

The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

Document Title: Next Millennium Conference: Ending Domestic Violence; What We Know About Domestic Violence

Author(s): Lori Heise ; Nanette Benbow ; Eileen Luna

Document No.: 184576

Date Received: September 27, 2000

Award Number: 1999-WT-VX-0002

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

**THE NEXT MILLENNIUM CONFERENCE:
Ending Domestic Violence
What We Know About Domestic Violence**

Page 1
BOS: as

... .. Kersti. She's the Professor of Sociology and Department Chair at Wheaton College in Norton, Massachusetts. She received her PHD in Sociology from the University of New Hampshire in 1981. She has also done-- she's a research associate with the Family Development Clinic at Boston Children's Hospital, as well as lecturer at the Harvard Medical School. She has conducted extensive research on several facets of domestic violence, including marital race, status of women, and wife abuse and battering during pregnancy. She served as a research consultant to the U.S. Marine Corp., coordinated community response to spouse abuse, and conducted evaluation research at AWAKE, the Boston Children's Hospital Battered Women's Advocacy Program. She's got several publications to her name, some of them are a Feminist's Perspective on Wife Abuse, and License to Rape, The Sexual Abuse of Wife. She has also published a feminist methodology and researcher activist collaboration. She's a Vice-President of the Board of Common Purpose Massachusetts' largest battered program. Why don't you let them see who you are.

Lori Heise. Lori is the Co-director of the Center for Health and Gender Equity Change, a not-for-profit research and advocacy organization. She's a long time advocate for women's health internationally, and has worked extensively

in the area of gender based violence. She has served as the technical advisor on Violence Against Women for World Health Organization, The World Bank, and the Pan-American Health Organization. She's presently collaborating with research teams in six countries to conduct a household survey on women's health and domestic violence.

Nanette Benbow. You can just let them see who you are. Nanette is a Senior Epidemiologist at the Chicago Department of Public Health since 1993. She's worked extensively in the areas of violence and minority health. In the areas of violence she has conducted one of the first clinic based surveys on domestic violence in Chicago. The study helped document the need for domestic violence identification and referral in health care settings. In the area of minority health, Ms. Benbow has assembled and analyzed data by race, ethnic in Hispanic subgroup categories to profile the health of specific racial ethnic groups in Chicago. Currently she is in charge of organizing and implementing a bilateral project between Chicago and Mexico to examine the relationship between HIV infection and migration immigration to design a bi-national HIV prevention started. That is a lot of work.

And last but not the least is Eileen Luna. She's an Assistant Professor of American Indian Studies Law and Policy at the University of Arizona, Tucson. She's a member

of the Chicamogwa[?] Cherokee Nation of Arkansas and Missouri. She was appointed by the Attorney General Reno to a position on the National Citizens Advisory Panel for Immigration and Naturalization Services. Professor Luna was awarded both the Kristen A. Johnson Endeavor Foundation Native American Fellowship, and the John B. Pickett Fellowship in the Criminal Justice from the National Institute of Justice for the Study at the Kennedy School of Governmental at Harvard University. She's the author of a number of law and criminal justice articles focusing on American Indian Tribal Police Family Violence and on community oversights[?]. So ladies and gentlemen, I give you the speakers.

... I wanted to say a little bit by way of overview of our session, which I think is a little bit misleading. What do we know about domestic violence is a title for a session that seems to promise a lot from the research track. And I want to begin by telling you we're not going to deliver on that promise. That's too big a question. We'll be kind of addressing our pieces, raising some important issues, I think, and hopefully doing it in enough time to have some discussion with you. I will be focusing on one of the research issues that is important to us as researchers in domestic violence, and I think very important to the advocacy field, which is the controversy about violence bi-

wise. Bi-women within intimate relationships. Before we get into that, I just wanted to tell you that, as you heard, I'm a domestic violence researcher, a feminist, an activist, a teacher, and although I've done many kind of individual research projects, I think the thing that most keeps me in this field and draws me to meetings like this is my desire to bridge the gap between the research in this field and the activists, the advocates, the practitioners, the people doing the hard work. And I think that we can do a lot better in making connections, doing the kind of research that will be useful to most of your work. How many of you are advocates and activists and practitioners in this field? Any researchers sprinkled in there? A couple. And a lot of us try to do both of those things. My desire to start bridging this gap goes back to early meetings at the University of New Hampshire where researchers first started presenting their data, and activists first started yelling at us. And it was kind of a frightening experience to get up there and present for the first time and have, you know, Barbara Hart, Ellen Pensit[?], all those people in the back of the room with no name tags, because they weren't invited and they weren't really allowed in. And ever since then I have seen how much more we can accomplish working together. I have to say that a lot of my research colleagues have not quite looked at it that way, and kind of proceed in that

research endeavor as if it's unconnected to the real work. And I think that's a problem. The domestic violence research is about 25 years old. The kind of empirical, social sciencey kind of research, and I think the controversy about violence by wives is just about the same, is about 24 years old, at least. And I wanted to give a little history to that whole controversy, and then hear, or later hear more from you about how we might deal with that controversy and make things better instead of worse, which I think a lot of the research has been doing for a very long time. One thing, for example, this conference is about domestic violence. No one seems to have a problem with that concept. I was looking at the mission statement of the conference that said this is a conference on family and intimate violence which will focus specifically on the topic of domestic violence as a subcategory of intimate. I mean, I think that we're all talking about battering of women when we talk about domestic violence. But the researchers out there have this whole field called family violence, spouse abuse, and proceed to do a lot of research on that topic kind of as if this whole battered women's movement didn't exist. I find it hard to believe when I sit with 2,000 people in that auditorium that all this research is going on kind of oblivious to the fact that we're all here and this work is going on in this way. There's a huge amount of

knowledge here that may not come from a quantitative survey. We have that family violence field over there that looks at this as a mutual couple problem. And I went to a session earlier where we were looking at data. We all read stuff in the newspaper about why women are as violent as men. Most recently from the Maufit Study. Headlines in the USA Today, proof positive. And that has implications for the work, and for the funding, and for how the criminal justice system works, and for the increasing arrests of women that we're all having to deal with on a practical level. And those who would arrest battered women for resisting, for defending themselves, for being angry at what's happened, use the research. Use the research to bolster that position, and kind of set up the rest of us as kind of like so whetted to an ideological position we just refuse to see it. I think part of our problem is that we're not quite seeing the whole picture, and each of us is struggling in different ways. And I think the only way we can get to see the whole picture is to be talking together more. And the controversy started not from people finding a lot of violent women, but from finding data from the original conflict tactic scale study. I don't know if you're familiar with that measure of violence, the kind of gold standard of research to measure violence. Which in 1975, the first study done by the University of New Hampshire, a big national study,

