant forms, of course, sex aggression can thrive in the most well run modern institutions, for much of it falls outside the purview of custody concerns.

Rates of sexual aggression, as we define the term, would seem likely to remain constant unless there is a change in the human or social ecology of the prison community. Rates of sexual assault, on the other hand, such as those reported in the Philadelphia study, must fluctuate drastically (especially in jails) as administrative competence and concern fluctuates. Custody cannot stop the problem, but it can take measures to control it.

One such control measure which seems of limited value, consists of bringing police and courts into the picture. Even though our sample is biased by the numbers of aggressors and victims we found through official sources, in our study only one incident resulted in aggressors being referred to court, and a year after the assault neither one of the two aggressors in the incident had been tried. The Philadelphia report notes a similar picture: out of an estimated 2,000 assaults, only 26 could be turned over to the police for prosecution.¹ In prison, victims fear testifying, inmate observers will not come forward as witnesses, and staff can observe little illegal sexual behavior. Even if staff are eager to obtain convictions, victims fear becoming "rats" during the remainder of their sentences, and are justifiably reluctant to face the humiliation and embarrassment that comes when one openly reveals one's "loss of manhood." Consequently, victims seldom urge the pressing of charges, especially when such a solution increases the chances of further victimization.

Even when cases of sexual assault are prosecuted in the courts, evidentiary standards make conviction difficult. Delays make the extended isolation of participants (victims, inmate witnesses, and aggressors) a necessity. The one

case in our study where aggressors were indicted caused endless trouble for administrators, witnesses, the victim, and for the aggressor defendants. Correctional law prevented the aggressors from being sent to the "box" for more than 60 days. Witnesses and the victim had to be separated from aggressors and protected from harm. Forced transfers and forced isolation were the only solutions. It is not surprising that victims often give up their intentions to press charges and that the initial courage of some inmate witnesses fades.

Moreover, prosecution of aggressors can do little to improve the situation we describe in this dissertation. Much of the aggressor behavior we describe is not provably illegal. While some threats and attacks may constitute bonafide violation of criminal codes, anything less than sexual assault is not likely to receive much attention in the courts. Threats and fights are the daily fare of prison: they are tolerated, viewed as normative behavior, and nothing to get upset over. Few prisoners or prison staff would be willing to define threats and minor scuffles as law violating, although they may be seen as breaches of prison discipline regulations. Attaching legal blame may also be difficult in many of the incidents we describe. Motives and intentions tend to be entangled in a complex interaction.

Nor should increasing the numbers of guards in the prison have an appreciable effect. The impacts we have been discussing are linked to how men view their world rather than to factual descriptions of that world. The clearest proof of this fact comes from our interviews with men in the youth prison, a paragon of what Oscar Newman calls "defensible space."² The most severe target reactions -

and the highest rate of target incidents - occur among youth prison inmates, the inhabitants of a bastion of rigid custodial perfection. The architectural design of the prison calls for inmates being under the eyes of staff whenever out of their single cells. Guards march men through the halls by "Companies." There are enough officers, they are well-trained, and work under excellent supervision.

Of course, in the prisons where our incidents take place, men could be locked up more. Free movement could be restricted even more than it is. Ultimately, all prisoners could be isolated from contact with one another. But we suspect that, even were such draconian measures to be taken, aggressors would somehow get their message across to targets. Increasing custody reaches a point of obvious diminishing returns.

Some argue that architectural alterations will reduce the problem of victimization, and single cells are frequently mentioned as a solution. Yet most of our incidents take place in a system that gives every man a secure single cell. In prison systems lacking them, the single cell can be recommended as an improvement. But as we see by our research, the problem can be expected to endure in diverse physical settings.

Some blame the largeness of penitentiary for the victimization problem, claiming that smaller institutions are safer.³ Yet, at least in the study by Bartollas, Miller, and Dinitz, sexual victimization thrives in supposedly humane "cottage" settings. We may also recall that there are substantial capital investment in large penitentiaries.

