

CHAPTER 5

IMAGO ANALYSES AND DISCUSSION OF CASE STUDIES

This chapter will present the information obtained for the two case studies, namely Simon Mandlenkosi and Jacques Eksteen. These will be presented in accordance with the format proposed for the narrative inquiry in Chapter 4. The prologue presents my clinical observations, observations of the participant's characteristic modes of expression, and comments on the interview process. The story presents the participant's semi-structured interview, alongside archival data in the discussion of his offences. The prologue represents the researcher's narrative of the interview process, while the story presents the participant's narrative alongside the 'narratives of others' contained in the archival material. Given this study's focus on the interviewee's narrative, the semi-structured interview data is considered the most psychologically important data.

As discussed in the previous chapter the interview data will be presented in chronological narrative form with imago analysis sections interspersed within it. Imago analysis sections were included to ensure that the rationale behind the analysis was made clear, as required by grounded theory. These sections also help ensure some separation between the presentation of the data and the analysis thereof. Neither narrative theory nor grounded theory insists on a strict separation between data presentation and analysis, rather emphasising that data presentation be considered part of the analytical process. Footnotes in the imago analysis sections will refer to which the parts of the transcriptions (see Appendix A) support the analyses being made. It should be remembered that a single segment of interview material may contain reference to a number of different imagoes, or different stages of development in a single imago; and this can make it difficult to separate various imagoes from one another. The interview for the second case study was conducted in Afrikaans and translated into English for the purposes of this study. Where translations were problematic, the original Afrikaans words is given, italicised and in square brackets.

The last section of each case study is the epilogue, which summarises the structure of the narrative presented, the imago analyses, and the answers to the narrative inquiries.

5.1 CASE STUDY ONE: SIMON MANDLENKOSI

5.1.1 Bibliographical detail

Born in 1968, Simon Mandlenkosi was 31 when I interviewed him. He was a black South African Xhosa-speaking male, who was also fluent in English. He was convicted of three counts of murder, two of rape (one of which occurred in the course of a murder), and one of attempted rape. Two charges of robbery and one of theft relate to offences he committed in the course of the murders.

He committed all these offences over a two year period. The three murders Simon was convicted of all occurred in 1997. All his victims were black females. He was interviewed at his place of imprisonment, for approximately four hours, on the 6th April 2000.

5.1.2 Prologue to Simon Mandlenkosi's story

5.1.2.1 Clinical observations

Simon Mandlenkosi was a tall shaven-headed man, of medium build. He appeared slightly fuller in figure than he had in the police photos taken at the time of his arrest. Apart from missing his front two teeth, he had no visible marks or scars. Simon was neatly dressed in green prison fatigues, with a red and white Aids awareness badge on the left pocket of his shirt.

Simon was a confident English speaker. He had completed high school and achieved a professional qualification. He presented as reasonably intelligent, and had no apparent memory disturbance. His mood and vocal tone were congruent with the content of his interview.

Simon was quiet, calm, and came across as soft-spoken and reticent. He presented as friendly and non-confrontational, although not particularly confident. Simon was liable to appear hurt when a line of questioning became too threatening. For example when the subject of his murders was first broached, Simon was visibly upset, and

tears came to his eyes. When he didn't understand a question, Simon would be silent and stare at me.

5.1.2.2 Responses in the interview process

Simon was capable of disarming honesty and self-deprecation. Repeatedly describing himself as someone who likes a joke, Simon often describes episodes in his life in humorous terms. He did not appear overly concerned with portraying himself as a socially acceptable or admirable figure. Rather, he painted a believable picture of himself as a flawed and human figure.

However it later became apparent that Simon appeared either unwilling or unable to fully reflect on himself, his emotions, and his motivations. This was most obviously and frequently manifested in Simon hesitating before expressing anything associated with strong negative emotion. This 'emotional pause' became an index of how emotive a topic was for Simon, and was often coupled with the volume of his voice dropping, and even with Simon lapsing into silence or curt answers when a question provoked particularly strong emotions. When asked a difficult question he would break eye contact and look at door or floor, 'staring into nothing'. With less threatening questions Simon would sit back in his chair with his head resting on the rear of the seat, half-close his eyes and look at me out the bottom of them. In both responses he would appear to stop and 'think through' his answer before eventually replying. The most obvious consequence of this is that most of his offences are described briefly and without detailed descriptions.

Associated with this was Simon's reluctance to openly state when he perceived something as negative. For example, when asked to describe a person he repeatedly implied had a detrimental affect on his life, he initially refuses, then relents and says they are "not a bad person as such". It took some probing to illicit a full response.

Notwithstanding the above the most problematic consequence of Simon's lack of self-reflection for his narrative was that it meant he often failed to articulate causality. Simon could narrate events, but when asked to discuss what caused the events he appeared less able, or less willing. While this did not mean his narrative was

superficial, it made creating a clear chronology of causal events, and consistently discerning Simon's attitude and motives, difficult. However in replying to my questions Simon would often shift the narrative back to a certain anecdote, event, or observation, thus offering a valuable insight into those aspects of his narrative that were important to him. This helped highlight the patterns in Simon's story.

5.1.2.3 Reflections on the interview process

Simon appeared to need the prompting of my questions to begin talking. He would answer a question and then stop, waiting for the next one. In this scenario the semi-structured IMAGO interview format was helpful, although it may have meant I led the interview more than would have been ideal. I initially had to work hard in the interview to establish and maintain rapport. Notwithstanding these challenges Simon later 'warmed' to the interview and, as mentioned, I found him likeable.

While Simon would readily disagree with me he would seldom challenge the questions I was asking. I thus controlled the interview and, more often than not, the direction of Simon's story-telling. Given Simon's reluctance to discuss negative issues I was obliged to frequently, often rather insensitively, probe Simon for this information at regular intervals throughout the interview. Simon did not appear to take offence at this, but it no doubt contributed to him finding the interview emotionally draining. I, similarly, felt that the interview had represented a genuinely emotional exchange.

