Sourcebook on VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Third Edition

Claire M. Renzetti
Jeffrey L. Edleson
Raquel Kennedy Bergen

Sourcebook on VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Third Edition

For Charles (Terry) Hendrix, with our gratitude for your foresight in publishing, your care and concern for victims of violence, your support and encouragement of us over many years and, most of all, your unwavering friendship.

Sara Miller McCune founded SAGE Publishing in 1965 to support the dissemination of usable knowledge and educate a global community. SAGE publishes more than 1000 journals and over 800 new books each year, spanning a wide range of subject areas. Our growing selection of library products includes archives, data, case studies and video. SAGE remains majority owned by our founder and after her lifetime will become owned by a charitable trust that secures the company's continued independence.

Los Angeles | London | New Delhi | Singapore | Washington DC | Melbourne

Sourcebook on **VIOLENCE** AGAINST WOMEN

Third Edition

Claire M. Renzetti
University of Kentucky

Jeffrey L. Edleson
University of California, Berkeley

Raquel Kennedy Bergen
Saint Joseph' s University

Los Angeles | London | New Delhi
Singapore | Washington DC | Melbourne

FOR INFORMATION:

SAGE Publications, Inc.
2455 Teller Road
Thousand Oaks, California 91320
E-mail: order@sagepub.com

SAGE Publications Ltd.
1 Oliver's Yard
55 City Road
London, EC1Y 1SP
United Kingdom

SAGE Publications India Pvt. Ltd.
B 1/I 1 Mohan Cooperative Industrial Area
Mathura Road, New Delhi 110 044
India

SAGE Publications Asia-Pacific Pte. Ltd.
3 Church Street
#10–04 Samsung Hub
Singapore 049483

Acquisitions Editor: Nathan Davidson
Editorial Assistant: Alex Helmintoller
Production Editor: Andrew Olson
Copy Editor: Jared Leighton
Typesetter: Hurix Systems Pvt. Ltd.
Proofreader: Eleni-Maria Georgiou
Indexer: Kathleen Paparchontis
Cover Designer: Karine Hovsepian
Marketing Manager: Katherine Hepburn

Copyright © 2018 by SAGE Publications, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Renzetti, Claire M., editor. | Edleson, Jeffrey L., editor. | Bergen, Raquel Kennedy, editor.

Title: Sourcebook on violence against women / [edited by] Claire M. Renzetti, University of Kentucky, Jeffrey L. Edleson, University of California Berkeley, School of Social Welfare, Raquel Kennedy Bergen, Saint Joseph's University.

Description: Third Edition. | Thousand Oaks : SAGE Publications, Inc., [2017] | Revised edition of Sourcebook on violence against women, c2011. | Includes index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2016045099 | ISBN 9781483378107 (pbk. : alk. paper)

Subjects: LCSH: Women–Crimes against. | Abused women. | Family violence. | Sex discrimination against women.

Classification: LCC HV6250.4.W65 S68 2017 | DDC 362.82/92—dc23 LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2016045099

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

17 18 19 20 21 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

CONTENTS

Preface viii
About the Editors x

PART I: THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES IN RESEARCHING VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN 1

1: A Brief History of Anti-Violence Against Women Movements in the United States 3
Jami Ake & Gretchen Arnold

Current Controversies: Coercive Control 26
Evan Stark

In the Field: When Victims of Battering Are Charged With Crimes 29
Sue Osthoff

2: Explaining Violence Against Women Within the Context of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) 31
Angela R. Gover, Tara N. Richards, & Maria J. Patterson

Current Controversies: Substance Use and Intimate Partner Violence 51
Larry W. Bennett

3: The Challenges of Measuring Violence Against Women 57
Diane R. Follingstad

Current Controversies: Are Women Really as Violent as Men? The "Gender Symmetry" Controversy 78
Sherry Hamby

PART II: TYPES OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN **83**

4: Rape and Sexual Assault on Campus, in Diverse Populations, and in the Spotlight **85**
Tracy N. Hipp & Sarah L. Cook

Current Controversies: Disadvantage as a Catalyst for Sexual Victimization **102**
Callie Marie Rennison

5: Intimate Partner Violence **109**
Alesha Durfee

Current Controversies: Gender-Based Violence Against Immigrant and Refugee Women: Heightened Vulnerabilities and Barriers to Help-Seeking **135**
Anita Raj & Jennifer B. Yore

In the Field: A Luxurious Reflection on Fearlessness **141**
Sudha Shetty

6: Sexual Harassment Is Still Violence Against Women at Work **143**
Phoebe Morgan

7: Gender-Based Violence in Schools **159**
Laura E. Agnich, Jun Sung Hong, & Anthony A. Peguero

Current Controversies: Technology-Facilitated Sexual Violence **181**
Nicola Henry & Anastasia Powell