In contrast to the arguments for increasing custody, some students see a solution in decreasing the control staff now have over men, Buffum, for example,

sing his argument on Gagnon and Simon's explanation of sex aggression as a symbol of masculinity, thus states: "Prisons' rigid rules and practices act to strip inmates of their masculinity, while a better fraternization between guards and inmates might give the prisoner new confidence in himself."⁴ And Gagnon and Simon suggest the possibility that:

By increasing coercion one increases the pressure to divide inmates from one another, and one decreases their capacity for self-expression and self-control. As the pressure builds, there may well be a tendency for homosexual relationships to increase in importance to the inmate population as a reaction to the intensity of the pressure.⁵

Paradoxically, this implies that increasing targets' protection through custody measures may create a system that causes aggressors to have a greater need to express themselves through exploitative activity. Certainly, aggressors should not be given free rein on the basis of a still problematical theory. Even if there is a chance that reducing staff presence might work, prisons have an obligation to protect men that precludes experiments reducing custody.

Along with functions such as security and treatment, classification can have the aim of protecting vulnerable men. Potential targets can be placed in the least threatening physical and social situations. Courts and penologists

recognize this principle and nowadays a common recommendation to relieve sex aggression is "proper classification."⁶

If a classification scheme were based on a statistical portrait of the man likely to be a target, virtually all young white inmates would have to be considered at risk. To physically separate such targets from potential aggressors would call for segregating prisons on a racial basis. Considering the equally pressing concern for integration, such a move is not an option which is available to administrators of public institutions. Advocates of integration, however, should recognize that there is some suggestion that the current situation may actually result in an increase in inter-racial tension and negative attitudes.

Resistance to ethnic classification could come from white inmates themselves. Forcing men to live in certain prisons or certain areas within a prison may violate plans men make for themselves. Many prisoners prefer coping with sex aggression to being the objects of an intervention shuttling them to places they dislike. Such men would particularly resent the assumption that they cannot (or have not) handled life problems successfully themselves. And inmates are unlikely to sacrifice benefits on the strength of a statistical prediction of danger.

Another issue is special classification, for which only the most vulnerable, the most traumatized, or the ones who request separation on the basis of fear could be considered.⁷ And, in fact, this practice occurs formally in Coxsackie and informally in other prisons. The strategy seems to work well, although it often serves men who have already had rough experiences. The biggest problem we face

if we expand such procedures is the stigma issue. A label can follow men for a long time and can effectively reduce the help given by special classification, even making future victimization more probable.

For years, in New York State and elsewhere, "sissy companies" provided safe havens for targets and potential targets. While offering physical protection, these companies also tended to restrict men to certain areas and to deny them privileges enjoyed by the main population. Consequently, there has been a move away from "sissy companies." They have been abolished in New York's prisons, for example, and federal standards now discourage their use
in protecting the physically attractive.⁸ Any plan grouping targets or potential targets, however, runs the risk of merely creating a new "sissy company" under different headings.

For years, classification has worked under the premise that separating the young from the old helps to protect younger men from exploitation. Our data suggest that sex aggression is concentrated in youth facilities, which implies that classification on age alone not only fails to solve the problem but may increase it. Youth prisons can give more peer support and more peer temptation to exploitation, and possible restraining influences from older men are absent. As Daniel Glaser notes, youths might feel less pressure in a mixed age institution than in an all youth facility.⁹

Issues Posed by an Educational Approach to Reform

In an educational model of reform, one tries to improve a situation by giving participants relevant knowledge. Two such recommendations address the

problem of sex aggression: 1) providing sex education for the prison population, and 2) training targets in manipulative and self-defense skills.

Sex education, involving "facts" about homosexuality, may serve to legitimize the behavior as much as to stamp it out, as has occurred in programs dealing with drug abuse through drug education. Another objection is the speed that would be necessary for the measure to be effective. We know that both targets and aggressors can become involved in incidents very early in their sentences. Many of our incidents occurred in reception populations, within weeks after the men entered prison. Sex education program would have to be given very early as part of orientation.

The training of targets in self-defense and manipulative skills is already done informally when staff and peers "advise" targets to "stand up" for themselves. The side effects of this strategy are troublesome, because what is basically taught is the desirability of responding violently. Moreover, some men, to whom assertiveness is "ego-alien," cannot avail themselves of "ideal type" strategies. Violence-related solutions, whether formally or informally inculcated, go counter to the correctional aim of socializing men toward constructive resolution of life problems.