discovered that women perpetrate these acts of violence as often as men, as far as the data are concerned. You probably all know that data all too well. Without mention of the motives, the meaning, the context, the consequences. Suzanne Steinmetz wrote a piece a long time ago called the Battered Husband Syndrome. Most of her evidence was, you know, that there are cartoons where women chase men with frying pans. An early response from that from Paulene Part in the plex was called the Battered Data Syndrome. And I think we're still suffering from that syndrome, how we look at this, and how we come to understand the problem. The controversy at those early UNH conferences where people were shouting at each other, walking out, and so on. Mary Strauss and Sue Steinmetz said they've had death threats because of their presentation of data. I want to say here it wasn't me. I didn't do it. (LAUGHTER) But it has been a painful and difficult controversy that we're still in the middle of.

And I would like to think a little bit together about kind of what mistakes the researchers have made, what mistakes I think feminist activists have made, people in the field so that we can reflect back and move forward in a more positive way. And maybe the kind of old fable about the blind man trying to describe the elephant has some kind of relevance for us, because I do think most of the people, the

researchers as well, working on this issue are very well meaning, are against violence, are trying to struggle with this issue. But are looking at it in such different ways, and in such narrow ways, and so convinced that the piece that they're looking at is right, that we have some serious problems. We don't have much openness. We have, for example, just most recently when I kept thinking the dialogue was getting better--come take these seats. Coming in just as I was going to quote Don Dutton. Don's not here though. In a recent violence against victims he writes "Gender analysis is misleading and counterproductive in understanding the complexities of domestic violence, and even wife assault. Such analysis remains mired in fad feminist theory." So you have leading researchers publishing stuff like that, and I'm trying to think how are we all in this same world together. We're obviously looking at different parts of that elephant. And I think it doesn't mean that everybody has this kind of an equally valid perspective on that. I think Dutton is just wrong. I wouldn't make that flat out statement about most of the researchers. But I think in this case this is just plain wrong. But everybody else is mostly struggling with this matter. So you have Kinell, the UNH folks, and all the people who kind of follow using conflict tactics scales working on the reliability and validity of these measures,

being really careful about that, trying to, you know, maybe they're just looking at the tusks and find two tusks, measure them, find them both four feet long and say, okay, we have quantitative evidence of kind of gender equality here. The rest of us are dealing with other parts of this kind of domestic violence beast, and our experience of it as not gender neutral, as clearly a gendered form of oppression, our experience is more of having had the elephant be sitting on us for a long time. It becomes a very different thing in that way. But we're not making connections between most of the research world. I see several people here who were at the University of New Hampshire Sixth International Conference on family violence research. And it amazes me how little overlap there is between those conferences, and in the kind of understanding of the issue that's out there.

The Feminist Analysis and the Battered Womens' Movement, which was beautifully displayed in that film, and lived by most people here, I don't need to go into a description of that, but what their spin is I think parallel trajectory, and some real successes both by the researchers and by activists. Sometimes in collaboration and using each other's work, but certainly not enough. I mean, I think researchers have been enormously successful. A lot of us got jobs, _____, some people even got fame. Hopefully we've

created some knowledge and explored some issues that have been helpful, but the bigger this whole thing gets the more it gives me pause about do you measure the success of a field by how much funding we get from the federal government, and how many journals we now publish. That kind of ends up being these kind of measures of our success, and that's not good enough. And I think the divisions between us, between kind of researchers activists, and so forth, get exploited by those who truly don't care about this issue. I mean, to the point where I think we could be used by to coin a phrase, "A vast right-wing conspiracy." But I don't think that's that far from the truth, because the kind of research that gets put in those newspapers, and then gets used to undermine programs and efforts to get funding, and cases where fathers' rights groups are challenging the way restraining orders are issued in Massachusetts, for example. Researchers are responsible for a lot of that.

I think that there has been mistakes on all sides. And I just want to touch on a couple of those and think about how we can move beyond them. The list of mistakes is so long that if we knew then what we know now, we could have done it differently. I think on the researcher's side one of the real problems has been that we've mistaken the data that come from measures like the conflict tactic scale for the thing itself. And kind of reified what we find with

those kind of surveys, and put a lot of faith in numbers without looking at what they really mean. And kind of missing the bigger picture. There's a radical kind of philosopher of science named Fire Obont, and he has this great quote about this kind of focus on method and measurement. "A narrow focus on method is like having an intense debate about a key without any attention paid to the nature of the lock." And I think we researchers have really done that in a bad way. I mean, we got that key like really fine-tuned except we're not paying attention to what it is we're trying to unlock. It is much bigger, much bigger than just assessing numbers of acts of violence, incidence of aggressive behavior. And that focus on incidence also, we're just in another session talking about how the criminal justice system is focused on incidence as well. Women get arrested for an incident without the pattern, looking at the nature of the whole lock. So unfortunately, these pieces come together.

We all know the further mistakes about emphasizing the violence by wives is as big a social problem as violence by husbands. I mean, that is a furious mistake that researchers make by not analyzing their findings in greater context. And we're really good at, I think, this group tends to be good at pointing out the researchers mistakes. I think feminist advocates and activists have also made lots

of mistakes. Here I'm going to focus on the ones we've made kind of relative to researchers. And one is really not to appreciate the power of that kind of research and the scientific method in looking for evidence, and the kind of rules of gathering evidence that researchers are bound to try to do a really good job. So often it's kind of like you start on that and eyes roll, oh God. I mean, it is boring, but it is necessary. But then I think that we also have been very willing to use research statistics for our own purposes, and I think in extremely sloppy ways. In ways that take where we stand up for whatever speech we want, every 15 seconds another battered woman FBI statistic. That's not FBI statistics. That actually comes from the Murray Strauss survey that everybody hates, right? Count up those acts of severe violence general acts of the whole population, and then we kind of go with that number without realizing where it came from, what the limitations of it are, and how it opens us up to say look at all the counts of acts of violence against the men in there. Strauss' survey finds very low injury rates. If we look at surveys like the National Crime Victims Survey, we find very high injury rates, we find kind of better data about what we would call battering. We would find that the severe violence by the men is seven times higher than that of the women, but we also find much lower rates, right? So, do we want to use

the big number and say, oh, we got a big problem, we need more money? Or are we going to be more critical of what the research is, and more realistic about what those numbers are? And so I challenge us to really do that, because if we don't, if we don't think critically about it, do kind of the hard, boring work of finding out what the research really says, challenging researchers to do better in studying issues in ways that you find useful, we're going to have this problem, and we do then leave ourselves wide open. Both well meaning, liberal researchers, and the Battered Womens' Movement to a very powerful force that does not like the work that we're doing at all.