8: Sexual Victimization and Domestic Violence Against Elderly Women **187**
Michelle Meloy & Nicole Cunningham

9: Human Trafficking: A Spotlight on Sex Trafficking **203**
Dominique Roe-Sepowitz & Kristine Hickle

Current Controversies: Pornography and Violence Against Women **219**
Matthew B. Ezzell

In the Field: Working to End Sex Trafficking **226**
Eliza Reock

PART III: PROGRAMS THAT WORK **229**

10: Innovative Criminal Justice Responses to Sexual Violence **231**
LeeAnn Iovanni, Susan L. Miller, & Emily Rowe

In the Field: Would You Rather Be Right or Be Effective? **254**
Dorothy J. Edwards

11: Innovative Criminal Justice Responses to Intimate Partner Violence **257**
Leigh Goodmark

Current Controversies: Economic-Empowerment Programs for Women Who Have Experienced Abuse **275**
Claire M. Renzetti

12: Intervening With Children Exposed to Domestic Violence: Multiple Opportunities to Prevent Harm and Promote Resilience **281**
Claire V. Crooks, Peter G. Jaffe, & Caely Dunlop

13: Innovative Health Care Responses to Violence Against Women **305**
Elizabeth Miller, Michele R. Decker, & Nancy Glass

Current Controversies: Programs for Women Who Have Used Force in Intimate Relationships **320**
Lisa Young Larance

In the Field: Working to Make a Difference **325**
Debi Cain

14: Engaging Men in Violence Prevention **327**
Richard M. Tolman & Tova Walsh

In the Field: Intervening With Men Who Batter **350**
David J. H. Garvin

15: Services for Survivors of Sexual Violence: Moving From Core to Comprehensive Services **353**
Stephanie M. Townsend & Rebecca Campbell

Index **373**

Preface

Fifteen years ago, we published the first edition of the *Sourcebook on Violence Against Women*. It was 10 years before the second edition appeared but only five more years for this third edition. This is due, at least in part, to the success of the previous editions but also to the burgeoning growth of research on violence against women. Although in this edition some familiar topics and debates are reviewed, readers will also find newly emerging issues in the field.

The third edition of the *Sourcebook on Violence Against Women* is composed of 15 chapters organized into three parts: theoretical and methodological issues in researching violence against women (Chapters 1–3); types of violence against women (Chapters 4–9); and, new to this edition, programs that work (Chapters 10–15). Each part opens with a brief introduction that previews the forthcoming chapters. Each chapter is original and was written specifically for this volume. As in the previous two editions, one of our goals was to be thorough in coverage, but it is impossible to include all of the topics worthy of discussion while keeping the book to a manageable size. We asked authors to give attention to diversity issues and cultural contexts and to discuss, whenever possible, the intersecting effects of inequalities of race and ethnicity, social class, physical ability and disability, age, sexual orientation, and geographic location. Some of the topics that were covered in the previous editions—for example, explanatory frameworks for studying and explaining violence against women, sexual violence, and intimate partner violence—are also included in this edition. But among the chapters new to this edition are a historical account of the anti-violence against women movement, gender-based violence in schools, violence against elderly women, and human trafficking. Another significant change is the focus on innovative prevention and intervention programs that evaluation studies are showing to have positive outcomes—for both victims and perpetrators. Once again, our objective is less to provide exhaustive coverage and more to encourage discussion and debate about critically important issues. To that end, we have also included brief discussions of some of the most pressing current controversies in the violence-against-women field, such as the gender symmetry debate, the role of substance use in intimate and sexual violence, technology-facilitated sexual violence and harassment, and how pornography may contribute to violence against women.

Also, in this edition, readers will find autobiographical essays written by practitioners and advocates working in the violence-against-women field. These six individuals reflect on how they got involved in the work they do, what motivates them to do this work, their “aha moments,” and what they consider to be the greatest rewards—and the greatest challenges—of the

work they do. Finally, they discuss their hopes and concerns for the future of the field. Our goals in commissioning these autobiographical reflections were to expose students, in particular, to the diverse work that's being done on the "frontlines" of the anti-violence against women movement and to help them see themselves doing this work. In short, we hope student readers will be inspired by these essays and, consequently, will seriously consider a career in an antiviolence profession.