Issues Posed by Human Relations and Pragmatic Approaches

Staff, it is sometimes argued, should become more "concerned" about inmates, should "care" more, be more interested in helping. In observing staff behavior, we find no lack of "concern" or "care" for inmates with problems. Many staff,

of course, are relatively insensitive to any problem lacking obvious objective referents. Even if a staff member is willing to aid a prisoner with a problem based on subjective estimates of danger, the issue of what course of action the staff member should take remains. Staff empathy comes mostly into play after incidents are over. Few prisoners share their incipient difficulties with staff, so that staff come into the picture mostly at the "crisis intervention" stage.

Based on the theory that sex aggression stems from frustration, it has been suggested that increased programming for education and economic advancement in prison will reduce the level of sexual aggression. It is argued that better programs will give potential aggressors healthier outlets than sex aggression for masculine expression. Gagnon and Simon, the forerunners of this idea, write that improved prison programming will give "alternative modes of self-expression for those social and psychological needs which, because of the current structure of the male prison, result in homosexuality." Davis mirrors this notion in attributing the events he describes in the Philadelphia report to two main causes: 1) inadequate guard supervision and 2) inadequate programming . Along with recommending more guards, thus, Davis recommends athletic, vocational and educational programs.

Our chapter on aggressors, however, shows continuity between behavior on the street and behavior in the prison. Aggressors seem to be members of a "subculture of violence," and are shaped more by community or cultural forces than by any forces inherent in prison. Compulsive masculinity, indeed, may

enter the picture, but, if so, it is formed well before coming to prison and is probably caused more by family structure than by prison life.

Irrespective of their origins, altering such dispositions would be a difficult task. Programs aimed at changing normatively supported conduct must struggle against such factors as susceptibility to group intoxication and the resistance posed by coherent group value systems. Moreover, although our research shows that some aggressors become known to authorities after incidents, most remain unknown. And predicting aggressors from background data, according to our findings, is impossible because aggressors share the characteristics of other violent offenders to a remarkable extent.

Providing Alternative Sexual Outlets

Another line of reasoning advocates correcting the problem by providing more acceptable sexual outlets for prisoners. And while commentators discount sexual motive, aggressors tell us they are bothered by sexual deprivation and seek contact for sexual stimulation. Yet conjugal visits would not help aggressors. At least in our study, very few aggressors are legally married or have common law wives. Many aggressors are too young to have wives, and others are so violent and so recidivistic that they lack enough street time to form relationships.

Aggressors also seem to be left out of home furlough programs because they fail to meet the criteria. Officials are reluctant to release aggressors on home furlough because they are manifestly violent and because their institutional behavior is poor. As we have seen, aggressors tend to accumulate inordinate

numbers of disciplinary infractions of all types. And they seem especially likely to accumulate violent "tickets," further indication of their dangerousness.

Sentencing

In all probability, there is not much that can be or will be done within prison to greatly alter the condition we describe in this dissertation. Sentencing, however, could alter the picture by removing targets or victims from prison. We have seen that many targets are "non-dangerous" offenders. If a policy assigning non-violent offenders to community alternatives had been in effect during our period of research, the numbers of targets available to us for interviews would have been drastically reduced.

The man most likely to be a target is also the man most likely to meet the criteria for a community corrections program. Some of our targets who were the most severely victimized were serving sentences for minor burglaries, drunk driving, marijuana possession, and joyriding. An increased awareness of the trouble such men face doing time would have reduced the incentive for sentencing them to terms in a state prison.

Footnotes: Chapter Eleven

¹ Davis, 75.

² Oscar Newman: *Defensible Space*. New York: Macmillan, 1972.

³ Albert Cohen, 20.

⁴ Buffum, 26.

⁵ Gagnon and Simon(1973), 259,

⁶ Davis, 79.

⁷ Toch (In press).

⁸ Scacco, 103.

⁹ Daniel Glaser: The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969, 105.

¹⁰ Gagnon and Simon(1968), 27.

¹¹ Davis, 39.

APPENDIX A: DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

Target Interview Schedule

- A. Description of sexual advances from the perspective of the person receiving them.
- B. Description of the physical and verbal response of the person receiving the advance.
- C. Description of the thoughts and feelings of the person receiving the advance which includes:
 1. attitudes towards violence, homosexuality, race, prison staff (e.g., can they help me?),
 2. immediate thoughts and feelings following specific sexual incidents,
 3. thoughts and feelings regarding the current living situation, and immediate thoughts and feelings following specific sexual incidents.
- D. Description of living patterns that have resulted from sex pressure.
- E. Descriptions of peer and staff intervention.
- F. Inmate ideas about solutions to their problem.
- G. Relationship of sex pressure to other problems.