My father-in-law a couple of years ago sent me the copy of one of his favorite magazines, The National Review, which I don't usually see, and on the cover was a caricature of Gloria Steinham with like a little calculator. And the headline was A Feminist With Statistics Is Like A Fish With A Bicycle. And it listed like all of our screw-ups in presenting data. I have more mistakes to cover, but my time is short. So I just want to challenge us to have better dialogues, get the better research, use it in better ways, and then we can kind of maybe move beyond the impasse I think where we are around this issue right now. Thanks.

(APPLAUSE) (END OF SPEECH)

... Lori?

... That's a hard act to follow. My name is Lori Heise, and this is my colleague, Mary Ellsberg, and we're both here from The Center For Health And Gender Equity, which is an advocacy and research organization that works on women's sexual and reproductive health issues internationally. Our focus is international. We work with women's organizations and research organizations all over the world that work on this issue. And our focus is to try to use our access as U.S. citizens to get the information, synthesize it, get it out to our colleagues in other countries that don't have the same kind of access to med line and information, and everything that we do. And we've been working on a project for the last seven or eight months, Nary and I and other colleagues of ours, to try to synthesize what do we--I actually am picking on the issue, that what do we know about domestic violence internationally. What does the research tell us? What does our collective experience as advocates and others? What do we know in terms of the degree to which this is a consistent phenomena across a wide variety of settings, and to what degree it's a different phenomena, or it gets manifested differently. And just to give you a sense of the project that we've been doing--so what I wanted to talk about today is this. What is the same, or what appears to be the same, all this you have to take as preliminary, because we're in a learning process. What

seems to be different are context driven, and specifically I'm just going to look at for lack of time things around the magnitude and characteristics of the phenomena, and it's health consequences. Because we're a health organization, so we focus a lot on that.

... (INAUDIBLE)

... Yeah, actually we have it all, and so, don't worry about it too much. In fact, you can just start to pass that around if you want. So what we've done is we've tried to synthesize some of the emerging lessons from what is over 35 population based, so representative sample surveys, and over 40 qualitative indepth studies that have been done in countries around the world. And we also then did the kind of traditional stuff. We searched Med Line, we searched Population, which is an international referencing service. We have our own for the last 10 years or 15 years, we've been collecting information, the future of literature, from groups around the world. In effect, we have over 1,000 articles now that we have synthesized and are using as a basis of this analysis. Also, a lot of what I'm going to talk about today comes from what really, really rich research collaboration that Mary actually--Mary is my epidemiologist. I always feel like I need a disclaimer that says I'm not an epidemiologist, but I play one on t.v. She has taught me everything I know about epidemiology. She and

her colleagues, she's moved up from Nicaragua to join our team, have been collaborating with Swedish University to do a really interesting series of studies in Nicaragua in Leone. What they have there is they have a demographic surveillance system, which means that for an entire population of 10,000 homes they follow every death, every birth, every kind of vital event. And then that allows them over time to have really interesting longitudinal data, and they can look at different outcomes by using what they're called nested case reference or case control studies, looking at how does domestic violence, for example, your exposure to domestic violence influence your risk of having an infant death or a child death? How does it influence your risk of becoming pregnant over the time that we're following? How much does it influence your risk of HIV, or if you have a low birth weight infant? So, I'm going to talk a lot about that collaboration, which is actually Mary's work.

So back to the magnitude and characteristic. This is kind of like a boring slide, but basically in terms of magnitude and characteristics, violence against women appears to be prevalent in all organized societies. There are some small scale studies that have been documented in the ethnographic literature where it's claim that violence against women, domestic violence is fairly rare if not

absent. But in terms of large, organized societies we're talking about a phenomena that is cross cutting. Also, everywhere where we have data, which is actually a lot of places now, women are most at risk from men that they know, family members or intimates. Which is very different than the epidemiology of risk for men. Men are mostly at risk from acquaintances and strangers. Another thing that plays out consistently across setting is that physical violence is a nexus of emotional sexual and physical violence. So I just pulled out a couple of examples. And you can do any number of 20 different studies that show the same thing. Among abused Japanese women, 57% experience all three types of violence. You very rarely see physical violence without emotional violence.

In about one third to one half in the studies of all physically abused women are also sexually abused by their partner. That's a consistent finding across a wide range of settings. And as I said, you almost always see emotional and physical abuse together as a phenomena. Another finding which is really quite consistent, and it's somewhat controversial here in the United States to talk about this, but in population based studies, these are representative surveys. These are not service based statistics, you consistently see in studies from all of these different settings that although it is true that there is violence in

domestic violence across all socio-economic groups, women living in conditions of poverty are at higher risk. Now, I don't think we understand what that means. Is it not having income? Is it crowding? Is it the frustration and despair? Is it stress? Is it all those things together? Is this a marker? Is this a real phenomena? We don't know, but we keep seeing it. And I think it's time that we start to look at what does this mean for women. And this is something which probably all the factors that have been studied it's the most consistent thing that emerges. We also see, especially in all the qualitative studies, that the same kind of physical violence occurring in the nexus of jealous and controlling behavior seems to be maintained for this phenomena in a wide variety of cultural settings.

So, qualitative indepth studies in all of these, including some additional ones, but I just put them there for your reference to show that abusive men, men who are physically abusive are also more controlling and jealous than non-abusive men. And that seems to maintain itself even in settings where male controlled behavior is normative. So in what you might want to say is a setting where more macho norms or more male dominant norms might be more prevalent. Abusive men are even more controlling than their peers who may be controlling compared to other settings. So for example, in a national prevalent study in

Nicaragua, 32% of physically abused women scored higher on a scale of marital control, which are things like what she's not allowed to do or how much he tries to stop her from visiting her friends, or some of the things that you're familiar with on scales here in the U.S. Compared to only 2.2% of non-abused women. So, while we might say, and we actually do know that compared to American men, Nicaraguan men might have more control in mass, abusive men also have additional increments of controlling behavior.