On reflection I felt that Simon's reluctance or inability to fully reflect on himself or discuss anything associated with strong negative emotions led to a more disjointed narrative, with a lack of associations made between various aspects of the story. This does not appear to have limited the creation of meaning in his narrative, but did make it more difficult to establish connections between the various aspects of his life, and thereby ensure all aspects of the narrative were in their correct chronological order. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the chapter structure was imposed in order to give a clear chronology to the narrative, support the interpretation of imagoes, and allow comparisons between case studies.

Overall Simon gave the impression he was giving an honest account of his life, and even though his seeming unwillingness or inability to reflect on himself meant his emotions and motivations only became apparent in the process of transcription, this did not render his narrative incoherent or meaningless.

5.1.3 Simon Mandlenkosi's story

This consists of the Simon's narrative of self gained from the semi-structured interview, presented alongside archival information when discussing the offences.

5.1.3.1 Childhood

Simon Mandlenkosi was born in 1968, the youngest of four brothers and four sisters, in Pedi, a semi-rural Eastern Cape township. Both his parents were alive when he was born, but his eldest brother and sister were his primary caregivers. He describes his eldest sister as the "mother figure". Simon idolised and attempted to emulate his eldest brother, and Simon introduces his brother almost immediately in telling his story:

BH: What did you want to be in your life?

SM: A church minister...My brother was a minister...

BH: So he was the one who took care of you.

SM: Yes.

BH: Was he the one you looked up to as a father?

SM: Yes...

BH: Did you get along with him?

SM: What I can say is, he was the most important. I wanted to be what he was.

BH: What is it about him that you wanted to be?

SM: He was good with his hands, he could fix anything. So most of the time I would help him when he was fixing his car, or something else. So that's why I took up electricity [*i.e.* became an electrician]. Because he was good with his hands, so I wanted to be good also.

BH: And what sort of person was he?

SM: Uh, [appeared not to understand]

BH: Oh [stammers]...What emotions would you say he had, when you thought of him?

SM: He was very, he was calm and quiet sometimes. Even if he was hurt he was not the kind of person who would show that he was hurt...

BH: Do you think your brother was a strong man? Not just physically, but in spirit?

SM: He was clever... My brother was the kind of person who, for him, it was not difficult for him to solve a problem, like a medical problem. So, to me, I couldn't compare him to anyone else. I put him in a higher place to other people. Maybe because he was my brother, I don't know.

In elaborating on the skills his brother had, Simon sets them up as the standards to which he aspires. By presenting these aspirations fluently and enthusiastically in the first minutes of his story-telling Simon claims them as a constant from his earliest days. However Simon does not readily refer to the internal or emotional life of his brother, or what his brother thought or felt. His eldest brother is consistently presented as always positive, and thus essentially one-dimensional.

The character of his eldest brother sets the stage for Simon's perceptions of his family as a source of good. Simon says he really loved his family, and repeatedly insists that he never fought with them. His mother and his eldest sister were "very strict" and the latter would hit him when he was asleep, but he points out that "I wouldn't say today

what she did was abuse” and never suggests that this discipline was unreasonable. Notwithstanding this “strict” discipline Simon describes his family as “very close” and says he “got along well with them.” Simon makes a point of mentioning that his sisters are still in touch with him in prison. Simon also appears to have felt very responsible for his family. When asked whether he suffered from nightmares when young Simon recounts feeling responsible for the welfare of a sleep-walking brother,

SM: I took it is my duty. I did not sleep very much because I was afraid that maybe he was going to get lost...just to make sure that I was so lucky that, if at any time he was to walk, I would be awake then. I took that as a nightmare, because I was afraid what if he would get lost. What if he goes somewhere we would never find him again?

BH: So you felt very responsible for your brother...How long did this goes on for, you not sleeping very much?

SM: It went on for a period of two to three years, until I had to leave East London.

Overall, his family is presented as the only source of solace and friendship for Simon growing up, so much so that Simon states his first friend from outside the family was when he was 24.

Although his family was such a clear source of support and aspiration to Simon, and despite his insistence that he had a “nice” and “very good” childhood, he does not recount many pleasant memories from his youth. His first notable memories were of the unrest that swept the townships in July 1976, when Simon was eight years old: “Schools got burnt, family members harassed, things like that”. Simon is slow to describe these negative memories, shying away from them and avoiding any detail. His first description of his parents’ deaths three years later is similarly brief, with Simon saying he was not sad as they were “not so close”.

However Simon later admits that he twice attempted suicide around this time, when he was around “10 or 11” years old. In a quiet, hesitant tone Simon recounts:

SM: I never told my family. I took gas. Instead of killing me it made my tummy run [laughs].

BH: What made you want to kill yourself?

SM: I was lonely... I felt lonely, there.

BH: Ja... Did you feel like your parents had sort of, rejected you by dying?

SM: I felt that God gave it, God was horrible to me, God gave this thing to me, that I was behind him. It didn't feel like God was there. ...I had to be angry at God. He was rejecting me, God was pushing me away from him.

BH: Did you always believe you God?

SM: Yes.

BH: Was your family religious?

SM: My mother was very religious.

The death of his parents represents a significant event in Simon's narrative, as will be shown. Despite his positive attitude his family, Simon did not have a constant family home. He describes a youth “kind of rotating between family members”, with his best friends being his brother and his sister's son. Simon's relationships with his peers seemed to consist solely of getting in fights with them. Reflecting on this, Simon says

SM: To me, having a fight is nothing... Then, I can say something to you, then you get angry, then I would not apologise. I would just push you, or hit you, for the wrong that I have done to you...I used to be like that.

BH: Did you get in lots of fights?

SM: Yes. Fighting for me was like a hobby. [laughs]

Simon puts these fights down to anger, and his ungovernable anger is a constant theme in his story:

BH: What do [you do] when angry?

SM: When I'm angry...If you made me angry, to me, for that anger to go away I have to get hold of you. I have to touch you, to hit you once or you hit me. I hate it when someone makes me angry then goes away without me having to touch him or having a fight with him. For that anger to go away, I have to do something.