Random Interview Schedule

1. What places of confinement have you been in?
2. Was sex pressure a problem in those places?
3. Did you have to deal with this problem? (If yes, go to target/victim interview schedule).
4. General questions about sexual aggression.

Staff Interview Content

- A. Perceived magnitude of the problem.
- B. Examples of principles relating to the resolution of typical cases.
- C. Recent history of the problem, as experienced.
- D. Staff views of the target of force.
- E. Types of advice given to inmates by staff, both formal and informal.
- F. Staff ideas about solutions and obstacles to solutions.

Date interviewed 5/75 Institution Attica

Date Received at Reception Center 1/74

Date received at interviewing institution same Parole eligibility date 11/74

Date 6/77 Maximum Sentence 4

Present crime Started his apartment on fire - night.

Date of birth 1/51 Age Height 5'11" Weight 150 Color white

Age left school 16 Highest Grade below H.S. Grad. 8

Occupation dishwasher Income on Arrest unknown

Residence on Arrest Utica No of years life

Marital status married

Previous Offenses

Year	Conviction	Disposition
	none	

Time in Juvenile Institutions none

Time in Adult Institutions only on current offense

Violent convictions, descriptions none

Residence in mental health facility Matteawan

Stated sexual identity Homosexual Straight

Family history to age 18: Parents divorced in 1964. Lived with mother.

Q. Verbal missing Non Verbal missing

Psychiatric Diagnosis "schizophrenia, chronic, undifferentiated type"

Note. 4/74 " delusional and paranoid ideations. Threatens to harm correction officers and other inmates."

Suicide attempts yes no

Number of disciplinary infractions since received on current offense 11

Violent " " " " " " " " " 0

Current housing location Invalid Company

Data Sheet (cont.)

Was a woman head of household during childhood? Yes. No. Unknown.

How long? after age 13

Was a father figure in the home? Yes. No. Unknown.

How long? until age 13

Evaluation of participation in sports in Elmira Reception

Center. Active. Participated. Not active. Unknown.

Parents income. Welfare. 0-2,999. 3,000-5,999. 6,000 -7499. 7,500-9,999.
10,000 and over.

number of sibilings. missing

Girlfriend on street when busted? Yes. No. Unknown. wife

Place where grew up. Utica

APPENDIX B: DATA ANALYSIS INSTRUMENTS

Sample Coding Form

The Victimization Incident Form

1. Code number A-8 2. ID number 106 3. Sample Attica Referral4. Stage of incarceration on current offense when incident takes place.
15 months after Reception. First transfer institution.5. Name of institution Auburn6. Type of institution Adult prison7. Location of incident in the institution. cell block and yard8. Duration of incident over 18 days

9. Time of day (if applicable) _____

10. Are other inmates (non-aggressors) involved? Yes. No. Missing.11. If yes, what is involvement? friends of target tell aggressorto leave target alone12. Does incident involve violence? Yes. No. Missing.

(If yes, go to Violent Incident Form)

14. Does staff know about incident? Yes. No. Missing.

(If yes, go to Staff Involvement in Incident Form)

15. Age of target at time incident takes place 2216. Did target receive peer advice on how to handle the problem? Yes. No. Missing.If yes, what advice? Told he should have told his friends earlier so they could have helped him.

17. How many aggressors are involved? 1

18. N of black aggressors 1

19. N of P.R. aggressors _____

20. N of white aggressors _____

21. N of other aggressors _____

22. What remarks does aggressor make to target? "Well, look, I am getting fucking tired of you bullshitting me around. Now I am going to get something from you or... I got something for you."

23. What do aggressors' peers do during the incident?

24. Other aggressor characteristics mentioned by target

Diagram of Victimization Incident

Code number A-8ID number 106Sample Attica ReferralAggressorTarget

Propositions target in cell block → Refuses politely

Propositions continue → Polite refusals continue

Propositions target → Target locks himself in, refuses to go to work or meals. Tells staff about the problem. Is keeplocked by the adjustment committee for a week, for refusing to work. No staff action against aggressor, who is not told by target the reason for the keeplock.

Target moves to different cellblock.

Threatens to harm target unless he goes with him. (in the yard). → Target informs staff of threat. Is locked up for his protection. Aggressor is locked up for one day. Target transfers to Attica.