Another thing is that we see consistently, and in fact, it's almost way more obvious internationally than perhaps it is any longer here that violence against women is at least in part a product of gender subordination, and is totally caught up in that. Four issues are consistently emerged when you look at cross cultural studies. I have an article that details all of this if you're more interested, because I don't have time to go into it. Norms around male entitlement, or ownership of women, male control of wealth in the family, notions of masculinity linked to male dominance or male honor, which is a very dominant norm of structure in certain cultures, and male control of decision making. So what differences though do we perceive? These are the things that kind of jumped out at you as the same. Briefly, I'll just go through prevalence, manifestations, meanings, degree of acceptability, and opportunities to

overcome violence. One thing that I think is really interesting, and the international literature is perhaps even better at demonstrating this in some of our domestic literature is that the prevalence of violence varies dramatically even within very small distances. This is data from UP, Uder Padesh[?], India, one state in India. It's the same interviewers, the same methodology. They basically were going--and what you see here is that in these different small town villages, there's a three-fold difference in the rate of men, this is a study of men self-admitting having forced their wife to have sex, or having hit his wife in the last year.

Now what accounts for those differences? We need to start to look at that. That's a key. Why is it in one place we have three times the rate? What can we learn about the community factors, the family factors, the socialization, whatever, that goes into creating those rates of difference? Obviously, the specific expressions of violence may vary. We all hear, and in fact the press and everything likes to attend to these kind of what I call an extreme on a continuum. India has bride burning and dowry violence, Bangladesh has acid throwing. But we have men killing women with guns. And to the activists in India that is just as mind blowing to them as it is for us to hear about some of what goes on there. And one of the messages

they always have is that the main problem in India is not bride burning, it's garden variety battering. Bride burning is the extreme manifestation just of their domestic violence problem in the same way that wife murder using guns and homicide is here. Now, one thing that does come out as different is kind of the socially constructed rationale by which people discuss and understand violence. And in large parts of the developing world, wife beating is conceptualized as chastisement, or correction. People talk about wife beating the same way that we hear talk about spanking children. We have a whole cultural debate, I know, going on about the appropriateness of using physical chastisement of children, but I think we relate to that culturally more, you know, you might spank a child for its own good, and we can debate whether that's good or not, but that's a rationale that we put forward. That is a rationale that is put forward as a justification by men and women in terms of wife beating in most parts of the world. It is a necessary thing you do to make women obedient, and if you don't you're not doing your responsibility as a husband. And there's this thin line. It's who can beat whom for what reason. And if you don't stay within that line, then other people will intervene. So if, for example, it's not a good enough reason, if you're beating her and she hasn't done anything wrong, then that's wrong. If you're beating her

and she has done something wrong, then that's okay. If you want to do the next one I'll give you an example of that. Here's two quotes. One is from an indigenous woman in Mexico, one is a rural man in Talmonato in India. The woman says, "I think that if the wife is guilty the husband has the right to hit her. If I had done something wrong, nobody should defend me. But if I haven't done something wrong, I have a right to be defended." The man saying, "If it is a great mistake", meaning if she's done something wrong, "then the husband is justified in beating his wife. Why not? A cow will not be obedient without beatings." You can take any qualitative study from the developing world and you would see this language over and over and over again.

... (INAUDIBLE)

... Well, yeah.

... (INAUDIBLE)

... Yeah, I think you are right. The point I'm trying to make is I think sometimes it's more subtle here, but if you go--some of what's interesting about looking at the international stuff is you see in a more blatant form things that are easy to not see--or not hear as well here. But I think your point is well taken. And I don't mean to be distinguishing. I'm just trying to--we're all on the same continuum.

When are men justified in beating their wives? This

again, there is a difference though in acceptability. I think that there has been the change in our acceptability rate of violence of the normativity. I'm not saying people don't still do it, but I think that what's changed here is the culture environment where people don't feel as free to say yes it's okay. For example, these are women, and if asked under what circumstances is a man justified, does he have a good reason to beat his wife, for refusing sex or for talking back.

... The women saying this?

... This is women here. Can you see the thing? And these two down here, these are men from Papa, New Guinea. These three are Nicaragua. So the first three are women agreement with the acceptability, and the second two are men. I'm not saying it's that much worse in Egypt versus whatever, but what's interesting to me about this is the variation. And so we actually do have quite a bit of variation in where the cultural attitudes toward are about normativity of violence.

This is an obvious one, but I think sometimes we forget. I just came back from Sweden, and I was struck even by the different situation between women here in the U.S. and Sweden in terms of opportunities to escape violence. There any single woman can leave with her children and the state will provide for you. Even if you're married you're given a stipend for all children who were born. Divorce is

easily available. Single motherhood is not stigmatized. That's a very different environment than our colleagues are facing trying to organize around this issue in many parts of the world, including many communities here in the U.S. Where being single is highly stigmatized, there is no room for single women in many cultural settings. The last thing I wanted to do is just share with you a little bit of some of this idea that Kersti was saying about how we can use data to make our case, and looking specifically at health consequences of abuse. This is a slide which just briefly summarizes a lot of what has been shown repeatedly in the literature as being the outcome of domestic violence or sexual or physical abuse in childhood or adulthood for women. Go to the next one.

And I think it's really important for us to be thinking about violence as a risk factor. And that's a concept taken from epidemiology that I found really powerful, which is in study after study you find that compared to non-abused women, women who have been victimized have less physical functioning, more physical symptoms, worse subjective sense of their own health, more lifetime diagnosis, and much higher use of different kind of healthcare services. And that the severity of abuse that they have experienced correlates quite well and quite consistently in almost (INAUDIBLE) response relationship with the severity of the

symptoms that she experiences. So while we tend to, even the medical profession tends to focus on injury, injury is probably the least--I don't want to say the least, but is certainly not the dominant health outcome of being victimized. And there's a concept that I think is incredibly powerful from epidemiology that we've been using quite successfully, which is of population attributable risk. And what that means is it's a concept that estimates what proportion of a health problem could be prevented by eliminating a specific risk factor. If you think about smoking as a risk factor, if you stopped everyone from smoking, how much of heart disease would go down. Likewise, if you could eliminate victimization of women, how much would you affect those various different health outcomes that we have looked at? And what's interesting about this is it depends on two things. Both how strong the relationship is, like how closely you smoke, how much does your risk of lung cancer go up, and how broad, how prevalent that risk factor is in a population. So that even something that's not a particularly strong risk factor in terms of the strengths of the relationship, if it's prevalent throughout the population it can have an enormous impact on the health burden of that problem. Let me give you a couple examples. And again, this is from Mary's work and her colleagues in Nicaragua. Abuse and low birth weight. This is a hospital

case control study which compared infants that were born underweight with normally infants born of normal weight. And then looked at all sorts of exposures to known risk factors for low birth weight, including smoking and prenatal care, prematurity and things. What they find in the study is that physical partner abuse is associated with a four-fold increase in low birth weight after controlling for smoking of substance abuse. So the other strong things.

