Abstract

Research on Sexual biographies of Russian women of three generations collected 25 interviews with middle class women from St. Petersburg (1997-1998). By middle class here I refer to women with a higher education. These life-stories give plenty of material for the analysis of Russian gender relations, including sexual relations. One of the topics covered in the study is that of sexual violence and abuse experienced by women in course of their lives. The issue of sexual violence is extremely private and sensitive, women narrate about it with certain constraint even if the case is quite a distance in time.

The purpose of the paper is to analyze just one frame of sexual violence – the one where a woman is not raped but is beaten by a man when she refused to have sex with him. The framing of the occasion of sexual violence in the interview refers to the cultural paradigm of violence. The cultural paradigm is the pattern of that embedded in the everyday practice and common meaning and this is reproduced regularly in social settings. The cultural paradigm is reconstructed from the framing of the occasion in the narrative and contains messages on the following issues:
- positioning of the context conducive to a certain sexual violence case
- positioning of the actors on the occasion of sexual violence
- positioning of the rules of the game reconstructed on the occasion of sexual violence
- moral statement on the experience

The text will proceed in the following way. First, I will discuss briefly the biographical discursive situation in Russia and make certain statements that will help to situate the biographical research on sexuality (and sexual violence) in the general context. Second, I will concentrate on the sociological version of the text analysis that was used in the study. Third, I will turn to the narrative itself and try to show what are the conclusions which were made from the analysis of the narrative. Fourth, I will present the analysis of different sections of the narrative.

Methodological Retreat. Socio-Biographical discursive situation in contemporary Russia

Socio-Biographical discursive situation is the term which is used here to describe the discursive practices of life-story telling or reports on individual life now common in Russian society. It is important to take into account that different periods in history are characterized by different patterns of life stories and thus provide different contexts for the life story research. There are periods where individual life stories of ordinary people are kept in the private diaries and do not enter public discussion and the periods when they are written and are kept in files for future generations. There are other periods when biographies and life stories attract mass public attention, showing the shifts in identity construction. In different periods, different topics are tabooed in the
life stories. The reasons for inhibitions in reporting on certain event, are both individual and
cultural-temporal. We do not expect to find illuminating pictures of sexual life, contraception and
venereal diseases in XIX th century autobiographies, for example, though there could be certain
exceptions. However, in contemporary coherent autobiography and life story the issues of sexuality
are seldom abandoned. One possible explanation for this could be the inclusion of sexuality in
public discourse (media, culture). I am not going to elaborate on this idea here, since it should be
discussed at length.

However I consider identification of the biographical discursive context to be an important
methodological assumption for the biographical research one carries out. If we identify biographical
discursive context (or situation) we can expect a certain level of authenticity of the individual life
story, on the one hand, and a certain level of representation of the life story for the culture it comes
from, on the other. Here authenticity does not mean – truth, but rather adequacy of a narrative in
reference to the frames and categories used by the informant in his/her identity construction as
presented in the life-story.

Knowing the features of the biographical discursive context we can expect also certain
methodological opportunities and barriers to the research. Thus for example if we know that people
consider financial issues to be a confidential topic and these issues are of interest for a researcher,
we should develop research techniques that will enable us to enter this private segment of life.

A feminist researcher (as I identify myself) should be sensitive to the discursive context of
research (Harding 1987, Smith 1989. Discursive context should be taken into account as it has at
least a three-fold consequence: it influences research design, frames research situation, and gives a
clue for the preferred interpretation of raw data.

The idea of the changing role of biography in the broad social context is developed by A.
Giddens in his work «Modernity and Identity». Giddens claims that modernization is a period of
biographization of society when individuals as agents construct their lives within the frames settled
by social structures. This general statement on biographization of society should be specified for
different cultures and different societies.

Thus the purpose of this methodological introduction is to identify discursive contexts of my
research and to ascertain how they influenced my study. I distinguish three dimensions of discursive
context that influenced my study of violence in the life story: 1) the revival of initiative
biographical work in Russian transition; 2) the Soviet biographical legacy; 3) the openness of the
discourse of sexuality. Let’s clarify what I mean by each of these aspects of discursive situation and
consider their possible impact on the study.

**Context 1. Revival of initiative biographical work in Russian transition.**

The breakdown of Soviet society and emerging opportunities and barriers caused by the
Russian reforms in the last decade brought about the phenomenon which is referred to as identity
crisis (e.g. Ionin 2000). Former Soviet identifications do not often work in a current context - the
borders of the states, the political configuration, the stratification design of the society is under
change. These changes demand active reflexive work of post-Soviet subjects who are looking for
their identities - new ones and old ones. The revival of old identifications - class, ethnic, gender,
political - and establishment of new ones is a typical feature of the transitory intellectual climate in
Russia. Using the term by W. Fischer-Rosenthal this kind of identity search can be labeled as
biographical work (Fischer-Rosenthal 1995). In the course of this intensive biographical work new
emerging social agents - individuals and groups - not only invent their own life-stories. Biographical
work becomes part of their identity construction and a pivot of their copying
strategies, through which they clarify those assets that they could use in the construction of their
lives in the given structural conditions. The indicators of such biographical initiative work are
numerous. To mention only a few - growth of the publication on life stories, biographies, memoirs
of the leaders of mass opinion and members of elite groups, genealogical search for the families of
origin in which thousands of citizens are involved, formations of oral history collections of different milieus, competitions of autobiographies, urban renaming campaigns, etc. Biographical social research with its interest in life stories is just a small part of this flow.