The Subjective Reaction to Victimization Form

1. Code number A-8 2. ID number 106 3. Sample Attica Referral

4. Describe subjective reaction Scared/confused/nervous / tense

5. Describe sequence of emotional impacts from beginning to end and after

6. Describe statements relating to confusion, paralysis, inability to respond, floundering, etc. "a lot of confusion...I really didn't know what to do."

7. Describe target's assessment of his physical danger at the time of the incident _____
he thought the man would try something violent

8. Does target express having felt fear during the incident? Yes No Missing.
If yes, describe He felt himself threatened. Put himself in protection
and keeplock from fear.

9. Does target express a need for help or describe efforts to seek help
during or after the incident? Yes No Missing.

10. Does target have suicidal thoughts after the incident? Yes No Missing.
If yes, describe _____

11. Is there a suicidal gesture afterward? Yes No Missing.

If yes, describe motive and deterrent _____

12. Does target feel anger or have other explosive reaction? Yes No Missing.
If yes, describe Said he told staff he would attack aggressor if he was
not put in protection

(The Subjective Reaction to Victimization Form, page 2)

13. Does target express physical complaints relating to anxiety, tension, or stress?

Yes No Missing . If yes, describe "on the verge of a
nervous breakdown...it got too much for me."

14. Is there any expressed impact on sexual identity? Yes No Missing .

If yes, describe

15. Describe the different alternatives the target considers for solving his problem and the expressed considerations for or against these alternatives. Avoid aggressor. Go to staff. Tell friends. Lock himself in.

16. What solution is adopted? Tried all three

17. Why? Fear of sexual attack.

Violent Incident Form

1. Code number _____

2. ID number _____

3. Sample _____

4. Describe cause for violence _____

_____5. Describe amount of violence deployed _____

_____6. Does the aggressor first employ violence to intimidate the
target? Yes. No. Missing.7. Is this a clear-cut violent target response to a verbal aggressor
approach? Yes. No. Missing.

8. Did target receive peer advice to act violently? Yes. No. Missing.

9. Do non-aggressors become involved in the violence? Yes. No. Missing.

If yes, describe _____

_____10. Describe any peer involvements which increase or decrease potential
for violence. _____

11. Does participant give motives and reasons for violence? Yes. No. Missing.

If yes, describe _____

14. What effect does target claim the violence has had? _____

15. Describe relation of use of violence to incident outcome _____

16. Describe relation of violence to subsequent career of the target _____

17. Describe subsequent relations between violent participants _____

Staff Involvement in Incident Form

1. Code number _____ 2. ID number _____ 3. Sample _____

4. What staff know of incident? _____

Sergeant. Shop foreman. Adjustment committee.

5. Describe how they know Target tells them.

6. Is some staff action taken? Yes. No. Missing.

If yes, describe Aggressor locked up for one day. Target put in protective keeplock and transferred to Attica.

7. Does staff give advice to target? Yes No Missing

If yes, describe Start yelling if anyone attacks you and we will come over.

8. Does staff make other comments about incident to target? Yes No Missing

If yes, describe If you don't want protection, what can we do?

A sergeant calls him a "fucking nut" and states sending him to Attica will "straighten his ass out."