On a population basis in Leone, in Nicaragua where they did the study, violence contributes 16% of the problems can be attributed to violence, the problem of low birth weight infants. And then there's also things about the mechanism. If you compare that to other known risk factors in this setting, poverty, this is the odds ration. So that means that if you live in poverty, your risk of having a low birth weight infant is twice the same as if you don't live in poverty. If you smoke, it's eight times the risk of having a low infant child. If you have bleeding, it's three times. That's kind of how you interpret those numbers. But if you look over here, in Nicaragua, even though smoking is a really, really strong contributor, not very many people smoke. And so, you end up with violence, which is a four-fold increase risk for an individual, but having a much bigger impact on a population basis of the problem of low birth weight. And in the developing world, low birth weight

that is between the World Health Organization, our NGO, our women's group, and the London School of Hygiene. And these research teams are in Brazil, Thailand, Namibia, Japan, Bangladesh, and Peru. And it's been a really exciting project. I'm hoping we'll have lots more data to share with you in a couple of years like this. (APPLAUSE) (END OF SPEECH)

... I just want to give you a brief--my name is Nanette Benbow and I wanted to give you a brief background as to why it's important to look at this community. As you know, Hispanics are one of the fastest growing minority groups in the U.S. Right now they account for approximately 11% of the population. By the year 2010 it's estimated that they will be the largest minority group in the U.S. And in this context it is crucial to understand their health, their well being, and what things need to be addressed. So for this reason I will be looking at what we know about intimate partner violence in the Hispanic population. And I'll be looking at a number of questions, what is the prevalence of intimate partner violence, how does it compare to other populations, what factors are associated with intimate partner violence, how do battered women address intimate partner violence, and what is needed to further our understanding. And in order to do this, I did an extensive review of the literature using Med Line, online data base,

is a big predictor of infant and child health. I'll give you another one just in terms of child mortality. Here we have, again, a case reference study and the odds. So if you're not abused, your chances of having an infant death, that's under one year, is your reference group. If you have physical or sexual abuse in your relationship, you have twice the risk of having an infant death die in the first year. If you have physical and sexual abuse, which we think is a marker for severity, you have eight times the risk if you're living in Leone, Nicaragua, of losing your child in its first year of life. After controlling for other things that we normally control for for infant death, 33% of child deaths in Leone, Nicaragua can be attributed to physical or sexual abuse by partners. That's a powerful advocacy statistic.

So anyway, we have some more of these. We have it with emotional distress and mental health outcomes. We have a whole variety of different health outcomes. But I guess what we're taking from this is that we need to have more comparable cross-cultural studies, because I think it challenges us to think about our reality a different way when we have (END OF SIDE A) (BEGIN SIDE B) And the last thing I wanted to mention is that we are involved, I think, she mentioned it early on, with a collaborative study with women's groups and research institutions in six countries

web searches, it's everything I could. And identified 20 studies that had detailed information on Hispanic women. Once I had that information I just tried to align each of these studies, so I was able to compare and know exactly how these things could be compared. So I had a series of complicated tables which I stared at for many, many days. And in doing so, I realized very early on how difficult it was to try to summarize what we knew about domestic violence in this population. And among the many difficulties in trying to estimate the prevalence and understanding the factors associated with physical violence are differences and the purpose of the study, the definition of abuse used, the data collection method, whether it was self-administered, a phone interview, face-to-face, type of sample, whether it was population based or clinic based, and demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the sample. Having said this is a big caveat, we still had the need to sort of get an idea of the prevalence of physical intimate partner violence amongst Hispanics. And what I did is I just kind of aligned all these studies with the aforementioned caveats, and identified roughly most of the measures were physical violence, many of them were either using the CTS, Conflict Tactic Scale, or a modified version of the Conflict Tactic Scale, or something called the Abuse Assessment Screen. At any rate, all of them basically

described abuse describing actions as opposed to just asking a woman whether she has been abused. I identified five studies that provided some sort of an estimate on domestic violence, intimate partner abuse, and we found that anywhere between 13-17% of Hispanic women had experienced physical abuse within the last year by the intimate partner. There were two studies that provided those estimates. In studies looking at lifetime abuse there weren't any that looked specifically at Hispanics. They broke it down by Hispanic subgroups. For Mexicans, 11% were estimated to have experienced physical abuse within the last year. There were no calculations for women born in Mexico, but among Mexican American women 18% had experienced physical abuse within the last year, 20% of Puerto Ricans, 3% of Cubans, and the rate of abuse among non-Hispanic women rate between 10-28%. And then I also provide the estimates for abuse during lifetime. Once again, all these differences in studies bring up a lot of crucial issues as to whether we can compare these or not, but we do have to have something to look at. Then the question is when looking at all these rates, are these differences significant? Yes?

... (INAUDIBLE)

... Yes. How do these--in looking at these rates you might have noticed differences in the magnitude of rates, so then the question is how do these rates compare across

populations, and which of these are significant and which ones aren't? The literature when possible did try to explore this, and pretty much found that significant differences and intimate partner violence were observed between non-Hispanic White and Hispanic women, between non-Hispanic White and Mexican American, between Mexican born and U.S. born women, and between Puerto Rican and Cuban women. Most of these differences disappeared when considering other factors. Yes?

... (INAUDIBLE)

... Yes, I will be getting into them. So the question is what factors are associated with intimate partner violence. Yes?

... (INAUDIBLE)

... Yes, of 20 studies.

... (INAUDIBLE)

... I'm not. Each one had a different definition, so I think we can only keep those differences in mind, and that's definitely one of the major problems in this research, in the body of current research. Regarding what factors are associated with intimate partner violence, I tried to identify both protective factors and risk factors. There wasn't unfortunately that much on protective factors, but two studies did identify social support and mutuality as measured by the empathy, communication and understanding a

mutual respect in a relationship as factors that contribute to decline--or to a lower level of prevalence of abuse. The risk factors associated with intimate partner violence were acculturation, defined as a process of learning and acquiring the values and behaviors of a new culture, demographic and socioeconomic indicators, such as age, urban residence, employment, income, education, partner's alcohol use with the level of use, cultural norms measured by approval of violence and gender roles, and pregnancy. I'll just describe briefly each one of these. When looking at acculturation, when they were able to measure acculturation, among Hispanics significant differences in the rate of physical abuse were observed when measuring acculturation based on place of birth, length of time in the U.S., number of generations in the U.S., and other measures of acculturation. And once again, the studies varied depending on whether this was information on the abusive partner or information on the wife. And that's one of the big problems in the research.