Simon repeatedly asserts, as if stating the obvious, that his anger will not ease unless he takes physical revenge on the person who caused that anger.

Simon claims he was lonely when growing up and says with a sigh “even today...I feel lonely”. Simon’s descriptions of the idyllic family life of his youth appear at odds with the death, violence, and sense of loneliness and rejection he also describes in his childhood. When asked to describe how this loneliness felt, Simon instead describes the loneliness in terms of what caused it:

SM: To me, to be lonely, it’s like, when it seems as if people put you away from them. When they don’t want to come near you, they don’t want to talk to you... Maybe the other person has nothing against me, but when I see them I think maybe they don’t want to talk to me. That makes me feel lonely. Especially if I would like to say something to you, and you are pushing me away. That makes me feel lonely.

BH: Has that happened a lot to you?

SM: Yes.

BH: Is loneliness close to rejection for you?

SM: Ja.

BH: Do you get angry with that?

SM: [sighs] A lot.

BH: It's like loneliness is similar to rejection and it makes you feel angry?

SM: Ja.

Rejection, in Simon's story, is emotionally synonymous with loneliness; and when lonely and rejected, he gets angry. Thus just as revenge is an inevitable consequence of his anger, so is anger the consequence of rejection and loneliness. This pattern of emotion and response is bound to Simon's thwarted desire for acceptance. Paradoxically, Simon insists that in his childhood he did not mind being alone and often preferred it:

BH: Did you have lots of friends at school?

SM: [pause] Friends, that's something I can never [inaudible]. I liked to be myself, I liked to be by myself...

BH: So you say you like being on your own, were you often lonely?

SM: I can't say I was lonely. I won't say I was lonely. But, at the same time, to me, it was the best thing.

BH: It felt nice for you.

SM: It felt nice for me, and I liked it, to be at home, in the yard.

BH: So it wasn't that you were lonely, you just weren't interested in other people.

SM: Ja.

These comments are supported by Simon's comments that child was more content with his own company, and his characterising himself a "shy" person.

a) Imago analysis: Childhood

The narrative of Simon's childhood reveals three imagoes. Two, the Happy Family imago and Eldest Brother imago, are associated with other people. These are established earliest in his narrative. The other, the Lonely Child imago, is associated with Simon's self and appears to arise slightly later in the narrative. In Simon's narrative the imagoes established in childhood stage personify the themes that pervade his story. This supports McAdams' (1993) proposal that childhood is where the tone and main ideological themes of the personal narrative are created.

i) *The origin of the Happy Family imago*¹

This imago is established first in Simon's narrative, alongside the character of Simon's eldest brother. This imago personifies Simon's experience of his family, not an individual family member. As the name implies Simon explicitly associates this imago with the positive aspects of his family. These positive associations exist alongside a number of negative associations which Simon does not acknowledge openly. The Happy Family imago is an ambivalent imago. An example of the ambivalence of this imago is shown in his perceptions of his parents. He describes his mother as both a "very lovely" and a "very strict" person, who hit him. Similarly, his father was both a "very loving person" and a drinker. The positive aspects of the Happy Family imago will be discussed first, followed by the negative aspects and results of Simon's unacknowledged ambivalence on his narrative and imagoes.

The Happy Family imago has a strong communal orientation and Simon associates closeness, lack of conflict, and acceptance with it. This acceptance is emphasised by Simon's statements that he is still in touch with his sisters, in prison. The family is also established as Simon's primary source of friendship and companionship in childhood (and beyond, with Simon stating he acquired his first friend outside the family in his 20's). The Happy Family imago is also associated with religion, and with God. The positive aspects of the Happy Family imago suggest a warm, nurturing communal bond, and one which Simon feels a strong sense duty towards. This is

¹ See transcription references: 3, 4, 15 – 19, 20, 23, 25, 26, 40, 52, 53, 62, 101

illustrated by his being afraid to sleep for fear of his sleepwalking brother being hurt. Simon is very protective of his perception of the Happy Family imago as the source of closeness, warmth and acceptance. This is demonstrated in his persistent reluctance throughout his narrative to associate anything negative with this imago or allow members of the Happy Family imago to be aware of any wrongdoing on his part (even to the extent of his not telling them about his suicide attempts in childhood).

Alongside these positive perceptions are the unacknowledged negative aspects of the Happy Family imago: Simon's upbringing was very strict, he was often hit, his childhood appears to have been nomadic, and most importantly, the impact of the death of his parents. The death of his parents evoked strong feelings of rejection in Simon, led to his attempting suicide, and left him particularly vulnerable to rejection. This rejection is couched in terms of "anger at God", and could be a hypothetical cause of the anger and loneliness which are constants of Simon's narrative from this point on. Although Simon insists his family life was very good, his narrative creates the impression that he was isolated, even lonely, growing up. This forms the basis for Simon's earliest imago of self.

However, Simon's adoration of his family (and the imago of his eldest brother) ensures that he does not focus the anger, rejection, and loneliness evoked by the death of his parents on the Happy Family imago. By not acknowledging his own ambivalence towards the Happy Family imago – that it is simultaneously a source of, and relief from, rejection, isolation and loneliness – Simon is able to retain the Happy Family imago as a source of solace in his childhood narrative. This lack of acknowledgement also sets the scene for, and contributes towards the development of, his later imagoes.

The Happy Family imago clearly displays two of McAdams' seven (1988) proposed features of the prototypical imago: it is associated with significant others; and has associated personality traits. It could also be said display some elements of a further three proposed prototypical features: associated wishes, aspirations, goals, occupational or personal strivings; associated behaviours; and some consistency with Simon's expressed philosophy of life. These latter three are more implied than explicit. The Happy Family imago does not however persist beyond his childhood.