9. Is target satisfied with staff management of incident? Yes No Missing.

CONTINUED

4 OF 5

10. If incident involves violence, do staff know about violence? Yes No Missing

11. If yes, do staff know the sexual nature of this violence? Yes No Missing.

12. Describe disciplinary action:

target keeplocked for refusing to go to work

aggressor keeplocked for one day

13. Describe any staff involvement that increases or decreases the violent potential of incidents _____

14. If incident involves a suicide attempt, is it known to staff? Yes No Missing

15. If yes, is the sexual aggression behind the attempt known to staff?

Yes No Missing

Behavioral Reactions and Institutional Adjustments Form

1. Code number _____ 2. Sample _____ 3. ID number _____

4. Describe statements about stigma of special unit _____

5. Describe attitude about stigma _____

6. Describe self-restrictions and restrictions of movement _____
locked himself in

7. Describe places avoided because of fear _____

8. Describe current feelings about safety and non-safety.
distrusts most other prisoners

References

- Amir, Menachem: Patterns in Forceable Rape. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1971.
- Ashman, Allan: "The I. C. Unit: new device for prisoner protection." Popular Government, 32 (1966): 4-5.
- Ball-Rokeach, Sandra J.: "Values and violence: A test of the subculture of violence thesis." American Sociological Review, 38 (1973): 736-49.
- Bartollas, Clemens, Miller, Stuart J., and Dinitz, Simon: Juvenile Victimization. New York: Sage Publications, 1976.
- Bennett, Lawrence: "The study of violence in California prison: A review with policy implications." In Cohen, 149.
- Berger, Richard S.: "Escape from prison: defense, duress, homosexual attacks." Akron Law Review: 352-9. 1975.
- Blanckard, W.H.: "The group process in gang rape." Journal of Social Psychology, 49 (1959): 259-266.
- Bloch, Herbert: "Social pressures of confinement toward sexual deviation." Journal of Social Therapy, 1 (1955): 112-123.

Bluestone , Harvey, Edward O'Mally and Sydney Cornell: "Homosexuals in prison."

Corrective Psychiatry and the Journal of Social Therapy, 12 (1966): 13-24.

Britt, Benjamin E.: "A case of illustrate, the need for single cells in prison." Popular Government, 32 (1966): 2-4.

Brown, Les: "Four advertisers drop spots on repeat of 'Born Innocent.'"

The New York Times, 25 October 1975. M-47.

Brownmiller, Susan: Against Our Will. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1975.

Buffum, Peter C.: Homosexuality in Prisons. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

Bugliosi, Vincent: Helter Skelter. New York, W.V. Norton, 1974.

Burgess, Ann Wolbert and Holmstrom, Lynda Lyle: Rape: victims of crisis.

Robert J. Brady Co., 1974.

Carlton, Linda: "The terrifying homosexual world of the jail system.:

The New York Times, 25 April 1971, 40.

Carroll, Leo: "Humanitarian reform and biracial sexual assault in a maximum security prison." Urban Life, 5 (1977): ____ - 426.

"Catalogue of savagery. Philadelphia inquiry." Illustrated Time, 92 (54) (1968): 520.

Clemmer, Donald: The Prison Community, Boston: Christopher Publishing House, 1958.

Cohen, Albert K., Cole, George, F., and Bailey, Robert G.: Prison Violence. Lexington [Mass.]: Lexington Books, 1976.

Cohen, Murray L.: "The psychology of rapists." Seminars in Psychiatry. 303 (1971): 312-325.

Conrad J. P.: "Violence in prison." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 364 (1966): 113-19.

Cory, Donald Webster: "Homosexuality in Prison." Journal of Social Therapy, 1 (1955): 137-41.

Cronin, John W.: "Emotional panics among prisoners." American Prison Association, (1941), 360-368.

Curran, James: "Sex deviation in correctional institutions." American Correctional Association, (1961): 237.

Davis, Alan J.: "Report on sexual assaults in the Philadelphia prison system and sherriff's van's." Philadelphia District Attorney Office and The Police Department. (Unpublished manuscript, 1968).

Davis, Alan J.: "Sexual assaults in the Philadelphia prison system and sherriff's vans." 6 Trans-Action, (1968): 8-16.

Davis, Allison and Dollard, John: Children of Bondage, New York: Harper, 1964.

Ehrmann, W.: "Marital and nonmarital sexual behavior." In Christensen, H.T.: Handbook of Marriage and the Family. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964: 585-622.

Employees of the New York State Commission of Corrections, testimony before a hearing held by the Senate Standing Committee on Crime and Correction [New York State], Albany, 21 April 1975.

"Escaped tells of prison attacks," Times Union [Albany], 22 April 1975, p. 4.

"Ex-Inmate tells of sexual abuse." The New York Times, 19 November 1975
(F-20).

Finestone, Harold: "Cats, kicks, and color." Social Problems, 5 (1957):3-13.
Fuller, Dan A., Orsagh, Thomas, and Raber,

David: "Violence and victimization within the North Carolina prison system." (Unpublished Manuscript, 1976).

Gagnon, John H. and Simon, William: Sexual Conduct, Chicago: Aldine, 1973.

Gardner, Martin R.: "The defense of necessity and the right to escape from prison - A step towards incarceration free from sexual assault." 49
Southern California Law Review, 110-52 (1975).

Gebhard, P. H., et al: Sex Offenders. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Geis, G.: "Group sexual assaults." Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, (May 1971):
101-112.