... (INAUDIBLE)

... Oh, I'm sorry, higher levels of abuse due to acculturation, due to these measures of acculturation.

... (INAUDIBLE)

... Was associated with a higher level of abuse, yes. Three out of the six, I don't want to call it studies,

because some studies analyze things in different ways, three of the six analysis using language preference as a measure of acculturation did not identify significant differences in the prevalence of abuse. Among the demographic and socioeconomic factors found differences in the rates of physical abuse between Hispanic and non-Hispanic White women disappeared when controlling for age, unemployment, urban residence. And most things did not happen, and one factor wasn't sort of independently related to this. These factors really did intertwine and combined seemed to reduce the incidence of abuse. Two of the four studies did not find income directly related to abuse, which brings us back to the point that Lori said that more needs to be explored in that area. And one of the two studies looking at women's indication did not find this to be related with abuse. And once again, men's education doesn't seem to be something that has been considered in the literature.

Partner's alcohol use, and as I mentioned earlier, more like the level of abuse, two studies examining the relationship between the perpetrator's alcohol consumption and the prevalence of physical abuse found this to be a positive association. So the higher--the more the husband drank, the more likely there was to be physical abuse. Cultural norms were measured in a number of different ways in the research. Studies measuring approval of violence,

two studies, found that this was related to wife abuse. Husband's belief and not the woman's belief in traditional gender roles were found to be associated with higher prevalence of physical abuse. And women's independence is measured by her contribution to the family income was associated with an increased level of physical abuse.

In terms of pregnancy there really had been a number of studies looking at the relationship between abuse in pregnancy, but very few of them, I can think of only two or three, and this only represents two studies that actually looked at, or collected sufficient data, adequate data to look at differences between Hispanics and non-Hispanic Whites, or even Hispanic sub-groups. Among pregnant women attending public and private clinics, there were no significant differences in the prevalence of abuse during pregnancy between non-Hispanic White and Hispanic women. And one study of pregnant and recently pregnant women identified significant Hispanic subgroup differences in the prevalence of physical abuse during pregnancy with Puerto Rican women at higher risk than Mexican, Cuban and Central American women of experiencing abuse.

... (INAUDIBLE)

... Yeah, and the author of this study does a nice deal of talking about this. I think initially contributing significantly to the income may definitely provoke sort of

the husband's anger, and threaten his power and control in the relationship.

... (INAUDIBLE)

... Right. So I think it's measuring exactly, I think it's really sort of getting to the point of traditional gender roles that are being threatened, right. The next question I tried to look at is how do battered women address intimate partner violence? What do they do? What do Hispanic women do? Who do they turn to? Unfortunately, there were a couple of great studies, but not many, as was the case with almost everything. Results from six studies examining some level of help seeking found that compared to non-Hispanic White battered women, Hispanics were less likely to report abuse to law enforcement, use psychologists and mental health services, and seek help in general. Less acculturated women were less likely to use help sources and more likely to turn to clergy. Mexican American women were more likely to turn to friends and family members than Mexican and Puerto Rican women. And I think this does sort of speak to the idea of the fact that there does seem to be service under utilization in this community, and that there is perhaps a stronger preference for some services.

Among the barriers to help seeking, I was able to identify only one study, which wasn't looking specifically at battered women, but was a study of immigrant women, 65%

of which had been battered. They asked why they had not sought help, and among the things identified were the fear of immigration problems such as deportation, not knowing that the service or help existed, or not being able to communicate with the service provider due to language.

I think the research thus far has done a good deal at giving us an idea of what things we need to look at, but I don't think there's really anyone who's been quite conclusive in its findings. For example, results regarding the effect of acculturation suggests that the contradictory results suggest that we might need to consider improving the way to measure acculturation, especially since depending on how we measured it, obtain different results. And we need to examine the relationship between acculturation and socially desired responses from the Hispanic population, self-disclosure of abuse, social isolation. So maybe acculturation is measuring these things and we just need to distinguish that. And I think we need to have more cross national comparisons and compare rates of abuse between ethnic groups here and those with their country of origin so we can get an idea of what differences exist as a result of perhaps of living in this country, and the stresses and environment involved.

... (INAUDIBLE)

... Is that in the context of cross national studies?

... (INAUDIBLE)

... These are all women who are now living in the U.S. All of these studies were conducted in the U.S. It's all here, but some of them recently arrived, some of them are third generation, and that is sort of what is being measured as acculturation, or is being attempted to be measured.

... (INAUDIBLE)

... Exactly. That was one of the barriers, right. The literatures certainly did point out at possible differences between Hispanic subgroups, and I think that really does need to be explored, so we need to design studies to examine Hispanic subgroup differences and similarities in the prevalence and characteristics of abuse both within and between Hispanic subgroups. Up until now most of the studies have been raised comparative, and none one them except with a few exceptions have actually been designed and have been thought of just of one specific population, and trying to understand what is happening in that population, and trying to create things that are race comparative, I think sometimes you lose detail in what you want to look at to understand the specific population. One also needs to conduct ethnographic studies to explore the relationship between intimate partner violence and cultural norm, barriers to help seeking, attitudes towards wife abuse, and in general the environment and dynamics of intimate

relationships. Finally, contradictory results in some of the factors that we observed suggest that we need to conduct longitudinal research to identify factors with intimate partner violence, the relationship between the factors we identified, compare Hispanic battered women with their non-violent counterparts, and compare Hispanic batterers with their non-violent counterparts. I think thus far the research has been predominantly quantitative and race comparative, and I think now we need to start looking a little bit closer at these groups and understand what's happening within these groups.

... (INAUDIBLE)

... Yes I do, yes. Sorry. (END OF SPEECH)

... My name is Eileen Luna, and I teach American Indian Studies Law and Policy to University of Arizona. For the past three years I have been conducting an evaluation of tribal stop grant programs that are aimed at reducing violence against women on Indian reservations and of tribal members. I've been doing this with a team of graduate students, so we've had some interesting experiences as we roamed the country, going to various reservations and trying to figure out how these programs were working. Because I've been working with graduate students and trying to train both law students and PHD students in how to do research, and coming to grips with some of the ideas that what happens

when you're doing research in Indian communities, eight out of 10 of the graduate students have been native, are native, but were from all different tribes, all different reservations. And the Indian peoples of this country are very different, culturally very different, politically very different. And so we tried to come up with a set of rules that talked about what does it mean to do research in Indian communities. Probably what does it mean to do research in any community, but certainly what does it mean to do research in our community. So we've tried to come up with a set of guidelines for folks, and I heard it discussed earlier as, and I think that makes sense, that active research, that good idea that we are part of the process, that we are indelibly part of the process, that everyone who has come before us has created the environment within which we work, and everyone who comes after us is affected by how we operated in that community.