Mass initiative biographical work gives the biographical research situation a specific blend. It has positive and negative influence on the study. On the one hand, interest in self-identity construction, which is substituting memory - blocking of Soviet copying strategies, makes people eager to share their self-understanding and self-construction. The intellectual atmosphere of voicing identities is favorable for a biographical researcher who can expect willingness and openness of informants and their emotional involvement in the study.

However, the same context could have a negative effect on the study or at least could make research situation more difficult. Emotionally charged involvement in biographical work, being a part and parcel of an individual's copying strategy in the situation of social instability, makes a narrator very sensitive to the professional biographical research. An informant believes that a sociologist is a political intruder in his/her private life who could very well mis-interpret it. Because of the fact that informants carry out auto-biographical research themselves, they are very carefully following the professions interpretations that could be damaging for their self-identity construction, that would not fit into their self-interpretations. Agents - constructors of their biographies see themselves as biographical experts, they expect respect for their self-reflections and are ready to oppose our judgments. Such a research situation claims for specific research design and specific techniques of interviewing. Not only anonymity and confidentiality should be guaranteed, which is normal in most of studies, but it is important to share with informants the ideology and the concept of research. It is important to make the study interactive and to convert an interview into a dialogue between two partners. In certain cases it is also necessary to present the research results in the audience of the informants and to consider their agreements/disagreements. It is necessary to follow these rules of research in order not to damage the field of research or professional reputation.

In my case I deliberately tried to take into account this discursive context addressing in the research of sexual violence only those people whom I knew personally before (advice of Anna Rotkirch), actually whose story of violence of harassment I had already known. This choice of informant gave me the opportunity to discuss the topics which are often taboo in the life story interview. Another technical device was to keep the issue of the violence in the last part of the interview and to carry out an interview in the interactive fashion, that is sharing experiences.

**Context 2. Soviet Biographical Legacy**

Soviet rules of the game still influence our everyday life and our attitudes and expectations in communication. It makes an impact on our professional settings. When we consider its legacy in relation to biographical research, we’ll see that it is two-fold. On the one hand, the Soviet system blocked initiative biographical work. A great number of experiences had to be cleared out from individual and collective memory - and these blockages were part of copying strategies of the reflective individuals and groups. People preferred to keep silence or just to forget not only certain experiences of their own but of their families of origin as well. Certain memories were not only psychologically harmful - as it is always the case with humans - but could be dangerous for their life-strategies. During the Soviet era people were not openly engaged in the search for their roots, certain stories were concealed from the younger generation, just to make their lives smoother and less traumatic. People changed their family-names, so as not to be identified as Jews or Germans or Finns, they forgot or did not know their kulak, gentry or White Guard’s ancestors. It was safer to live with an individual biography - to be a Soviet orphan, a mancurt (a person without memory) as the Soviet writer Chingiz Aitmatov put it in his utopia. This is one part of the Soviet legacy.

The other side of the same coin is the official biographical formulas that were designed by Soviet bureaucracy and filled in by Soviet subjects hundreds of times in their life time. People were obliged to fill in Soviet bureaucratic questionnaires that were extremely detailed and covered not
only multiple aspects of an individual’s public and private life, but also those of his or her immediate relatives, descendants and ancestors. Soviet subjects provided detailed information on official biographical formulas on multiple occasions - in the medical officers, in educational institutions, in the work places, etc. These records were archived as personnel files, were eligible at the KGB archives and were used in career promotion. In the course of this official biographical work of the Soviet bureaucracy Soviet citizens did their best to construct politically correct biographies that fit the demands of the party-state ideology. These official formulas can be seen as imposed life-stories which informants used in their self-presentation as officially public. Such self-presentations during official interviewing or interrogations became part and parcel of Soviet double self-identity.

For the inner circle of the friends and the family, individuals kept another, ‘true’ story, less selective and less politically correct. However sometimes for the purposes of self-protection people stayed loyal to their official life story even in privacy. Soviet formal biographical work was obviously a part of the social control and self-censorship system (Voronkov & Chikadze, 1997).

The influence of such a legacy on the contemporary biographical research situation is severe. It is one of the aspects of the legacy of the reputation of Soviet sociology in society (Voronkov & Zdравомыслова 1996, 1998). The Soviet sociologist equipped with the questionnaires, validated by the CPSU departments, were seen as interrogators that implemented official biographical work. People provided them with the imposed life-story which was developed for official occasions. This means that a sociologist has to invest a lot of zest if he/she wants to get an authentic life story from an informant. Any narrator has at least two stories at his/her disposal - one for official purposes, another for the trusted people (Voronkov & Chikadze 1997).