Acknowledgments

As in the previous two editions, the ordering of the editorship for this book is arbitrary; the labor was shared equally among the editors, and the end product is the result of the genuine teamwork that characterized the entire editing process. And as with the previous two editions, we have incurred many debts in producing this book, so it's time to say thank you. First, we thank Charles (Terry) Hendrix, retired editor extraordinaire of books on interpersonal violence for SAGE. It was Terry who planted the idea for the first edition of the *Sourcebook* in our heads 15 years ago and encouraged us to pursue this project and many others, which is why we dedicate this book to him. We miss working with Terry, but we are delighted that he continues to enjoy a very full life that includes opera, travel, and time with good friends. We also thank Kassie Graves, who was our SAGE editor until just a few months ago; Abbie Rickard and Nathan Davidson, who took the helm when Kassie moved on; production editor Andrew Olson; and copy editor Jared Leighton. The book is better for your attention and care. The changes we have made in this edition incorporate the suggestions of many faculty, researchers, practitioners, and especially our students, and we thank them all for taking the time to share their ideas and feedback on the second edition. Of course, we are indebted to the authors of this edition of the *Sourcebook*. We thank them for making time in their already busy schedules to contribute to the book, and we see this as further evidence of their unflagging commitment to ending violence against women.

Claire Renzetti wishes to acknowledge her sons, Sean and Aidan Curran, because not a day goes by that they do not make her intensely proud of the men they have grown up to be: gentle men who respect others, appreciate difference, and seek nonviolent solutions to disagreements and conflict. She also extends her thanks to her colleagues in the Sociology Department at the University of Kentucky and the University's Center for Research on Violence Against Women. The professionalism and friendship of these individuals both inspire and sustain her on a daily basis.

Jeffrey Edleson wishes to acknowledge Sudha Shetty, who transforms his life every day, and their growing family anchored by their four boys: Nevin, Daniel, Neil, and Eli. He also wishes to extend thanks to his colleagues at two great public universities—the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, and the University of California, Berkeley—who have supported his work over the 15 years that the editions of this *Sourcebook* have evolved.

Raquel Kennedy Bergen wishes to acknowledge her children, Michael Ryan and Devon, who teach her the importance of loving, supportive relationships every day. She is also grateful to Saint Joseph's University for the support of her work over the past 25 years as well as her Rape Education Prevention Program (REPP) students, who exemplify commitment and passion for ending violence against women.

Finally, we are grateful to each other for hard work, collegiality, patience, and, most of all, our friendship over many years—and many projects. With every project on which we have collaborated, we have brought energy, good humor, and mutual support to nurture one another through good times and bad, both personal and professional. Such relationships are far too rare, which is all the more reason that we cherish them.

SAGE Publishing acknowledges the contributions of the following reviewers: Barrie Levy, University of California; Carolyn Slotten, Miami University; Diana L. Bruns, Southeast Missouri State University; and Etta J. Caver, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.

About the Editors

Claire M. Renzetti, PhD, is the Judi Conway Patton Endowed Chair in the Center for Research on Violence Against Women and professor and chair of the Sociology Department at the University of Kentucky. She is editor of the international, interdisciplinary journal, *Violence Against Women*; coeditor, with Jeffrey Edleson, of the Interpersonal Violence book series for Oxford University Press; and editor of the Gender and Justice book series for the University of California Press. She has authored or edited 21 books, as well as numerous book chapters and articles in professional journals. Much of her research has focused on the violent-victimization experiences of socially and economically marginalized women. Her current research includes an evaluation of a horticultural therapy program at a shelter for battered women, studies examining the relationship between religiosity and intimate partner violence perpetration and victimization, and an evaluation of coordinated community services for human-trafficking victims. Dr. Renzetti has held elected and appointed positions on the governing bodies of several national professional organizations, including the Society for the Study of Social Problems (president), the American Society of Criminology (executive officer), the Eastern Sociological Society (treasurer), and Alpha Kappa Delta, the sociological honors society (president). She has been honored by the Women and Crime Division of the American Society of Criminology with the Saltzman Award for Contributions to Practice, an award that recognizes a criminologist whose professional accomplishments have increased the quality of justice and the level of safety for women. She is also the 2011 recipient of the Lee Founders Award from the Society for the Study of Social Problems, in recognition of significant lifetime achievements in research, teaching, and service leading to the betterment of human life. In 2014, she was inducted into the Alumni Wall of Fame by the University of Delaware Alumni Association.

Jeffrey L. Edleson, PhD, is dean and the Harry and Riva Specht Chair in Publicly Supported Social Services at the University of California, Berkeley, School of Social Welfare. He is professor emeritus in the University of Minnesota School of Social Work and founding director of the Minnesota Center Against Violence and Abuse. He has published more than 130 articles and 12 books on domestic

violence, group work, and program evaluation. Edleson recently served on the U.S. National Advisory Council on Violence Against Women and is a fellow of the American Academy of Social Work and Social Welfare.