So we put a big emphasis on truthfulness, on telling people exactly what it is they can expect, and telling them that if at any point you feel uncomfortable, stop us. We give them gifts at the beginning because that's part of our culture. We also think it makes sense, and we tell them this is a gift. If you want to stop right this second it's okay with us. We believe strongly that our research has to help develop communities, that we're not there to take away

knowledge for personal gain, we're not there in our struggles for tenure, or our struggles for teaching positions in universities. We're there to help create an environment within which these programs can grow, and within which these people can be safe. So that's essentially what we're doing with that. I think in order to understand a little bit of what we're doing I have to turn that off and give you a mini-lecture, which I will spare you most of it because I'm sure that some of you know some of this at least.

In terms of Indian law there are 549 tribes in the United States, and they are sovereign nations. They're what's called domestic dependent nations. It means that we are sovereign, we are like a protectorate, like Guam. We have not given up our sovereignty by accepting the protection of the United States. So what does that mean? That means that within this country there are 549 plus tribal governments with which the United States has decided to act as equals. And what has happened since 1994? Well, it originally happened in 1979, but there's been a commitment to self-determination of Indian peoples. And the Clinton administration has done incredibly well in terms of dealing with tribal nations, Indian nations as equals. There was a self-determination act in 1994, there was an executive order that required that all federal agencies deal

with the tribal governments on a nation to nation basis. That affects how the tribal government run programs with now federal money. So what happened in 1994 with the Violence Against Women Act was it was put into the Act that states, local government, and tribal nations, Indian nations would get money directly from the federal government. Then a cataclysm hit, because not only did they say that we could get money directly from the federal government to run the programs ourselves, this is a big change. It used to all come through the Bureau of Indian Affairs. We used to have very little to do with how the federal program got implemented in Indian country. So 1994 the Vowa[?] Act comes along, and they say okay, the tribal governments are going to get this money directly, and you get 4%. Well 4% of \$1.6 billion is a lot of money. It's particularly a lot of money when tribal peoples are only 1% of the population in this country. We're about two million people, but there's what, 230 million people in the United States. I think that's close to 1%. 4% of the money is a lot of money. So on one hand that's very good.

On the other hand, remember what I said about the BIA, tribal governments for years, for 150 years, or whatever it is, have been subjected to the federal government telling us what to do and how to do it, and they would take care of it. And all of a sudden in the late '80s and early '90s we now

have the privilege and the responsibility of building these institutions to provide services for our own people ourselves. And we're also dealing with the federal government in terms of what do those guidelines mean? How does it work? I'm going to take you through a little bit of that in terms of the tribal governments, because the Tribal Stop Grant Funds, which are the funds that are funding these programs in Indian country. Have four components. Law enforcement, lots of tribes don't have law enforcement. Prosecution, lots of tribes don't have prosecution. Victim services, they now have victim services.

And then a miscellaneous column which is used for data collection, hardly any data collection, code and protocol development, this is new, because the Bureau of Indian Affairs used to have all the protocols and all the policies. So what's happened has been a significant change in Indian country in terms of not only providing the services, but trying to move ahead with code and ordinance and program development, and institutions of democratic government development all within tribal governments which are generally small. Two million people in the United States who are native, but the average tribal size is 1,500. There's 200,000 Navajo, and 200,000 plus Cherokee, but the rest of the tribes, the average size tribe is 1,500, which creates an issue in terms of how developed do your

procedures and policies and institutions and rules need to be when you're talking about servicing 1,500 people, and you're also talking about 60% of native people are urban, 40% are still living on reservations. So although people come and go, and a lot of us who are raised in urban areas go home and send our kids home, we don't necessarily live there all the time. So a tribe can build a structure for providing services for a population that half of the folks are living in Tucson, or Seattle, or somewhere. So that's just a little bit of the issue that exists in terms of dealing with my study.

The Stop Grant Funds, as I said, are services, training officers and prosecutors. And so what we've been doing, we've been doing it for three years, we have completed the first two years of the study, and are now into the third year. We have three basic goals, which you can read there. I promised my son I would use this, he gave it to me for Christmas. It's Indian study. See, it has a little red arrow. (LAUGHTER) To develop a basic understanding of the cultural legal contacts of reducing violence against women, to evaluate the impact of the programs, and to recommend improvements for existing programs. That's what we're trying to do. We're trying to help develop these programs as well. We consider that part of our job. In the first two years of the study there were 14 tribes that got money.

59 tribes applied for money in 1195, 14 got them. So of those 14 we did indepth site visits on all 14. We spent time at each reservation, we interviewed everybody we could talk to, and we wrote a report that's gone to NIJ that supposedly is going to be published hopefully in December, which will be from what we can tell sort of the first indepth study of tribal domestic violence program. Now in the third year of our study there is now 100 tribes that have gotten money directly from the federal government. And so what we are doing is a sample. We're doing a total of 15 tribes, three longitudinal from the original 14, and an additional 12 of the folks who didn't get money in the first round have gotten it since.

General findings. Well, this is probably the case in lots of places, but leadership in some tribes is enthusiastic, but for other tribes it's not a priority. When you are dealing with unemployment of 60%, 70%, 80%, massive poverty levels, all sorts of violence in addition to domestic violence, massive educational problems, domestic violence is an issue but it may not be that high on the list, frankly. And so, that becomes a problem. We also have people on tribal councils who have experienced with battery themselves. You know, this is not an issue that they particularly want to have addressed. This is a problem. Second finding, we're going to talk about this a

Calimity is international law that says if I get a court order in the United States, and I go to England, that England will courteously recognize my court order. But it is not mandated. It's discretionary. So, if Indian people go with calimity as the demand, we're building in the discretion that we might not want to have. But if we go with full faith and credit, to some of us we're saying wait a minute, we're not a state, this doesn't cover us, and we don't want it to cover us. So it becomes a problem that is under discussion in Indian country, and it is as yet unresolved.

... (INAUDIBLE)

... And that's the issue. That's the issue, because tribal governments and tribal courts do not necessarily look like the courts of a U.S. sovereign.