Taking into account such a legacy, it is extremely important in the current research situation to build up the basic trust as the ground of interaction between a researcher and an informant. This trust will make the authenticity of the story more plausible. However, this trust is always an extremely fragile attitude. What could be the techniques to construct trust in a research situation? Let’s consider some of them. I believe that the warming up part of the interview should be expanded as compared to the usual warming up interview procedure. A researcher has to share his understanding of a research problem with an informant. It is necessary to make bridges between the two interaction agents, the bridge that would challenge inevitable hierarchy in the interview situation. Discovered common ground could be diverse: it could be commonality of gender (women), sharing the same political platform, sharing the same generational experiences, ethnicity, etc. Commonality of ground or interaction bridging - is a necessary part of the dialogue research situation. I would like to emphasize that the methodological consequence of discursive context of Soviet legacy in biographical work is a demand for interactive organization of the immediate interview situation. Other advice will be the combination of the biographical interview with participant observation which takes a long time but enables a researcher to surpass boundaries of exclusion. In the research on sexuality, this discursive context was also taken into account. I represented myself as a feminist researcher of sexuality. I basically had been acquainted with my informants for a long time. I used the situation of a feminist researcher as a frame that enables me to bring attention to the topic of risks and disadvantages of women in the everyday life.

To conclude: the contemporary Russian discursive situation can be described as a biographical boom. Its indicators are numerous TV talk shows, mass publication and discussion of biographies and memoirs, personal notes, competition of biographies stimulated by social scientists, etc., genealogical search in which families are engaged, etc. This, of course, is part of transformation of identity. It means that the discursive context is conducive to the research on biography. On the other hand, the same context sets up certain barriers for research as everyone is interested in the study and everyone is personally engaged in the construction of biography and that is why people are extremely sensitive to interpretations – they are very much ethnographers.
Context 3. Discursive Context of the Research on Sexuality

Research on sexuality is a specific issue which has been tabooed for a long time in Russian discourse or at least has not been reflected at length in public until recently. It is a hot topic now in Russia – a terra of discovery. Very often people for the first time verbalize their sexual experience in public only with the interviewer but often spoke about it more eagerly and easily than the researchers had expected (Temkina, forth).

Openness of sexual matters for discussion made research of sexuality easier. Thanks to the voicing of the issues of sexual violence by Russian feminists and the media, it became possible to more openly discuss it. Life-story appeared to be quite a suitable method for the study of sexuality. Narrating biographical experiences informants select from the memory stores those life events which they consider relevant for the presentation requested by an interviewer. In the course of immediate biographical work the emotional emphasis is shown in bright colors that are attached to certain pieces of the story that are seen as important for one’s identity. However, sexual violence in one’s life story is often a taboo topic. Usually informants do not give a narrative of violence without being prompted. However every request to tell the story of sexual violence or abuse resulted in several narratives. The biographical interviews that we collected are full of the different stories of sexual violence and abuse, including such different patterns as domestic violence, street hooliganism, rape, beatings, etc. The narratives are evidence of the normality of violence in women’s experience. Discursively, sexual abuse and violence are a common experience for women. These traumatic memories when articulated in the interview are charged with emotion and thus difficult to report.

The Idea of Cultural Paradigm of Sexual Violence

The aim of the research was to reconstruct one cultural paradigm of sexual violence from the story of violence presented in the biographical interview. The story of violence is taken as a narrative that is a meaningful coherent piece of presentation that has its own logic: the prelude, the story per se and the final. The following issues of the story give us the picture of the logistics of the violence story. Who is she? A narrator, a person who became the object of sexual violence. The context of the violence story; the consequence of events that resulted in the violence occasion; presentation of the abuser; the justification that is the attribution of responsibility for the sexual violence and interpretation of the case.

The method of discursive analysis helps to identify cultural paradigms of sexual violence that exist in Russian society. The concept of cultural paradigm is borrowed here from Irina Paperno’s research on suicide as a cultural institution in the XIXth c. Russian society (Paperno 1997). She herself based her work on the ideas of You. Lotman. Cultural paradigm is a script that makes the event possible to understand, an event that is justified and rationalized. Irina Paperno sees the story of individual famous suicides as units of meaning. Cultural paradigm embraces a certain type of circumstance conducive to suicide, a certain type of personage or identity that is vulnerable to suicide. She sees the cultural paradigm as more or less stable construction that is reproduced though reformulated and modified in other contexts. Thus, for example, she describes the paradigmatic suicide of Socrates in the following syllogism: Socrates is immortal, Socrates commits a suicide, thus suicides can be interpreted as immortals. Deliberate death is seen as an action of immortality of the soul (Paperno, 1999:10).

In a similar fashion I am looking for paradigmatic cases of sexual violence against women. However my data material differs substantially from the one used by Paperno. I look for the paradigmatic cases of sexual violence in the life-stories of ordinary people. However the commonality of experiences makes them paradigmatic. This article aims at the reconstruction of one paradigmatic script of sexual violence.
I take a critical or political position in this analysis. I look for the possibilities of avoiding the violence that is implicitly present in the story.