Raquel Kennedy Bergen is a professor of sociology at Saint Joseph's University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. She received her BS from Saint Joseph's University in sociology and her PhD in sociology from the University of Pennsylvania. She is the author or coauthor of numerous scholarly publications and nine books on violence against women, including *Wife Rape: Understanding the Response of Survivors and Service Providers* and *Issues in Intimate Violence*. With Claire Renzetti and Jeff Edleson she edited the *Sourcebook on Violence Against Women* and *Violence Against Women: Classic Statements*. She coedited *Violence Against Women: Readings From Social Problems* with Claire Renzetti. She is the current chair of Gender Studies at Saint Joseph's and the faculty moderator for the Rape Education Prevention Program. Her area of expertise is sexual violence in intimate partnerships, and she regularly provides workshops around the country to domestic violence and rape crisis programs to address this form of violence. She has volunteered as an advocate for battered women and sexual-assault survivors for the past 27 years. Her current research continues in the field of violence against women—analyzing the intersection of women's experiences of physical, sexual, and emotional violence with their partners during pregnancy.

Part I

Theoretical and Methodological Issues in Researching Violence Against Women

When confronted with facts about the prevalence and severity of violence against women in its many forms, many people, not surprisingly, want "something" to be done to address it. In Section III of this book, contributors discuss a variety of programs and practices designed to prevent violence against women and to help those who have been victimized. But this activism is not new, as Gretchen Arnold and Jami Ake demonstrate in the their chapter, which opens Section I. Arnold and Ake trace the history and development of the battered women's and antirape movements in the United States, documenting their successes, such as legislative reforms, but also noting the challenges that remain. The authors also discuss the debate surrounding the criminalization of intimate partner violence and how communities of color are disproportionately bearing the burden of this type of response. While measurable progress has been made in increasing women's safety, addressing the needs of victims, and holding perpetrators accountable, it is clear that substantially more must be done. Fortunately, as Arnold and Ake discuss, "new voices" have come forward to lead the anti-violence against women movement, developing strategies and programs from an intersectional framework that more effectively respond to diverse groups of victims. Some of these efforts are discussed further in Section III.

One of the questions frequently raised with regard to violence against women is, why does it happen? Why are women violently victimized, particularly by people—usually men—whom they know, trust, and often love and who claim to love them? In Chapter 2, Angela Gover, Tara Richards, and Maria Patterson discuss various answers to this question by exploring some of the major theoretical perspectives that have been developed to explain violence against women, particularly intimate partner violence (IPV). These include psychological, social-learning, and feminist theories. In their review, Gover and her colleagues identify both the strengths and weaknesses of each theory in light of the empirical research that has been undertaken to test them. But they also point out that there are

several criminological theories that may be relevant for understanding violence against women but that have not yet been applied to this problem. They call for more research, especially longitudinal studies, to further elucidate the interrelated risk and protective factors for violence against women. In the Current Controversies box that follows this chapter, Larry Bennett discusses one factor that has been widely identified as a significant contributing factor to IPV: substance use. As Bennett points out, however, the relationship between substance use and IPV is neither as simple nor as direct as many people assume.

Diane Follingstad, in Chapter 3, examines some of the methodological challenges that confront violence-against-women researchers. These include problems stemming from competing definitions of complex phenomena, the validity of various measures for gauging specific forms of violence, and difficulties that arise from particular data collection methods. Sherry Hamby, in her Current Controversies box, further illustrates the serious misunderstandings that are generated as a result of problematic definitions and measures. As Follingstad points out, these are more than simply “academic” issues because the findings of our research shape public perceptions of IPV and other forms of violence against women and, more so, inform public policy and practice. Follingstad’s goal in this chapter—and, indeed, ours in this book—is to encourage and enable readers to be more critical consumers of violence-against-women research, not only to build the knowledge base but also to replace commonly held fallacies about violence against women with empirical evidence from rigorous research.

1

A Brief History of Anti-Violence Against Women Movements in the United States

Jami Ake

Gretchen Arnold

Multiple efforts in the U.S. to confront rape and incest, wife beating, stalking, workplace sexual harassment, and sex trafficking emerged in the late 1960s and '70s. All were shaped by a larger cultural context of civil rights and second-wave feminist activism that recognized systemic injustices and inspired collective political action. The most organized and sustained efforts to confront violence against women have been the battered women's and anti-rape movements,[1] which have employed similar strategies and experienced parallel trajectories. Both began as a series of responses to the practical needs of women who had been victims of male violence and to the larger systems that had long condoned and legitimized such behaviors. Through organized networks and coalitions, these movements challenged cultural beliefs and called attention to the ongoing violence faced by women in their homes; in public spaces; in the legal, medical, and mental-health systems; and in society at large. They worked to prioritize efforts to combat gender-based violence in programs, communities, organizations, and public policy, eventually making domestic violence and sexual assault mainstream issues. Each has also played a central role in developing models of service provision and advocacy that are in widespread use today.