Rather its influence and its associations are incorporated into later imagoes. Many of Simon's imagoes after his childhood appear preoccupied with reclaiming the acceptance and solace, and overcoming the rejection, of the Happy Family imago. The ambivalent Happy Family imago is the foundation for many of the subsequent imagoes in Simon's narrative.

ii) The origin of the Eldest Brother imago²

Simon's eldest brother is immediately established in Simon's narrative as his role model and the source of his aspirations. Simon seeks to emulate his brother in vocation, physical skill, emotional temperament and intellect. The Eldest Brother imago is an idealised representation of Simon's brother, personifying the positive traits and aspirations that Simon attributes to him: a "practical", "clever", "calm" man, for whom nothing was too difficult.

The Eldest Brother imago shares a number of features with the Happy Family imago. They both have a strong communal orientation. The church is also associated with the idolised Eldest Brother imago, just as religion was associated with the Happy Family imago. Like the Happy Family imago, Simon's narrative presents the Eldest Brother as unequivocally and unambiguously good, and does not acknowledge any ambivalence in this understanding. The idealised imagoes of the Happy Family and Eldest Brother ensure that Simon does not associate anything negative with either of them, or acknowledge the feelings of rejection created by early family experience. The main difference between the Happy Family and Eldest Brother imagoes in Simon's childhood is that the Eldest Brother acts as a source of aspiration for Simon; while the Happy Family is a source of acceptance and solace. While the Happy Family is a source of unacknowledged ambiguity, in Simon's childhood the Eldest Brother imago is entirely positive. The entirely positive perception of his brother is maintained throughout his narrative and forms an important part of his narrative and imagoes of self.

² See transcription references: 4, 18, 20, 21, 44.

The Eldest Brother thus displays four of McAdam's (1988) seven features of the prototypical imago: it is associated with a person; has associated wishes, aspirations, goals, occupational or personal strivings; as well as having has associated personality traits and associated behaviours. Like the Happy Family imago, it displays some elements of a further proposed prototypical feature, having an association with some aspects of Simon's expressed philosophy of life.

iii) The origin myth of the Lonely Child imago³

Unlike Simon's other two childhood imagoes, this imago has a clear origin myth: the death of Simon's parents and the powerful feelings of rejection, anger and loneliness this engendered in him. Simon's Happy Family and Eldest Brother imagoes discourage him from associating these negative emotions with members of his family. The Lonely Child imago appears to arise as a personification of these emotions and a means to handle them in the narrative. The Lonely Child therefore becomes a repository for the feelings of rejection, loneliness, and anger. Being associated with Simon himself, this imago becomes one of his dominant ways of interacting with the world.

The characteristics of the Lonely Child reflect Simon's efforts to overcome the emotions created by his parent's death. These feeling of loneliness and anger at rejection are established as early features of the Lonely Child imago. Simon's narrative clearly explains the motivations of the Lonely Child: rejection leads to loneliness, which is then handled through anger at the rejecting person(s) and violence against them. Simon asserts that his anger will not fade unless he has acted against the rejecting person. This suggests the Lonely Child imago achieved emotional release through violence. It also suggests that the Lonely Child imago did not have any means other than violence to handle its emotions and, given that the consequential fights seem to have been a dominant feature of his interactions with Simon's peers in childhood, it would appear that the Lonely Child imago considered a wide range of behaviours as 'rejection' evoking loneliness and justifying violence. This pattern of rejection, loneliness, anger and violence becomes a constant in his narrative. Finally it

³ See transcription references: 5, 18, 19, 25, 26, 37 – 39, 51, 61, 63, 100, 102.

appears that the Lonely Child, as the imago of Simon's lonely youth, has little control over his circumstances; particularly the death of his parents. It thus relies on violence to assert self and attempt to control his environment.

Alongside this violent reaction to rejection, the Lonely Child imago also encapsulates Simon's desire to be alone and his seeking of isolation and separation from others. While seemingly contradicting his violent reaction to rejection, this can be explained by Simon's reluctance to associate anything that could be perceived as negative (in this case, loneliness and isolation) with the Happy Family or Eldest Brother imagoes. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that his statements of how in childhood he sought isolation and was not interested in interacting with peers often occur during discussions involving his family or his brother. This re-iterates that the Lonely Child imago is used as a repository for negative emotions that Simon is reluctant to associate with his family, but willing to associate with his self.

The above suggests the Lonely Child imago does not have a communal orientation. On the contrary, it characterises Simon's isolation from others. This is supported by the observation that, unlike the Happy Family and Eldest Brother imagoes, the Lonely Child imago does not interact with the Simon's other childhood imagoes. The Lonely Child is also Simon's means to assert his desires for agency and control over his life. In childhood, these agentic desires appear to be mainly expressed in violence. This emphasises the link between loneliness and violence in the character of the Lonely Child imago.

The Lonely Child displays five of McAdam's (1988) proposed features of the prototypical imago. It has an origin myth, is associated with a significant other (Simon himself), and has associated personality traits and behaviours (anger, violence, alongside a paradoxical 'shyness' and desire for isolation). It also exhibits associated wishes, aspirations, or goals. Unlike the vocational aspirations of the Eldest Brother imago, the Lonely Child imago's goals are implied in its role: to handle the loneliness, anger and rejection present in Simon's narrative of childhood; and overcome his thwarted desire for acceptance. By handling these negative emotions the Lonely Child protects the Happy Family and Eldest Brother imagoes and allows them to continue to act as sources of acceptance and aspiration in the narrative of his childhood.

5.1.3.2 Adolescence

The township uprisings of the early 1980's first affected Simon in 1981, when he was 13. He describes the uprising starting when he and his classmates in Standard 6 (Grade 8), were taken from their class. Simon asked why they, and not the older children, were being taken: "That was the question I asked. Then I received a big stone on my head." Simon laughs at this, casually discussing how he was unconscious for four hours as a result. Simon differentiates himself from his peers in adolescence, and resumes many of the themes of his childhood narrative in his description of his adolescent self:

What I can say is that I developed late, you see...Other boys, they started doing things, smoking and having girls, at the age of 13, 14. But I liked to play, just play alone, doing wire cars and all that stuff. So I developed late. Maybe I developed after 17 years then I started to have a friend then, you see.