**Research Method**

To reconstruct the cultural paradigm of sexual violence I used the slightly modified technique of text analysis which is called MCD (Membership Categorization Device) developed by H. Sacks and A. Schutze (Sacks 1998, Schutze 1983), which I will describe briefly. This method is the most fruitful in group work. Researchers divide the text into macro-sequences that can be distinguished according to different criteria – authentic sequences that are provided by a narrator and/or authorized sequences according to the topic that is of interest for a researcher. Each macro-sequence is seen as a shorter narrative centered around a certain topic. The macro-sequence in its turn is divided into meaningful fragments organized by a category. Each identity is seen as a category from the broader collection to which it belongs. The consistency rule assumes that once one category is used from one collection, we tend to see other categories as belonging to the same collection. The researcher should identify category-bound activities deriving them either from the text or from other supplementary sources. In this way a researcher reconstructs behavioral patterns that are commonly ascribed to each identity and the actions or rules of the game to which the narrator refers and which make the discussion understandable and interaction accountable. The next step is to identify standardized pairs of related categories that are linked together in a standardized way. This method is grounded on the conviction that each statement or category that appears in the narrative, involves certain intentional or unintentional assessment that refers to the value conventions of the narrator and milieu, and makes the text accountable. These assessments or justifications, if identified, can help to reconstruct the meanings that are believed to be shared in the community to which a narrator belongs. Configuration of these meanings combined with the logic of occasions are seen as a cultural pattern or a cultural paradigm.

When applied successfully this method shows how narrative description works as a socially organized activity and what is common in people’s understanding of experience.

**Let’s turn to the case study.** The following is the story of sexual abuse and violence from the interview with Olga, born in 1960, who was then a student and a sportswoman. The event took place in the Caucasian village, in the summer sports-camp in the early 1980s.

#I: Did someone ever tried to rape you?

#O. Yes, yes. I have one very unpleasant story. In the end it was without sex. But the situation was rather strange. I have to start from the beginning: I was in the South at the summer camp.

#I: Tell me how old were you.

#O: 21 years old, probably. I was at this sport camp... The camp was situated in the small village (in the mountains near the sea), so I knew all the village people who often came to the camp. We were always told not to have any relationships with the locals there. There were plenty of stories, I always said to the girls not to go anywhere with them, that they would seem to be such nice guys, they'd give you
something to eat and to drink, but they would always push for sex. And every time there were situations when the girls got beaten up or something like that would happen periodically, let's say twice per a season it would happen where someone would agree to go out with them... Of course there were romances with the locals. So there was one guy over there who liked me. Every time we met occasionally he would ask, if everything was O.K., if any of the locals had disturbed me, and if anything happened to tell him, because people were different. He brought me fruit from his garden, just cared about me all the season, and every time we met he asked if something worried or bothered me. At the end of the training season he came up to me, I was there with my friend, and said - you know, tomorrow my friend with whom we were together in the military service comes here in his car. Let's go together with Larisa to some river in the mountains. We'll have a picnic, sit there, talk, then come back. So I was listening to him even nodding my head, and I was thinking at the same time, it would not have been Ruslan, whom I knew so well, who had always been so good to me, I wouldn't even talk about it. But because there were so many signs of attention and friendly attitude I didn't feel that it was right to say "no" straightaway. So when we finished talking with him, he said: so, we are coming tomorrow to pick you up. I came up to Larisa and said: Ruslan offered to go, but let's not go. Tomorrow when they come, we'll say that we don't feel well, and won't go. They didn't come next evening. And on our last day there, we had to leave in the morning, and in the afternoon Ruslan, that local guy, came and invited us to come to his place. He said that his friend hadn't come at the agreed time, but now he invited me, my friend, another girl, and a few other guys, so all this company was invited to come. We were eating and drinking, had lunch and came back to the camp. In half an hour he came back, saying that his friend has managed to come, may be we could go now, and there were our friends, wrestler, who came up to us and said: Olga, go with them, they are nice guys; go with them to the mountains, there's nothing wrong with that. It was 2 p.m., the whole situation seemed to be quite safe. So as we were at that time - Larisa came straight from the beach in her swimming suit and robe, and I was in sportswear. We sat in their car and left. He said that there was a mountain river nearby, but first we needed to go to the shop to buy something to eat and drink, then to the market place, to buy some fruit, and then we'd go to the river. First we went to the liqueur store. First, I didn't like that they were speaking in their mother language between themselves, we didn't understand a word. And when we got to the liqueur store and when I saw how much alcohol they bought I understood that we were in trouble - they got a box of wine. Then we bought fruit and food and came to the river. We were drinking, but as I felt we were so in danger, I was not getting drunk. We had one glass of wine after another, the kind of wine I liked, but I didn't want to drink and I was not getting drunk or relaxed, I only got a head ache. And they were pouring wine into big glasses and making toasts, and every time we were supposed to drink it all.

#I: Of course, there is such a tradition, but not for women.