Some prominent segments of each movement were so successful that, since the mid-1990s, intimate partner violence and sexual assault have become core issues in federal efforts to address violence against women. The passage of the first Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) in 1994 and its three subsequent renewals have unmistakably signaled that domestic violence is finally

being taken seriously on a national scale—a long-hoped-for goal of many activists. Similarly, in 2011, the U.S. Department of Education's initiative to shape how colleges handle sexual misconduct, followed by the McCaskill *Sexual Violence on Campus* report in 2014 and legislation to address sexual assault in the military, has focused attention on the issue of sexual assault and provided an infusion of energy for the antirape movement's efforts.

Neither of these movements, however, has been without its critics. The passage of VAWA in 1994 was part of a larger cultural shift in the 1980s and early '90s toward law enforcement approaches to solving social problems through criminalization. Much criticism has centered on whether the criminalization of gender-based violence, though helpful to many women and men who have been victims of abuse, has also excluded many women from redress and has had outright negative effects on others. In addition, critics have charged both movements with straying from their grassroots and radical beginnings in the early 1970s, pointing to the increasing professionalization, organizational hierarchies, and service-centered approaches that contrast so dramatically with the movements' explicitly political and feminist grassroots origins. Less controversial have been efforts to stop sexual violence in higher education and the military, although there has been considerable debate about the appropriate processes for doing so. When it comes to sexual assault, criticism has focused more on the failure of the criminal justice system to take the problem seriously and to develop mechanisms to ensure that victims are not harmed in the law enforcement process.

Since the 1990s, many groups within the mainstream battered women's and antirape movements have taken seriously the criticisms that they have relied too heavily on criminal justice solutions to violence, excluded socially precarious populations from interventions and services, and overprofessionalized their programs. In response, many have experimented with changes. At the same time, these critiques—many of which come from groups formally or informally excluded from mainstream efforts—have galvanized other activist movements to address all types of violence as a manifestation of larger, structural issues of oppression and social injustice that require community-based (as opposed to criminal-justice-based) solutions. Currently, there is not one single movement but, instead, multiple movement*s* seeking to end gender-based violence in the United States.

Historical Roots

Rape has been regarded as a crime since the colonial period in the United States, and then it was codified into law once the nation was established. Above all else, early rape laws protected the property interest that men had in the women who belonged to them and reinforced social ideals dictating appropriate feminine behavior. Embedded in the statutes themselves and in the judicial deployment of rape law were the social prejudices of race and class that deemed only some women worthy of legal protection from rape (Schulhofer, 1998). Legal requirements unique to rape, including prompt reporting, witness corroboration, the admissibility of a victim's prior acts and reputation, and "resistance to the utmost," revealed both concerns about women's assumed propensity to lie about victimization and a larger cultural assumption that only women who did not violate gender expectations could truly suffer harm (Dripps, 2010). The assertion by Chief Justice Sir Matthew Hale in 1680 that "rape is an accusation easily to be made, hard to be proved, and harder to be defended by the party accused, tho' never so innocent" continued to inform American statutes and instructions to juries well into the 20th century (as quoted in Caringella, 2009, p. 16). According to early legal codes, there was no such thing as rape within marriage; if rape was ultimately a crime against a man with rights over a particular woman, then it was legally nonsensical that a man could commit such a harm by forcing sex upon his own wife.[2] It was only well into the 1970s that sexual-assault activists

successfully lobbied the first states to pass laws against marital rape, and it took until 1993 for it to be criminalized in some fashion in all 50 states, though spousal exemptions remain in some form in many states to this day (Bergen, 2006).

The abuse of wives[3] was certainly not a new phenomenon in the 1960s and 1970s, nor was the opposition to such abuse, especially in cases where a husband's "abuse of authority" resulted in "unjustified" beatings (Siegel, 1996). Even during historical periods when common law permitted the corporal punishment of wives—as long as no permanent physical injury resulted—there was simultaneous recognition of the potential harms of such "chastisement," especially when such acts became excessively brutal.[4] Nineteenth-century reformers, most notably temperance advocates and women's rights activists, successfully challenged laws and social norms that granted husbands the prerogative to beat their wives. As *chastisement doctrine* gave way to late-19th-century legal approaches that defined the marriage relationship as private and thus largely outside the purview of legal intrusion,[5] an array of court cases challenged the limits of such privacy and asserted women's rights within marriage and their rights to divorce on the grounds of physical cruelty. The 19th century also saw the gradual criminalization of some forms of "wife beating" and building opposition to "domestic tyranny" by feminist leaders, including Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, and Lucy Stone (Pleck, 1983). In the 1890s, the Women's Christian Temperance Union successfully lobbied for legal change and, in San Diego, opened a home as a refuge for orphans, neglected and abused children, and poor mothers, including those who had been abused by husbands (Pleck, 1983, pp. 463–464). In Chicago, the Protective Agency for Women and Children, sponsored by the Chicago Women's Club, likewise extended support to abused wives and rape victims, including legal support (Pleck, 1983, p. 465). After the turn of the 20th century, however, the Progressive Era government effectively turned over to social scientific professionals the authority to define and address the problem of wife beating, and women's activism around the issue waned. Social workers and psychiatrists used therapeutic terms like "marital discord" and "domestic difficulties" that implied that both men and women shared equal responsibility for the problem. Then, under the influence of psychoanalysis in the 1930s, women's stories of abuse were often labeled fantasies or, in the 1940s and '50s, examples of female masochism. It was not until the 1960s that the contemporary feminist movement sought to regain control over the public interpretation of the issue (Arnold, 2006).