... (INAUDIBLE)

... Due process doesn't apply to the tribes. Because the constitution does not apply to the tribes, and the Bill of Rights does not apply to the tribes. What applies to the tribe is called the Indian Civil Rights Act, which does not include the same kind of issues of due process that are included in the Bill of Rights. So, in order to resolve this, the federal government and the Department of Justice has taken the position that if you get Vowa money you have to recognize the other court orders. But this is not a

little bit. The full faith in credit is required under the Violence Against Women Act. So for court orders they are supposed to recognize each others court orders. Tribal governments or sovereign. We're not in the constitution. So, when full faith and credit is discussed by Congress, it doesn't necessarily apply to us. There's a question whether it's more appropriate that we're talking about full faith and credit or where it's more appropriate if we're talking about calmity [?], yes.

... (INAUDIBLE).

... You bet. Not only doesn't it apply back into the courts of the sovereign of the federal government, state government, it doesn't apply from tribe to tribe. The tribes are sovereign.

... (INAUDIBLE)

... But they don't.

... (INAUDIBLE)

... Right.

... (INAUDIBLE)

... We can't get the tribes to honor each others court orders, let alone state and federal. This is an issue. And all I'm saying is it's a problem. For Indian people, we don't particularly like full faith and credit anyway, because full faith and credit applies to the states. We're nations. What applies to us is the concept of calmity.

clean issue for a lot of the tribes, because a lot of that comes down to rules and regulations for their courts that they don't particularly want to enact. And a lot of the tribes don't even have courts. So what do you do then? It's a problem. And then there's Public Law 280. Public Law 280, and I have a chart on that, which I may relieve you of, but anyway, basically what Public Law 280 is is a termination era law from the early '50s when they were terminating tribal government that says the federal law, the federal rights to exercise authority on Indian country are transferred to some of the states, some particular states that had lots of Indians. Well, that means that the state has the authority to act in Indian country. That's a problem, because the tribes have problems with most of the states. But it's also a problem because the states cannot tax the tribes. So Indian land is sacrosanct. They can't tax it. So if they can't tax it, they don't want to give services, right? I mean, that's how that works. So, Public Law 280 continues to plague us. And I'll put up a chart in a minute that shows you how pervasive that problem is.

Law enforcement quality is a major issue. A lot of tribes, one, don't have law enforcement. But those that do, a lot of them really pay very little, the training component is problematic, lots of the police officers are not state certified because the tribe does not want their police to

act like police of the state. They want them to act like police that belong to the tribe. So, the training gets troublesome. Because it means that the training won't be done by the state, because they're not state certified, so it means the tribe has to do it, or the federal government has to do it. And there's also a lot of turnover, because these guys don't make much money. For example, at White River Apache Tribe pays \$13,000 for a tribal police officer. I mean, that's what we're dealing with. Now, that person is lucky, because if you've got an 80% unemployment rate in the reservation, that person at least has a job. But you're not talking about people who make a lot, and there's a lot of turnover. There's also incredible difficulty hiring or retraining prosecutors. Lawyers, the minute they get any experience go to the big city. So we may be able to hire some of my students, they may get them out there and start them to work, and they put in six months, but the minute they get some training or some experience they go somewhere else. Unless they're part of that community. And so what's happened is there's been a real difficulty hiring or retaining prosecutors. And so the tribes are coming up with other ways to deal with the prosecution requirement and component. Lots of communication difficulties at the tribal governments between the police, between the victim services, between the courts. Those kind of structures that are set

up often don't talk to each other. And this is something we see in the majority community too. I mean, I spent a lot of time working with law enforcement in the majority community, and they don't talk to anybody else either. So this is not distinct for tribal governments, but it's a problem.

The other is shelters. Shelters generally don't work in Indian country. Most of our population, the rural population, the tribal population is pretty far spread out. A shelter that sits there empty or one at a time people coming in is an expensive proposition. They've developed some other components called safe houses where people can go for two or three days, but it doesn't have any long term situation. If you move an Indian woman and her children to a shelter in Rapid City, for example, what have you done to that woman? You forcibly urbanized her. And urbanization is not something we are okay with anymore, generally. Particularly on a forced basis. So, the shelters are generally run by non-Indian people, they are not culturally compatible or comfortable for a lot of reservation women. So, how to deal with the shelter issue is a critical problem, and it isn't resolved as easily as it can be in another community.

I've only got a couple of minutes here, so I'm going to put up one table here. Just to give you a sense of how the law enforcement component works, policing. For the first

14, you can see we're all over the map. Four contract, they're policing from the federal government under the Public Law 638. Four contract, they're policed under self-governance, which means they get the money and they get to do whatever they want. Two have their police under Public Law 280, which is a problem. Two tribes use VIA police. That's also a problem, because the tribe can develop a domestic violence code, but the Bureau police work for the Bureau. They don't work for the tribe. It's just like a Public Law 280 problem. Because if the police of the state, if the tribe develops a domestic violence code, they can tell the police of the state that they wanted to do it that way, but they're not necessarily going to be able to make them do it, because the police don't answer to the tribe. So, that's part of the problem.

In terms of code, some tribes had DV codes before the grant. Two are developing codes. Three had codes passed. One tribe is revising it, and one tribe has no intention of developing a domestic violence code. So, they're all over the map. It's very different, and the main thing to understand when you're dealing with Indian country, or you're reading anything about Indian country is the 549 Indian nations in this country are all different. It is as if you were dealing with 549 United States. So you can't make any presumptions. You can't assume that something is

going to work, and not only can't you assume it's not going to work, but you shouldn't assume that something that works in the majority community is necessarily going to work in Indian country, or is necessarily going to be welcomed to even have the discussion in Indian country. So, that's predominantly what we found. They've come up with a lot of innovative approaches. They've come up with some things called, for example, with prosecution, prosecutorial advocates, where people who live in that community get trained as people who go to court with victims, who help them through the court process, who talk to the judges if there's a judge, who basically function in many ways as a prosecutor, but who are not attorneys. Because the minute they get a law degree they want to go to Rapid City, or they want to go to Chicago. They don't want to stay on some reservation some place in the real rural area. But a community person is part of that community, some stay there. And so there's been some developments of those kinds of things that I think are real exciting. And that's some of the stuff that's happening in Indian country that hopefully could even be a model for some of the stuff that's happening in the majority community. So anyway, that's where we are, and that's what we know. Thank you. (APPLAUSE) (END OF SPEECH) (END OF TRANSCRIPTION)