#O: Yes, you have to. That friend of mine, I felt she understood nothing, she was having fun, she looked at me asking what was wrong with me. And I was thinking how to get out of this. We couldn't leave without a car. It was hot over there, we had lots of food, and we were tired of those men, so I began to talk about going home. They said - look, so much food and wine left and the sun is still up, let's go to swim,
and then we can continue. And then they said, let's go to the bar at the closest small town. We couldn't go there without our changing clothes, so I grabbed a hold of this thought. Let's go, let's go! They had to take us back to the camp where I could ask our guys to tell those men that we weren't going anywhere with them, and tomorrow we had to leave anyway. So I said, yes, yes, let's go to the bar. I even relaxed a bit, I thought that everything was fine now. We sat in the car, we sang songs, I felt that it was passing by, 'cause the main thing was to get home. And suddenly the car made a turn. We were on the road where they had to go straight, but they were turning away; they said that they were going to the beach to spend some more time there. I thought - oh, my God. So we got out of the car, took out the wine and fruit. Larisa went somewhere with Ruslan. First, because she wasn't a very smart girl, and second, she wasn't in touch with reality. I stayed with Ruslan's Army friend. First, we sat and had a talk, he told me about his wife, that he had studied in Leningrad, where he had liked to go out... so, it was O.K. And then he said to me - let's make love. I tried to make it all a joke, and said "no". And suddenly he hit me in the face. I was so shocked, I couldn't even understand what was going on. I don't remember what he was saying- something like he wanted me so much, but at the same time he didn't do anything, he didn't try to undress me. Nothing, but he was beating me. He beat me just to make me say that "yes, I want it, too". He said something like - let's just do it fast, then we'll forget everything about it, it's nothing for you, why are you torturing me, I want you so much. He began to undress and I saw that he was not hard and I didn't understand what he wanted from me. Later, when I thought about it, I was amazed why I didn't resist him, why I only looked at him, saying that I didn't want it and I was not going to, didn't try to hit him or push him back. Because he didn't do anything. He beat me up all through that time. And on the other hand, I had this thought all the time, what if I'd say "yes", what was he going to do with me then, he was not hard... (Ha-ha-ha)!...I didn't understand what he wanted from me. But there came the time when I got scared.

#I: But you didn't say "yes".

#O: I didn't say "yes", and I continued to say "no". Then, you know, he took the bottle and broke it. And I got so scared but on the other hand, I was thinking that I should've done it from the very beginning, why I was letting him beat me. He hit me with his feet, I was all dirty. All my face was bruised after it. I was so shocked, so passive. When I was a child I was always fighting, and here I did nothing. He wasn't a big man. When he broke that bottle I got so afraid that I was ready to say "yes". And then Ruslan came with Larisa. He looked with horror on all of that. Larisa began to scream - what happened? And I just began to cry. Wasn't able to say even a word. Ruslan said - get into the car, he sat down to drive it, though it wasn't his car. I said that I didn't want to leave Larisa alone, he said - don't worry. He took me to the camp. On the way back I didn't see that my face was bruised, but I saw that I was all dirty. I got into my room which I was sharing with a girl, didn't talk to anyone, just lay down on my bed. The girl saw me and went out to get these wrestlers, who had told me to go with those men. There were similar cases before, but in those cases it was possible to say that it was the fault of these girls who agreed to go to some restaurant, so they gave those men a reason, in my case they decided to call the militia. It was a very unpleasant story. The militia came and began to ask me why that man hadn't raped me after all. I tried to explain. He asked, if this guy had tried
Another character presented in the Prelude is that of a local man – a mediator – Ruslan (R.). This character is functionally very important for the story. He is the one who brings Olga into the scene of violence (a mediator). Olga gives several justifications, that aim to convince herself and the listener, that she had enough reasons to trust R. Let’s follow her arguments for trusting relationship with a local man that serve as justification for her further security rules violation.

Olga presents R as an exception among local men. He treated Olga in a special way – he was bridging the gap between herself and local men. Olga names the strategies of trust construction which he used. R. expressed long-term friendly concern to her; small presents that he brought from his garden (it is assumed that he did not spend money on those presents which made them more precious, non-interested). Another argument that convinced her to trust R. was his good reputation among Olga’s male wrestler-friends. They convinced Olga her that he was trustworthy, that it was not risky to communicate with him and she could be safe with him.

The picnic party with R. that had been planned by the end of the training period, seemed quite safe to Olga. The fact that she was invited with her friend – Larisa (not alone) and in the daytime (not at night or late evening) convinced her of the secure setting of the forthcoming adventure.

Justification for Olga’s actions can be formulated in the following way. Once the trustful communication was established there were good reasons to break the common rules of women’s safety. Olga established trust – the basic attitude of communication with R. This trust presumed traditional gender configuration – she sees him as her protector and his respectful attitude is a guarantee for her safety. She sees herself as an object of his concern and admiration.

Macro-sequence 2 - picnic invitation.
The core of this section is the description of the occasion of invitation. R. invites Olga and her friend Larisa for a picnic party organized on the occasion of the visit of his Army friend. The invitation is the occasion of choice: Olga is free to decide whether to accept it or not. Now in retrospect she realizes that it was her own choice that brought her into the trap of sexual violence. Still she tries to reconstruct the consequence of the events and the arguments that brought her to this decision. With this mental activity she builds up justifications for her actions.

In this sub-sequence Olga presents other features of her self identity. She describes herself as a relational woman, that is a woman who is oriented on trustful communication and does her best to sustain such communication. She is afraid to offend the person who invites her by her distrust. Thus, when the invitation follows, she does not reject it immediately but leaves it for further consideration. Such relationalism is the pivot of her self-presentation in the whole life-story.

While making the choice, Olga has to choose between two sets of rules that organize her conduct: rules of relation-orientedness and rules of security.