What *was* new in the era of civil rights and feminism was a perspective that defined *domestic violence* as a distinct form of violence. Such abuse was reconceptualized as symptomatic of other forms of oppression that extended well beyond the household. Rape, too, was reconceived as an act of power and domination (rather than an act of sex) enacted at the individual and collective level. Whereas many early anti-wife-beating initiatives had claimed to uphold patriarchal family ideals—most often finding fault with the temperaments of individual men or with the evils of drunkenness—the late 1960s and 1970s ushered in the beginnings of an analysis of oppression and male dominance that located the problem of domestic violence in the inequality inherent in patriarchy itself. Similarly, a new feminist analysis of rape as a mechanism of patriarchal social control demanded an approach to the issue that addressed both immediate, individual harms and the entrenched social norms and practices that activists argued produced a *rape culture* that perpetuated sexual oppression.

The Antirape Movement's Early Years

The antirape movement worked to bring visibility to a problem surrounded by silence and deep social discomfort and, like the battered women's movement that followed, owed its early momentum

to feminist consciousness raising. In conversations with other women in small-group settings, survivors of rape discovered that they were not alone and that the harms they had suffered suggested larger, systematic patterns of male power and women's oppression. Unprecedented activist events, like the speak-out organized in 1971 by the New York Radical Feminists in New York City, brought rape into public discourse and framed it as much more than a rare individualized act of sexual aggression; feminists developed an analysis of rape as working to silence and victimize individual women while simultaneously maintaining patriarchal privilege and control. Armed with this understanding, antirape activists sought to reform the male-dominated institutions—courts, law enforcement, and medical practices—that revictimized women, reinforced victim blaming, and promoted cultural misunderstandings of rape (Koss & Harvey, 1991). They also developed their own organizations, rape crisis centers (RCCs), to provide emotional support and practical assistance for women traumatized by rape.

The first rape crisis centers were founded in 1971 in Berkeley, California, and 1972 in Washington, D.C. Both were grassroots efforts by local women to provide medical and legal information and advice and emotional support for rape victims, and both became national networking hubs as more RCCs and hotlines were established in quick succession across the country (Matthews, 1994). RCCs were seen as more than just a mechanism for service provision, however. In the early 1970s, feminists developed an influential critique of the hierarchical and nondemocratic decision-making structures of traditional institutions. Such structures, they argued, embodied patriarchal values and reinforced the status quo in which women were subjected to the political, economic, and social control of men. Their response was to create RCCs organized as feminist collectives in which responsibilities and decision making would be shared equally among a largely volunteer staff.

The police and hospitals became early targets of activists in the growing movement, who advocated more responsive and sensitive treatment of rape victims. At the same time, legal scholars were also challenging the ways in which rape law and legal practice blamed rape victims and hampered prosecution. The first congressional response came in 1975, with the establishment of a National Center for the Prevention and Control of Rape. By and large, however, the movement remained organizationally segmented until the first formal national coalitions were formed in the late 1970s (Matthews, 1994), most notably the National Coalition Against Sexual Assault (NCASA) in 1979.

The overarching social project of the early antirape movement was to challenge the prevailing cultural view of rape as a sex crime committed by a few sick men or brought on by women's suspect behavior. Activists framed rape as an act of violence integral to male domination and worked to expose culturally entrenched *rape myths* (e.g., women always lie about rape, no means yes) that continued to shape the assumptions underlying social, institutional, and policy responses to the problem. The early activist figures of the antirape movement—Susan Brownmiller and Susan Griffin, chief among them—voiced a growing recognition of the widespread and systematic oppression of women as a function of patriarchy and sexism that helped to connect the personal experiences of individual women with larger political systems.