At around this time, Simon was sent to live with his brother in the Transvaal province. With disarming candour, Simon puts this down to his increasing hate of school, due to his own laziness. In the tentative and hesitant tone he reserves for discussing emotional events, Simon narrates how, once there, "everything changed", and not only did his school work improve, but he describes himself as being "happy with people".

His elder brother appears to have been the only controlling influence in Simon's tumultuous teenage years. So when Simon returned to the streets of Pedi in the East Cape province, he reports that he simply reverted to how he had been before: "the same problems I had before...I got lazy... Maybe problems here...I don't know". Simon played truant often; preferring to "sit at home and do nothing". Again coming into conflict with teachers Simon failed maths, an experience he found very embarrassing, and one which served to engrain his hate of school.

Simon was soon embroiled in the township fighting of the mid-1980's as part of the ANC-affiliated Comrades, but disliked it, stating there was lots of fighting with sticks and guns. Simon hated guns in particular. 15 years old at the time, Simon's role was that of a political advisor and he differentiates himself from other, more violent members of the Comrades:

SM: Some of them, they were stupid, who did bad things. They didn't follow the politics. They didn't read books and all that stuff. I like to read in books.

BH: You did it for the politics, they did it because they liked to break things.

SM: Breaks things and all that stuff, ja.

Simon shuns the indiscriminate violence of some of his contemporaries, stating he would only follow orders to commit violence if there were a good reason, and it could be proven that their target was part of "the System". Simon is proud of his intellectualism when compared with his peers in the Struggle, and this interest in learning and studying further stayed with him and is returned to repeatedly in his story.

It is notable that Simon still insists that, amidst his seeming constant fights with his peers, he never fought or stole from his family. In contrast to the Simon's stories of a lonely, conflict-marked and semi-nomadic youth; his narrative also tells of a warm, strict but close family, around whom Simon can be his joking and helpful self.

Simon says he "developed late", particularly when it came to girls. He comically describes his shock at being approached by a girl when he was 15:

I didn't know what to do, what you do with a girl... I would say it was just a waste of time, I didn't know what to do with a girlfriend. I didn't

talk to her... I didn't sit down and have discussions; it was just a child affair.

Simon is amused by his own naïveté during this, his first relationship, saying he had no time for girls then. This changed when he first had sex aged 18. Simon describes sex as “the nicest thing I ever had”. The older woman who taught him about sex, Sweetie, “changed everything”. Sweetie was the first woman that was “important to his heart”. Their relationship lasted for 3 years. Then, says Simon, she “broke my heart. She fell for another man.” He insists that she should have told me she didn't love him, rather than have an affair.

BH: How did that make you feel?

SM: [long pause] To me, I wanted to revenge. I wanted to do something to her for what she had done to me, but I didn't have the guts to do it. There was something, there was a way of getting her, of hurting her; but then I didn't have the guts to do...

BH: What way would have you got revenge, if you had the guts?

SM: You know I wanted to hurt her. Hurt her. Whether it was going to be physically or any other way I could try...just to lay my hands on her. To make her feel that she hurt me, so I must do the same...

BH: Do you find rejection quite hard?

SM: I hate, I don't like to be rejected.

BH: Is that your worst thing?

SM: [quietly] Ja.

According to Simon, Sweetie was his “first big rejection”. Simon is unambiguous in how he should respond to this rejection.

It's like what I said. If I am angry with you I must do something to you. But not to kill you, but I must do something with you, you see? At least enough to make me feel alright, it's going to take away the pain. That's the problem.

In describing his break up with Sweetie, Simon does not debate whether it is right or wrong to take revenge on her. It is obvious to him that he would be justified in taking revenge. The only issue is that he didn't have the courage.

Crucially, whereas before this event this Simon appears to avenge himself on anyone who rejected him, his anger and vengeance now has a focus. This focus is any woman he desires or is in a relationship with. The lonely boy who felt rejected and lashed out has grown up and become the jealous and violent man, assaulting women who reject him.

Simon says that he promptly got another girlfriend after Sweetie, and claims to have moved on, but he does not forget the wrong hurt it did to him: "I won't say I forget. I don't forget, that stays with me... you've got to let go, but it's difficult to let go". From this point on, around the time Simon left school (1987), Simon remains extremely sensitive to rejection from women, reporting that although he was only subsequently rejected three times, and although each relationship lasted less than a year, he states: "I felt that rejection. I hated it." "BH: 'Would you say that's the thing you hated most?' S: 'Yes'." He repeats the names of the girls who rejected him, pausing emotionally between each.

a) Imago analysis: Adolescence

Simon's childhood imagoes persist into adolescence, before evolving and being incorporated into the imagoes that will carry him into adulthood. This section will first discuss the persistent aspects before discussing how they change.

i) Persistence of the Lonely Child imago⁴

It appears that the Lonely Child imago remained the dominant imago of self in Simon's early adolescence, and its role remains largely unchanged. This is demonstrated by his adolescent behaviours displaying the interpersonal interactions that denoted the Lonely Child imago in childhood. Examples of this include his desire to be alone and his insistence on his separateness from his peers; be they more 'mature' boys or his peers in the Struggle. Simon's adolescence also displays the anger and violent reaction towards rejection associated with the Lonely Child imago.

This anger, alongside the other features of the Lonely Child, was progressively channelled into an emergent imago of self. The process of change began around the age of 15, with his involvement in the Struggle against apartheid (as will be discussed below with reference to the Eldest Brother imago). It accelerated most markedly with his first serious sexual relationship, at age 18, with Sweetie. This relationship supplied the origin myth for two of the dominant imagoes of Simon's narrative: the Vengeful Suitor and the Rejecting Woman.

ii) The origin of the Vengeful Suitor imago⁵

Before Simon's mid-teens, relationships with the opposite sex are not associated with his imagoes, particularly not with the Lonely Child's desire to overcome his isolation and sense of rejection. The idealised Happy Family remains unattainable because his parents are dead, and because Simon does not acknowledge the strong sense of abandonment and rejection his family, his only apparent source of solace, appears to have invoked in him.