Olga gives another supportive argument that convinces her to accept the invitation: she recollects the rehearsal – this is the sequence where she describes her visit to R’s place with her friends-wrestlers and the failed picnic with the R’s expected friend.

These first two macro-sequences together form the exposition of the story of violence. Their main message is a bifurcation in Olga’s understanding of proper behavior under the given circumstances. Olga presents herself as an adherent of two different contradicting groups of rules: security rules for women and rules of trustful relationship. She is a reasonable women who follows the rules of security for women, and if she makes any exceptions then she has sufficient reasons that are supposed to guarantee her security. The feeling of trust in communication with R. is supported by different arguments that justify Olga’s decision to go for a picnic.
to undress me. I said - no, he just beat me. The militia man asked why I thought
then that he wanted to rape me. So, it looks like he didn't. There was the camp
director who screamed at me that I was a hooker, I went out with someone I didn't
know and after it all even called the militia. But even the locals were mostly on my
side. One of the locals came up to me and said that he thought that I had a good
reputation among them, and he apologized that it all happened like that. It was our
last night in the camp and everyone was concerned for me. I stayed in a separate
room and there was one guy, we weren't even friends, but he spent all night sitting
there next to me. I was so shocked that I wasn't really able to talk about anything else
but what had happened. So all the night I was telling him about it. In the morning we
left and that was the end of the story.

MACRO-SEQUENCES: CATEGORIES AND JUSTIFICATIONS

I divided the narrative into several macro-sequences. Each of them describes certain aspects
of the script, that is, certain clusters of conditions that made the case of violence possible.

Macrosequence I - Prelude.
In this part the chronotop of the story is presented in its specified time and space context. The
action takes place in the seasonal sports' training camp in the Southern resort area, where a group of
young sportspeople, coming from different places of the country live. They had visited this place
before. This training season was the 3rd or the 4th. The story takes place in summer 1980.

The narrator – Olga – gives the background of the occasion of the violence. She identifies
the context of communication with the local residents of the village. The local population is
presented as a community of young men: women, who obviously lived there, were never mentioned
in the whole story.

Olga formulated the security rules for women in this setting. She speaks of herself as an
experienced young woman, who is knowledgeable of the risks of sexual abuse in the camp - she
refers to the multiple evidence of sexual abuse and rape occasions experienced by women who had
not followed the security rules. The knowledge of frequency of sexual violence in this area was
structurally important for her story. She refers to it emphatically. She calls the victims of abuse -
silly women whose behavior was provocative as they did not follow the security rules.

Local men are presented as dangerous strangers, the camp community is different from them
- they are in a way mutually excluded, no credit is given to the locals. The security rules are
discussed in the story as common knowledge, shared by everyone, including the narrator herself.
The basic security rule for women says: do not trust local men, avoid contacts with them.

Category of (mis)trust is central in the description of the communicative patterns between the
locals and the sportswomen.

Another category of the Prelude is presentation of Self of the narrator – Olga. Olga
presents herself as a reasonable young woman. She is a sportswoman, she knows security rules and
follows them consciously. She counter-poses herself and those foolish women who had not
followed the rules, had provoked sexual abuse and thus had got into trouble and were often raped.

Olga is not only ‘a good girl’, but she also represents herself as a different woman – a
woman, capable of developing friendly platonic (non-erotic) relationships with men. She describes
her status in the company of friends – the wrestlers – as their tovarishch, as the one, who is
assimilated in their culture. Her specific reputation, she imagines, helps her to develop specific
contacts with certain local men also. These contacts she presents as exceptional, based on concern
and respect.
The next micro-sequence shows the change of the modus of the story from the situation of security to the risk situation, from trust to distrust. Olga reveals how she began to recognize the danger and names its indicators. Each argument appears in turn and from the narrative we can reconstruct the semantics of danger and the destruction of trust.

In her retrospective reflection she distinguishes several categories for the shift of meaning. The fragile bridge of trust is broken by at least three interferences: 1) On their way to the picnic, the men speak their native language that the women could not comprehend – this excluded women from communication. 2) The men buy a large amount of alcohol – Olga deciphers this as a signal that they are not supposed to be sober. Drunkenness is interpreted as a context of abuse and violation of communication rules. 3) Larisa does not see the situation as dangerous. She is presented as a frivolous person. As a result, Olga feels herself alone in her assessment of the situation as unsafe. 4) When the picnic starts, the men insist that the women drink more and more. To convince them to drink they refer to the misinterpreted local traditions, saying that if they do not drink, it would offend the rules of guest behavior; 5) the final argument intensifying the growing feeling of insecurity is the change in the original route. They look for a new setting to continue the picnic. The women are manipulated and taken to another place. At the end of this sequence we see that L. and R. leave the scene and Olga and the AF are left together. Olga feels alone and in danger. She expects trouble with the AF.

Macro-sequence 4. Culmination. The AF tries to make a communicative bridge between himself and Olga, presenting certain arguments that could enable a development of mutual sympathy. He positions himself as a person who has something in common with Olga. To show that he is trustworthy, he says that he is married, and that he knows St.Petersburg where Olga comes from. This ‘warming up’ is followed by the abrupt proposal «to have sex» immediately. Olga does not accept this invitation trying to make a joke of it.