Over time, however, the field has become characterized by significant ideological diversity (Koss & Harvey, 1991). While most RCCs still engage in community education to challenge prevailing attitudes and beliefs about rape and rape victims, their priorities often lie with providing crisis response and victim advocacy services. There has been a lot of internal movement debate about the degree to which victim services are compatible with social-change objectives. Service provision, including legal advocacy, often involves close cooperation with established social-service and criminal justice agencies. Many social-change-oriented activists believe this leads to a dilution of feminist ideas and undermines the oppositional politics of the

movement. These concerns were intensified with the availability of federal funding for RCCs, beginning with the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) and the Department of Labor's Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) in the mid-1970s. In order to qualify for such funding, centers have to demonstrate organizational stability and community support that, in practice, typically requires that they adopt the traditional hierarchical structures and professionally credentialed staff that the early feminist RCC eschewed. Whether or not such organizational characteristics do indeed result in depoliticization and co-optation by the state is a matter of continuing debate (see, for example, Koss & Harvey, 1991).

The antirape movement suffered setbacks in the 1980s, including the loss of funding in many states and an antifeminist backlash against the gains of the 1970s (Greensite, 2009). Nonetheless, many activists and state coalitions at the core of the antirape movement continued to collaborate to push for crucial local and statewide changes to practices in hospitals, courts, and police departments as the radical origins of the movement gave way to more liberal reforms (Caringella, 2009).

The Early Battered Women's Movement

Like their antirape counterparts, early battered women's advocates struggled to dismantle stereotypes and common myths about survivors, who were often blamed for their abuse, including the ways that professional discourses and practices, like psychology and law, located the root causes of battering in the behavior of the abused women themselves. Early battered women's activists also looked to similar efforts in England and Scotland, where activists had opened the first shelters for battered women earlier in the decade.[6] Some of the very first shelters, including Rainbow Retreat in Phoenix, Arizona (opened in 1973), and Haven House in Pasadena, California (opened in 1974), had originally intended to serve women victimized by "alcoholic husbands" but quickly recognized that the problem of battering extended well beyond the effects of alcoholism and became refuges for all abused women (Tierney, 1982). These early grassroots activist efforts most often combined practical necessity and engagement with larger political or social concerns. They typically provided for the immediate needs of women fleeing abuse—safety, shelter, and personal support—while also often offering spaces for education, awareness, and consciousness raising that focused attention on larger systems in need of change.

Some early collectives supplied temporary housing, either in informal arrangements or in already existing spaces provided by organizational or personal donations and state grants (Schechter, 1982). Although many activists, including former survivors, had been informally offering safe space and resources to individuals on a small scale for years, the first recognizable U.S. shelters just as often emerged out of organized grassroots or community-based efforts. Some started out as gender-focused services like women's crisis lines or legal services or grew out of feminist consciousness-raising groups and collectives. Women's Advocates in St. Paul, Minnesota, for example, was first a consciousness-raising group and then evolved, in 1973, into one of the first known shelters in the country (Dobash & Dobash, 1992). Other shelters grew out of organizing efforts in racial or ethnic communities and focused on the needs of minority women. In 1977, a Latina-run battered women's shelter called Casa Myrna Vazquez opened in Boston, and in the same year, the White Buffalo Calf Woman's Society opened the first tribal shelter on the Rosebud Reservation of the Sicangu Lakota Nation in South Dakota. The first shelter for Asian women opened in 1981 in Los Angeles and was called Everywoman's Shelter ("Herstory," n.d.). Nearly all of these shelters relied primarily on volunteers, donations, and small grants for their day-to-day operations. Although there was wide variation in the provision of

shelter from state to state, by 1980, battered women could find a shelter in every major city, and by 1982, there were between 300 and 700 shelters and safe-home projects (Ferraro, 1996; Schechter, 1982).

Mobilizing against domestic violence took a number of forms and strategies, and even in the period of early grassroots organizing, there was no single ideology or set of strategies that defined the growing organized support for battered women. Even though the activism on behalf of battered women was recognizably feminist and clearly linked to other second-wave feminist efforts, not all of the early attempts to reach out to battered women and to provide services were feminist in nature. As Kathleen Ferraro points out, "traditional charity, social work, and religious efforts to assist battered women" operated alongside more clearly feminist efforts, such that "a survey of existing shelters in 1977 found only 46 percent identified as 'feminist' in orientation" (Ferraro, 1996, p. 83).

Although not all shelters or resources for battered women averred feminist ideals, in the 1970s and '80s, feminist battered women's shelters became iconic symbols for the movement to end violence against women. Dobash and Dobash (1992) assert that shelters were much more than safe spaces for battered women and their children. As with rape crisis centers, battered women's shelters became both the symbolic locus of the larger political movement and a physical base for ongoing political organizing. In the experiences of the women who lived and worked in shelters, they were also a tangible reminder of the deep economic dependence of women on male-dominated households. The domestic violence shelter operated both symbolically and in practice as the liberatory alternative to the private, patriarchal home, where abuse was all too common.