Giallombardo, Rose: Society of Women, New York: John Wiley, 1966.

Gilman, David: "Courts and corrections." Corrections Magazine, Sept. (1976):
51-53.

Glaser, Daniel: The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. New York:
Bobbs-Merrill, 1969.

Goffman, Erving: Asylums. New York: Doubleday & Company, 1961.

Gold, Martin: Delinquent Behavior in an American City. Belmont [California]:
Brooks/Cole, 1970.

Gold, Martin: "Suicide, homicide and the socialization of aggression."
American Journal of Sociology, 63 (1958): 651-661.

Green, W. Arnold: "The middle-class male child and neurosis." American Sociological Review, 11 (1946): 31-41.

Green v. State, 10 Criminal Law Reporter, 2017 (Mo. Sup. Ct., 1971).

Greer, Germaine: "Seduction is a four letter word." In Schultz, 374-395.

Griffin, Susan: "Rape: The all american crime." In Schultz, 19-40.

Guttmacher, M. and Weihofen, H.: Psychiatry and the Law. New York: Norton, 1952.

Hamilton v. Love, 328 F. Supp. 1182 (E.D. Arkansas 1971).

Hays, William L.: Statistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963.

Huffman, Arthur: "Sex deviation in a prison community." Journal of Social Therapy, 6 1960: 170-181.

Huffman, Arthur V.: "Problems precipitated by homosexual approaches on youthful first offenders." Journal of Social Therapy, third quarter (1961), 216-22.

Hopper, Columbus B.: Sex in Prison: The Mississippi Experience with Conjugal Visiting. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1969.

Irwin, John: "Some research questions on homosexuality in jails and prisons, (Unpublished paper, (1971)).

Irwin, John: The Felon. Englewood Cliffs [N.J.]: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Jackson, Bruce: "Our prisons are criminal." N.Y. Times Magazine, 22 October 1968.

Johnson, Robert: Culture and Crisis in Conflict. Lexington (Mass.): Lexington Books, 1976.

Johnson v. U. S. 258 F Supp. (1966).

Kanin, E. J.: "Male aggression in dating-courtship relations." American Journal of Sociology, 63 (1957):197-204.

Kanin, E. J.: "Male aggression and three psychiatric hypotheses." Journal of Sex Research, 1 (1965), 221-231.

Kanin E. J.: "An examination of sexual aggression as a result of sexual frustration." Journal of Marriage and Family, 29 (1967): 428-433.

Kanin, Eugene J.: "Selected dyadic aspects of male aggression." in Schultz, 59-76.

Karpman, Benjamin: "Sex life in prison." Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 3 (1948): 475-486..

"Killing of Carolina jailer, charged to woman, raises question of abuse of inmates.: The New York Times, 1 December 1974.

King, Wayne: "Rise in inmates strains jails in south: Florida jams 10 into 12-by-15 foot cells." The New York Times, 24 October 1975, pp A-1,C-10.

Kinsey, Alfred C., Pomeroy, Wardell B., and Martin, Clyde E.: Sexual Behavior in the Human Male, Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders, 1948.

Kirkpatrick, D. and Kanin, E.: "Male sex aggression on a university campus." American Sociological Review, 22 (1957): 52-58.

Lindner, Robert M: "Sexual behavior in penal institutions," in Albert Deutsch, Sex Habits of American Men, New York: Prentice Hall, 1948.

Lockwood, Daniel: "Living in protection." In Toch, Hans: Survival in Prison.

New York: The Free Press (in press).

Martin, Bob, et. al., "The account of the white house seven," Friends Journal, (October 1, 1974): 484-499.

Miller, Walter B., Geerty, Hildred, and Cutter, Henry S.G.: "Aggression in a boy's street corner group." Psychiatry 24 (1961): 283-298.

Miller, Walter B.: "Lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency." Journal of Social Issues, 14 (1958), 15-19.

Merklin, Lewis: They Chose Honor. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

Miller, David and Levy, Howard: Going to Jail. New York: Grove Press , 1970.

Millett, Kate: Sexual Politics, New York: Avon, 1970.

"Needed: prison of another stripe." The National Observer, 15 June 1974, pp. 1, 14, 16.

New York State Special Commission on Attica: Attica. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974..

Newman, Oscar: Defensible Space. New York: Macmillan, 1972.