At this point we see the breakdown of communication. When rejected the abuser becomes aggressive, beating Olga in anger. This is his response to her ‘misconduct’. The brutal scene is interrupted by the appearance of the other pair. This piece of their interaction - the breakdown of communication - Olga describes using two main categories – his beating and her shock.

The communication is broken by the AF: that is he is active, Olga is passive. Beating is a violent communication break implemented by the AF. What meanings can be arrived at from the conjuncture of beating?

First. The beating as a communication breakdown indicates that meanings ascribed to the situation by Olga and by the abuser were different. In the abuser’s view, the picnic should culminate in sexual intercourse. He expected Olga to follow the rules of his script. He and R are the authors of the script. Women should follow the prescribed roles as gifts. These rules are implicit.

Olga’s picnic script was different from the men’s, though not as clear and coherent as theirs. On the one hand, she shared the idea of herself as a picnic-gift. On the other, she had the imagery of herself and of the script rules that allowed her to develop an alternative script. She obviously underestimated the fact that the script was formulated by men and mastered by them, though the rules that they followed were tacit.

Second. The beating indicates that the power relations in the picnic situation are the relations of male domination. The AF is the one who decides whether Olga’s conduct is proper or not. He sees her reaction as a picnic rule violation. He decides how he could react on her conduct. Her shock allows him to react in the brutal way.

Third. The beating is though brutal, still a practiced way to implement a man’s domination and to sanction woman’s rejection to follow the rules of men’s celebration.

Let’s turn now to Olga’s description of her reaction to the beating as a ‘shock’. The shock metaphor shows that Olga mis-recognized both the situation and her position in the power relations in the picnic. She says that the shock blocked her from fighting back, resistance or appeal

The violence story starts with the introduction of the abuser. He is presented as the Army Friend (AF) of R., the mediator, the person of trust. The naming of a person as an AF (Olga never calls him by name) is a category that connotes certain credentials of trust. In this piece Olga implicitly refers to the mythology of male friendship that was formed during conscription, relations where true masculinity is learned and tested. According to the shared cultural patterns AF should be considered as positive and trustful as R. himself. AF is a title of alterego, because military service is seen as a crucial institution of masculine socialisation. Men’s friendship created during the homosocial communication in the conscription period is known as a sacred value of manhood. Respect for the relationship and obligations of men’s friendship is shared by both men and women. The category-bound activities implied by the term – the Army friend – made him similar to R. with whom he shared difficult and crucial experiences in his formative years. It is supposed that mutual support and help was the basis of their relationship. According to this implied logic the attitude of trust, the feeling of security in the relationship with R. thus could be transferred to his AF.

It is assumed that the culture of the army friendship has its own rituals. The narrative does not give us descriptions of these rituals but refers to them and we can reconstruct them from the other sources. Army friends can meet more or less regularly, remembering their common past and talking of the present. Often that in these traditional rituals women are excluded as partners but can be included as exchange gifts (Rubin 1975), or decoration. Men’s exclusive rituals reconstruct the traditional image of a woman – as a sexual or at least as an entertainment object.

The presentation of the abuser as R’s Army Friend is sufficient argument for Olga to accept the picnic invitation. Olga motivates her agreement by her unwillingness to break the relationship of trust, which are of basic value for her. This motivation is supported by her self-image as a relational woman, abiding by security rules.

Let’s return to the story. AF comes to visit B from some distant place where he lives permanently. For B. this is a special occasion for his hospitality. The category reconstructed from this section is the one of picnic as a celebration of men’s friendship. R. was responsible for the party. He wanted to make it as splendid as possible, to make it really memorable. The party was his gift of special hospitality to his AF. For such an occasion he chose a picnic in the picturesque mountains by the sea which would be decorated by two beautiful nice women.

When Olga and her friend, Larisa accepted the invitation, they agreed to follow the rules of the picnic as a celebration of men’s friendship. The assumed rules of men’s friendship celebration ascribe certain roles for women at the party. These rules are traditional – women are supposed to play the traditional roles as decorations, muses of amusement and entertainment, to be gifts in the men’s communication exchange and sexual objects. The way Olga presents this situation leaves no doubt that young women understand this role division as normal and accept it albeit subconsciously.

Men have good reason to interpret the acceptance of invitation as a success in their seduction script. Being precious gifts, women are seduced by the car voyage, fruits, beautiful mountain landscape, friendly communication with men. Olga’s story shows that she is conscious of being a part of the gift for the friend – an object of admiration and amusement. She shares the same imagery of herself as men do, though possibly unconsciously. At the same time Olga thinks that she could manage the situation and be sexually safe.

Olga still sees the situation as secure enough. It could have been insecure if she agreed immediately, if the picnic had been planned for a night, if she had not known R. – the mediator, if she had not gone, if her friends-wrestlers had not considered it unsafe. In other circumstances she sees that is common to be unsafe and that they are occasions of rape and sexual violence.
for help. She says that this paralysis was caused by the unexpectedness of the violence and seeming irrelevance of the beating to the sexual intentions of the abuser. She was surprised by his unwillingness to work on the situation— he did not try to convince her to have sex, to court or undress her. He showed himself as a non-relation oriented person. The shock is caused by Olga’s failure to implement her own version of the script. Her basic confidence that she could rule out the situation was obviously based on her self-image as a relational and rule-abiding woman on the one hand, and on the other her mis-recognition of the picnic situation in which she could trust her rules. However she cannot rule out the situation, because the rules of men’s domination dictated what she should do, and the power to reformulate those rules was not in her hands.