⁴ See transcription references: 40, 96, 97.

⁵ See transcription references: 26, 34 – 36, 38, 87, 99.

Sweetie was Simon's first significant intimate relationship, he felt close to her emotionally, and she introduced him to sex: "the nicest thing I ever had". On the basis of these strong positive associations we can hypothesise that this relationship gave Simon a means to access the acceptance that the Lonely Child craved and so lessened the isolation and rejection associated with the Lonely Child imago. We can hypothesise that this relationship allowed him to reclaim the acceptance and sense of communion associated with the idealised Happy Family imago, which had been undermined by the death of his parents. This relationship thus encouraged a change in Simon's imagoes; with relationships with women, rather than violence, beginning to be established as the preferred means to address his loneliness. This relationship marks the point at which the Lonely Child imago begins to wane, with its roles and characteristics being taken on by other imagoes.

This waning of the Lonely Child imago was accelerated sharply when Sweetie rejected Simon. Simon's short-lived role as a loved suitor came to an abrupt end. This end evoked the rejection, loneliness and anger of the Lonely Child imago and supplies the origin myth for the Vengeful Suitor imago. As the name implies, the Vengeful Suitor has two motives: to overcome rejection through violence; and to reclaim the lost communion of the family and the Happy Family imago. The former is inherited from the Lonely Child imago, and springs from Simon's life long fear of rejection and anger at those who reject him. The latter, as suggested above, is now particularly achieved through relationships with the opposite sex. While these motives overlap, the origin myth illustrates how these motives are aspects of a single mode of interpersonal interaction (rather than two separate imagoes); and how one comes to cause the other: Simon tries to reclaim the family via an intimate relationship and when this fails, tries to overcome the rejection through anger and violence.

The manner in which this anger is expressed, who it is focused on, and what Simon is trying to achieve through it clearly marks the evolution from the Lonely Child to the Vengeful Suitor. Firstly, this anger is now more specifically articulated as taking revenge. Secondly, where previously it appeared less discriminate this anger is now focused on a single group of people. The Vengeful Suitor offers Simon clear and unambiguous behavioural plans to take physical revenge on any woman who rejects

him. This also suggests that the Vengeful Suitor imago, unlike the Lonely Child, is partly defined by its relationships to other imagoes. Thirdly, the Vengeful Suitor refines the function served by violence that it inherited from the Lonely Child imago. Where the Lonely Child used violence as a means to achieve emotional release and so manage loneliness, now the Vengeful Suitor uses it as a means to *overcome* loneliness and rejection by directly attacking the person who evokes it. These defining factors also set the characteristics for the Vengeful Suitor: hot-headed, unable to tolerate rejection, and violent.

Where previously the Lonely Child was unable to overcome the loneliness and rejection it feared, the Vengeful Suitor provides Simon two means to do this: intimate relationships which evoke the acceptance of the Happy Family imago, and revenge to overcome any subsequent rejection. These factors are the motives for the Vengeful Suitor. The characteristics and functions of the Lonely Child imago are thus subsumed into the Vengeful Suitor imago and its relationships with other imagoes. The Vengeful Suitor imago becomes Simon's dominant imago of self and displays the same proposed features of the prototypical imago as the Lonely Child imago: an origin myth, an association with a significant other, associated personality traits; associated behaviours; and associated wishes, aspirations, or goals (McAdams, 1988).

iii) The origin of the Rejecting Woman imago⁶

This imago has an identical origin myth to the Vengeful Suitor: Simon's relationship with Sweetie. The Rejecting Woman imago arises alongside the Vengeful Suitor and provides a focus for the Vengeful Suitor imago's anger and vengeance. The origin myth also sets the template for interactions between these imagoes, whereby the Rejecting Woman's rejection provokes the Vengeful Suitor's anger. This interaction not only helps define the role of these imagoes, as will become increasingly clear, it also comes to play an important part in Simon's narrative.

By becoming a focus for the Vengeful Suitor's negative perceptions and hatred of rejection, the Rejecting Woman refines a role previously associated with the Lonely Child imago: it ensures no negative associations are made with Eldest Brother imago

⁶ See transcription references: 26, 34 - 36

or idealised Happy Family imago of childhood. These imagoes are therefore free to continue to act as sources of aspiration for Simon.

At this stage, the characteristics of the Rejecting Woman imago are vague and, as shall be shown, the Rejecting Woman is associated with any woman who rejects Simon. At this point this imago displays two of the seven proposed features of the prototypical imago (McAdams, 1988): an origin myth; and associations with a significant other. The Rejecting Women will change in years to come but from her origin around the time Simon left school in 1987, she is a repeated influence in his narrative.

iv) The role of the Eldest Brother imago and the beginning of the Good Family Man imago⁷

The role of the Eldest Brother imago changes during the narrative of Simon's adolescence. In Simon's childhood the Happy Family imago was a shelter for him, and the Eldest Brother imago an idol. In Simon's early adolescence the Eldest Brother imago takes on a stronger role as the only source of control over the Lonely Child imago. Simon is adamant that when he was with his brother both his school work and his interactions with his peers improved. Initially, however, these positive affects were only seen when Simon was in direct contact with the person of his eldest brother.

This begins to change as Simon ages. He states he stopped running away from school. Furthermore, as demonstrated by Simon's pride in his intellectual status during Struggle, it appears that Simon is increasingly adopting the intellectual and educational aspirations of the Eldest Brother imago as his own. This marks the point at which the Eldest Brother imago begins to be associated with both Simon's self and the person of his brother. The influence of the Eldest Brother imago is further strengthened with the transformation of the Lonely Child into the Vengeful Suitor imago, as now Simon's anger and rejection is clearly focused on the Rejecting Woman and no longer risks undermining the Eldest Brother imago. The increasing

⁷ See transcription references: 21 – 23, 47, 62, 103 – 105

association of the Eldest Brother imago with Simon's self is the start of the development of Simon's most positive imago of self, the Good Family Man imago. At this stage of the narrative, the Eldest Brother retains the four proposed features of the prototypical imago (McAdams, 1988) seen in childhood.