Note, "Sexual assaults and forced homosexual relationships in prison: cruel and unusual punishment." 36 Albany Law Review 428-438 (1972).

Ovesy, Lionel: "The homosexual conflict," Psychiatry, 17 (1954): 243-50.

"Panel says an informed public would demand prison reform." The New York Times, 7 March 1974, C-18. Report of House Judiciary subcommittee headed by Representative Robert W. Kastenmeir (D. Wis.)

Patterson, Haywood and Conrad, Earl: Scottsboro Boy. New York: Doubleday, 1950.

People v. Lovercamp, 43 Cal. App. 3d 823, 118 Cal. Rptr. 110 (1974).

Pepinsky, Harold E.: "Need a policeman's lot be an unhappy one?" Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 14 (1977): 134-139.

Radzinowicz, Leon: Sexual Offenses. London, 1948.

Redl, Fritz: "The phenomenon of group contagion and shock effect in group therapy." In Eissler, Searchlight on Delinquency, New York: International University Press, 1949, 315-328.

Roth, Loren H.: "Territoriality and homosexuality in a male prison population." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 41 (1971), 510-513.

Scacco, Anthony M.: Rape in Prison. Springfield [Ill.]: Thomas, 1975.

Schultz, Leroy: "The victim offender relationship." Crime and Delinquency, 14 (1964).

Schultz, Leroy G.: Rape Victimology. Springfield [Ill.], Thomas, 1975.

Sellitz, Claire, Jahoda, Marie, Deutsch, Morton, and Cook, Stuart W.: Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1951.

"6 indicted in sodomy at Dutchess Co. Jail," Times Union [Albany] 31 May 1975.

Shaw, Clifford R.: The Jack-Roller. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Slim, Iceberg: Pimp: The Story of My Life. Holloway House, 1967. In

Gregory Armstrong: Life at the Bottom. New York: Bantam, 1971. 232-237.

Sparkes, John: "The Ombudsman." Unpublished manuscript, School of Criminal Justice of the State University of New York at Albany, 1973.

Spiegel, John P.: "The dynamics of violent confrontations." International Journal of Psychiatry, 10 (1972): 93-108.

Srivastava, S.P.: "Sex life in an Indian male prison." Indian Journal of Social Work, 3 (1974): 21-33.

Sykes, Gresham M.: The Society of Captives. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971.

Task Force for Institutional Violence: "Aggressive history profile and known reason for violence against victims (CDC and YA combined)."

Unpublished manuscript, California Department of Corrections, 1965.

Teresa, Vincent: My Life in the Mafia. Greenwich [Conn.]: Fawcett, 1973.

Thomas, Piri: Down These Mean Streets. New York: New American Library, 1967.

Tobey, Jackson: "Violence and the masculine ideal: some qualitative data." In Marvin E. Wolfgang (ed.), Patterns of Violence, The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 364 (1966), 19-27.

Toch, Hans: "Institutional violence code, tentative code of the classification of inmate assaults on other inmates." Unpublished manuscript, California Department of Corrections Research Division, 1965.

Toch, Hans: Violent Men. Chicago: Aldine, 1969.

Toch, Hans: "Interventions for inmate survival." Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Grant Proposal, 1974. (Funded as Grant Number 75 NI-99-0030).

Toch, Hans: Men in Crisis. Chicago: Aldine, 1975.

Toch, Hans: Peacekeeping: Police, Prisons, and violence. Lexington [Mass.]: Lexington Press, 1976.

Vedder, Clyde B. and King, Patricia G.: Problems of Homosexuality in Corrections, Springfield [Ill.]: Thomas, 1967.

Ward, Jack L.: Homosexual behavior of the institutionalized delinquent.
Psychiatric Quarterly Supplement, 32 (1958): 301-314.

Wayne County Jail Inmates v. Wayne County Board of Commissioners, 1 Prison Law Reporter 51 (Illinois, 1972).

Weiss, Carl and Friar, David James: Terror in the Prisons. New York:
Bobbs-Merril, 1975.

Williams, Vergil L. and Fish, Mary: Convicts, Codes, and Contraband.
Cambridge [Mass.]: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1974.

Wolfgang, Marvin E., and Ferracuti, Franco: The Subculture of Violence.
London: Tavistock, 1967.

Yablonsky, Lewis: The Violent Gang. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1962.

END