Why do I see this violence frame as a cultural paradigm? It is the story of the clash of two interpretations of the rules and women’s disobedience in following the men’s interpretation. This case shows that her exceptionalism and relationalism, does not guarantee safety for Olga. Following the rules of relation-orientedness a woman easily falls into the trap. For Olga relation-orientedness was a priority to the rules of safety. Olga’s specification of safety rules based on the priority of trustful relations established with men brings her to the violence scene. The two sets of rules: rules of relationism and rules of safety are contradictory on the occasion of men’s domination (that is the picnic occasion). In vain Olga tries to conciliate them. It is her relation-orientedness that makes her to at least partially accept the men’s picnic rules. The clash of men’s and women’s rule interpretations makes a woman a victim because the rules are mastered by men and women can but follow them. They often have no resources to break the rule. If they break it, they are punished and not only by abusers. The end of the story shows that the abuser is not punished, Olga hardly avoids common blaming for her mis-behaviour, her only consolation is apologies by other local men, and the sympathy of her male friends on whom she directs her relation-orientedness.

The AF does not care about the trustful communication which is so valuable to Olga. He makes ‘warming up’ talk and establishes contact with instrumental purpose. Trust is just a necessary precondition for the sexual intercourse which is his final destination. He sees Olga as a desirable sexual object, a possible gift, and warming-up talk he sees as a prelude for sex which, in his logic, is one of the rules of the game. He thinks that Olga knows the picnic rules and accepts them. Her rejection to have sex with him (to Say ‘No’) is looked upon as a rule violation (the salient contract guaranteed by his friend was broken) and thus her mis-behavior must be punished. In Russian her behavior is called ‘to run dynamo’. ‘A Dynamo woman’ is the label for a woman who uses the privileges of her sex appeal in the communication with men but does her best to escape sexual intercourse that is expected to result. The term ‘dynamo’ is used to indicate that such a woman makes the man work on the contact in vain without sexual accomplishment.

Olga’s logic is different. For her communication based on trust has the highest value. She thinks that it has equal value for men. She believes that communication based on trust which she had been able to establish is the guarantee for her safety. She thinks that safety rules are subordinate to the rules of communication of trust. Thus she misinterprets the situation. She believes that her NO will be considered with respect and it was not the case. She is shocked by her own misinterpreting of the situation.

In his eyes she a dynamo woman (dinamistka), in her eyes he is a wild beast. As a result of the clash of two interpretative schemes Olga is physically damaged - beaten.

Macro-sequence 5. Epilogue. Olga does not want to voice the incident, and she tries to escape, but her female neighbor sees her, informs her friends and they come to console her. The militia comes, Olga is interrogated, her evidence is questioned with the result that she is blamed for provocative behavior. Her friends understand her and try to console her. On the next day, the camp
in cancelled. Olga interprets her case as the exceptional one, as a result of communication breakdown and as shock.

**DISCUSSION.** I see this violence story as culturally paradigmatic. It belongs to the cluster of sexual abuse and violence with men whom women know. The semantic core of the story – is the clash of two versions of women’s roles in the picnic script and following misrecognition of the situation by the actors in the situation of men’s domination.

Olga orients herself in two basic frames. Each frame is presented in her self-images and activities bound to those images. The frames operate simultaneously and are constructed in an hierarchical order. When she needs to make a choice she gives preference to a certain frame. The first frame is centered on her self-image as a relation-oriented woman. Relation – orientedness means that trustful communication is her main value. As a relational woman she wants to sustain trustful communication in different situations, even in the situation which can be seen as an unsafe one. She looks for the arguments that allow her to define the communication as safe, though she knows that it is dominated by local men. Being deeply oriented on relations, she easily finds these arguments which were reconstructed in the course of this article.

The second frame is focused on the value of safety. However, Olga considers safety as derivative of trustful communication. She decides to violate common safety rules because she appreciates communication as a guarantee for safety and subordinates safety rules to the rules of traditional women’s relation-orientedness.

This subordination of rules brings her to the violent scene. It results from the fact that men interpreted her relation-orientedness in their own fashion – as readiness for picnic rules formulated by them. According to these rules a woman at the men’s party should be a gift and a sexual object.

The clash in the interpretations between Olga and her abusers result not in the mere communication breakdown. Obviously the picnic communication is constructed as the setting where men dominate and control the women’s conduct. The AF beats Olga as a rule violator. Here men’s domination takes a brutal form.

All this interpretation can be used in order to learn how a woman can escape the type of abuse or violence or how this paradigm of violence can be destroyed. The core aim here is to abandon women’s traditional relation-orientedness and to insert the rules of safety into the focus of her frame.

Her relation-orientedness is orientation on the men’s organized relations, which, she thinks, she knows, and this very relation-orientedness is the source of her vulnerability, as we will see. When following these rules of relation-orientedness, she becomes the object of abuse and sets herself into the trap. Following the men’s rules does not guarantee the safety of women.