The above suggests that the direct influence of the Happy Family imago over Simon fades as the controlling influence it had in his childhood is subsumed by the influence and aspirations of the Eldest Brother and embryonic Good Family Man. However the solace and acceptance offered by the idealised Happy Family imago of Simon's childhood remains a goal in his narrative, and one he tries to achieve via the Good Family Man (adopting the Eldest Brother's aspirations) and the Vengeful Suitor (overcoming rejection). This will be shown later in the narrative.

5.1.3.3 Adult life (Pre-murder series)

After he left school and moved into the working world of adulthood Simon's loathing of rejection did not slow his love life down. The love of sex that he had discovered with Sweetie appeared to grow over the subsequent years. Simon estimates that he has had sex with over fifty women, and says he has come to prefer women 10 to 15 years older than him. Simon reports being sexually adventurous and enjoying experimentation. However these experiments never appeared to have been violent or involved bondage. He seems to frequently "propose" to women he is acquainted with, a term Simon uses when he is referring to propositioning a women for sex. He enjoyed visiting prostitutes, as he could experiment more with them than he could with women he was in a relationship with. Simon enjoyed pornography, and kept a collection of books and videos. He reports having a girlfriend who worked in a sex shop, and on being asked whether he enjoyed visiting the sex shop replied: "[I] had no choice...she worked there, I had better like it" and laughs.

For a man who casually and openly admits his many girlfriends and varied sex interests, he appears to have taken pains to hide these activities from his family: "I didn't want them to know me as a person who liked funny things about that stuff". Just as with his suicide attempts as a child, he appears try to keep his family segregated from anything that could be perceived as negative.

Even though he was promiscuous, Simon is still jealous towards the many women he is involved with, a fact he admits is not logical:

SM: For me, it's easier to be in love with a number of girls. But I hate it when a girl does the same thing to me, to share me with somebody else, you see?

BH: Ja.

SM: She must not share me. But to me I am doing that [laughs]...

BH: Do you find that something strange?

SM: To me it's strange really.

Despite his colourful love life and violent reactions to rejection, on leaving school Simon appears to have maintained a conventional and modestly successful life: becoming a qualified electrician, marrying, and setting out in business as an electrician. This appears to be the most stable period in Simon's narrative. He held various odd jobs between 1990 and 1992 while obtaining a professional electrician's qualification. He married in 1993, by which time he was working as a machine operator. When narrating his story Simon does not immediately name his wife, Thembeni. Simon reports liking work; enjoying working fast and doing things properly. He cheerfully reports that his love for hard work got him into trouble with some bosses, who feared he would make them look bad by comparison.

Simon opened his own subcontracting firm to undertake his electrical work. He was a contractor from 1994 up until his arrest in 1997, working both on municipality houses and private jobs. Simon describes his work life honestly, saying that there were times when his business did not go well, but overall there were "no big problems". He was never fired and modestly assesses himself as a "fair" worker.

Notwithstanding this apparent success, and the stability seemingly bestowed by his employment and marriage, Simon's job required he move around the region a lot and

he appears, as in his youth, to have lived a semi-nomadic existence. Simon's narrative paints the picture of a rootless man, constantly moving around on contracts, with girlfriends scattered among the many small towns of the Eastern Cape. With apparent regret, Simon accounts how he never saw much of his wife. This, no doubt, facilitated Simon's having many girlfriends, alongside his extra-marital affairs and regular visits to prostitutes. When asked whether his wife knew about his girlfriends Simon lapses into silence, then mouths 'Yes'.

Simon's anger remained ungovernable, and focused on the women in his life. This is illustrated in his description of an argument with his wife:

BH: How does that anger feel?

SM: When I get angry, I shake. I start getting cold. And that's when I have, to solve this I want to resolve this. To make myself better I have to do something.

BH: Yes.

SM: At school what I would do is that I would leave. Without asking the teacher, I would go take a walk or something, I had to do something, you see? It's how I am... You see, my wife, we can argue now before we go to sleep, at maybe seven o'clock or eight o'clock. But she would be asleep and I would be lying next to her thinking 'ei, this thing is making me angry'. I would wake her up maybe two o'clock, three o'clock in the morning with the same anger. I would tell myself, I had to do something. Even if I had just to hit her once, then it was going to make me feel better.

BH: Ja?

SM: That's how I am.

Shortly afterwards, Simon again articulates how during this period of his life his jealousy was routinely given expression in anger, then action.

BH: And with your girlfriends, would you have [physical] fights with them?

SM: Yes.

BH: What would start the fights?

SM: I would say I am jealous, I'm a jealous person. So...

BH: You would think they'd be looking at other men...

SM: Ja.

BH: And then what would you do?

SM: I would get angry...

BH: When you had fights with your girlfriends, would you shout at them?

Be physical?

SM: I would be physical.

BH: Where would you hit them usually?

SM: I like kicking.

BH: Where would you kick them? On the legs, head, chest?

SM: Anywhere.

BH: How long would you kick them for before you stopped?

SM: I would kick them once, twice, maybe thrice, then I would stop.

Later, when Simon was describing why he hit his girlfriends, he expands on his motivation:

Maybe, I dunno, maybe it's like I wanted so show who I am; I'm the man, I'm dominant, I'm all that. Maybe that was the reason. Now that I'm here I think about these things maybe that is one of the reasons. I wanted to show that, I wanted to be the dominant partner... maybe I wanted to show

that I'm the boss, I'm the strongest. I must dominate to be the man.

Maybe that's what happened.

At around this time Simon's need to dominate through violence took on a sexual element:

BH: Did you ever rape them to show you were dominant? Or have sex with them after you fought them?

SM: [pause] Yes.

BH: Was this with your girlfriends?

SM: Ja.

BH: What would happen? You would kick them and then have sex with them?

SM: Ja. I would do that...

BH: So, if I can say how it went, you would hit them then when you were the boss have sex with them. Would you say anything to them?

SM: No.

BH: Did it feel good?

SM: It made me feel better.