The story of the battered women's movement in the 1970s is one of increasing coalition building, the development of practical responses and theoretical explanations for domestic violence, and the mainstreaming of domestic violence as a social problem. The movement itself comprised a number of different constituencies, each with slightly different interests, contexts, and sets of relationships. There were feminist activists who were more radical, including many women of color, who had forcefully articulated an antipatriarchal critique and helped build the analysis of battering as a systemic rather than individual harm. This analysis provided the impetus for early networks that modeled self-help and peer support as strategies for empowering survivors of violence. More mainstream, liberal feminists also worked toward political awareness and reform, joining the issue of domestic violence to other demands for gender equality, including equal pay and reproductive rights.

The problem of domestic violence gained national recognition as it became newly visible in politics and the media. The mid-1970s witnessed growing attention to the issue by feminist groups at the local and national levels, including the National Organization for Women's (NOW) Task Force on Battered Women and Household Violence (1975) and the International Women's Year Conference in Houston, Texas (1976). Coalitions at the city and then at the state level emerged and claimed goals that included the creation of networks of information and support, along with fostering political power in state legislatures through lobbying. State coalitions also became the organizations in charge of setting standards for antiviolence programs at the state level, for disseminating federal funding, and for providing a consistent analysis of the problem (Schechter, 1982). Growing out of strong state coalitions and a nationwide conference on domestic violence in 1978, the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV) was formed, the beginning of a system of networking and organized political activism on a national scale (Tierney, 1982).

Historically, state coalitions have also served as locations where some groups of women of color could organize. For example, a Women of Color Task Force was founded in 1985 as part of the predecessor to the Georgia Coalition Against Domestic Violence and task force members later worked with the state coalition to

increase visibility and outreach to communities of color (Aszman, 2011). The various women-of-color task forces and caucuses also became an important mechanism for networking, information sharing, and organizing to address issues specific to battered women of color on state, regional, and national levels. Nonetheless, as the battered women's movement coalesced and became recognizable as a mainstream effort, many women of color criticized its emerging focus on gender to the exclusion of other forms of oppression that made people vulnerable to violence. In reality, they argued, the oppressions of gender, race, and class are not discrete and insular and cannot be treated as if they are without neglecting the experiences of women who are not white and middle class. In other words, this problem cannot be addressed with a colorblind approach (Wang, 1996).

Women of Color

As domestic violence gained a national profile, the dominant narrative of the causes and solutions to abuse shaped by liberal feminist interests often eclipsed analyses that placed domestic violence in the context of other oppressions like racism and poverty. At the first NCADV conference in 1980, the lack of women of color in visible leadership positions led some members to form the Third World Women's Caucus (later renamed the Women of Color Task Force) (Schechter, 1982). This group pushed NCADV to form alliances with organizations that dealt with issues important to women of color, to actively promote women of color as members and leaders in the organization, and to collect antiracism documents and tools that could be used in domestic violence agencies (Schechter, 1982). Their efforts were successful enough that in 1982, the second NCADV conference started with a Women of Color Institute on the first day. A growing analysis of the layers of gendered, organizational, and state-sponsored oppressions that women of color routinely faced meant that issues of police brutality, racialized patterns of incarceration, and systematic discriminatory treatment and surveillance by social services became central to discussions about intimate partner violence. The 1984 New York Women Against Rape conference, for example, became a "multiracial, multiethnic conference that confronted multiple challenges facing women organizing against violence against women—by partners, police, social service agencies, and poverty" (Thompson, 2002, p. 345). Community-specific resources also began to emerge, most often in large cities, to provide culturally competent support to survivors who could not easily or comfortably access more mainstream services. In 1978, for example, the Center for the Pacific Asian Family opened in Los Angeles to provide help for Asian and Pacific Islander women experiencing sexual or domestic violence, followed in subsequent years by the New York Asian Women's Shelter (1982) and the Asian Women's Shelter in San Francisco (1988) (Shah, 1994, p. 149).

Organizing across racial lines has always been difficult for both the antirape and battered women's movements. Mainstream feminism in the U.S., including the first efforts focused exclusively on combating violence against women in the 1970s, has been predominantly white. At the same time, historians like Becky Thompson (2002) and Sherna Berger Gluck (1998) argue that the organized efforts by women of color to confront violence against women have been largely written out of the history of the feminist movement. These women, Thompson observes, worked on three fronts in the 1970s: in white-dominated feminist groups; in women's caucuses in existing mixed-gender organizations; and in autonomous Black, Latina, Native American, and Asian feminist organizations. Activists confronted gender-based violence from within groups that, at the same time, targeted the interlocking race, class, and other forms of systemic discrimination. To this day, these groups have tended to concentrate on the immediate needs of the community and provide a range of programs, not only housing battered women and assisting victims of rape but also providing