BH: Was it the sex that made you feel better or the control?

SM: Maybe it's the control. Maybe it was in the fact that it made me feel in control.

BH: If you had to describe the sex you had then, would you say it good sex or bad sex or...

SM: I wouldn't say it was good... Maybe it's the part that made me feel in control. Maybe I wanted to feel, wanted to be, in control, you see. I wanted to feel like I am in control. So it was no good.

BH: So the sex didn't really matter, it wasn't really the important part. It was more showing the control, is that it?

SM: Yes.

Simon acknowledged his violence towards others, but did not show regret. As the above quotes imply, Simon usually felt justified in his anger and his violence. Both were part of 'who he was' and his violence was focused against woman who, by rejecting him, made his violence explicable and acceptable. Throughout his narrative Simon implicitly and explicitly maintains that violence against those who reject him is justified. This is in marked contrast to the indiscriminate violence of his Comrades in the Struggle who Simon was so contemptuous of.

However with the approach of 1995, Simon's story was on the verge of a radical change. Two events foreshadowed the change to come. First, he met his long term girlfriend, Amelia. Although he states that she is the "only one I never hit" and would like to marry her; she, like his wife and girlfriends, is a minor, interchangeable 'extra' in his central drama.

Second, Simon was arrested and imprisoned for taking a car without the owner's consent in October 1995. He was imprisoned for three months before charges were withdrawn:

SM: The car I took was my friend's car, a minister, church minister... I dented the car. Now the insurance wouldn't pay the car. They said 'I took the car', they had to lay a charge so that the insurance can fix it up.

BH: How did that make you feel?

SM: Angry. I was angry...

This appears to be the first time Simon came into conflict with the church. This initial conflict seems to set a precedent for what it to come.

Simon does not speak directly about the crisis in his life during the late 1990's. He, typically, skims over negative events in the briefest terms and narrates the various strands of his life in different parts of his story. However these strands, when drawn together, suggest that a crisis engulfed him at this time. The exact timing of the crisis, and the precise order of events within it, is vague. What is clear is that Simon suffered a series of stressful events which he perceived as inflicted upon him from the outside world.

After these events, Simon committed the offences for which he was imprisoned. Simon implicitly confirms the importance of these stressors when he is asked what caused his offending:

BH: What do you think caused those things? [Long pause] A lot of things?

SM: Sometimes I try to think of how I could correct my life. But I simply can't come up with the answer, to say *this* or *these* were the causes... I would like to.

BH: So you think back, and you can never quite find out what happened.

SM: Ja.

It is possible that Simon's failure to directly acknowledge this crisis is due to this lack of insight, or inability to articulate, the affect that it had on him.

The first stressful event was his brother getting married to his second wife, Nandi. Simon states that his brother was "forced" to marry Nandi after he had an affair with her and she fell pregnant. As a result of this his brother was suspended from the

ministry and began to drink. Simon directly blamed Nandi for his elder brother's fall from grace and his position in the church.

When asked to describe Nandi, Simon avoids directly answering the question, commenting only on her materialism:

BH: Nandi, what sort of woman would you describe her as?

SM: I don't know.

BH: Would you say she was a bad person or a good person?

SM: [pause] I can't say she was a bad person. But she is different, you see. The funny thing with Nandi is money. For her, if she can get money to her, that's life to her. She's that kind of person, but not bad as such...

Later comments he makes about their relationship are more revealing. He appears to have lived with Nandi and his eldest brother for periods and he describes the downward trajectory of his relationship with her, and his growing anger. It is unclear whether Simon had a significant or consistent sexual interest in Nandi (the possibility of his being sexually interested in her is alluded to so briefly as to preclude a conclusion either way). What is clear is that they had a tempestuous relationship and she invoked potent feelings of rejection in him. So while Nandi did not reject Simon in the same way his girlfriends did, she rejected him as Simon's peers used to: simply by refusing to fully accept him.

The pressure this relationship placed on Simon worsened when Simon's eldest brother died. Simon doesn't describe when or how his brother died, but describes the consequences:

BH: How did it feel when he died?

SM: I was angry. When my brother died I was angry. I was angry with myself, I was angry with God, I was even angrier with his wife.

Simon had, up to this point, retained an almost unthinking obedience to his family, his brother, and the church. He does not appear to have questioned why he obeyed them and, as shown in his school days, he appears to have relied on them to ensure he obeyed. Robbed of the controlling influence his brother, Simon is free to vent his anger at the person he blames for his brother's downfall, Nandi:

BH: Did you have problems with Nandi?

SM: We never argued, but when my brother passed away, I told her what was inside me then. I was very angry. And I showed her that I was angry.

I said all the things I wanted to say to her that day, that I hadn't said before...

Simon's acute stress is compounded by his rejection by the church, which he describes immediately after giving an account of his brother's death:

BH: Did anyone get in the way of you becoming a minister.

SM: The church constitution, the constitution of the church. It was the only thing that got in my way. They said there were steps... the problem is this, I did go according to those steps. But, sometimes I think maybe just because there were no; in that church, I didn't have a friend, as it was just me alone, or someone to stand by me, to fight for me... So I had problems with the church. They didn't take me seriously...

BH: So you were angry with them?

SM: I was angry with God... I wanted to leave the church. I wanted to go and do something else, have nothing to do with the people... I wanted to be something different from what I had wanted to be. But things didn't go that way.

Thus the aspirations he had inherited from his brother suffered a blow from a rejecting world when the “church elders stood in the way” of his becoming a minister. Simon describes this rejection in the same terms that he used to describe the death of his brother and his parents: loneliness and “anger at God.” In the midst of these blows, Simon commits the first of the offences he was later imprisoned for.

a) Imago analysis: Adulthood (Pre-murder series)

The period of adulthood immediately prior to Simon’s committing the murders for which he was imprisoned sees a number of changes in the characteristics of his imagoes and the interactions between them.

i) The Vengeful Suitor imago is embedded, and develops⁸

This period sees a consolidation in the role of the Vengeful Suitor imago in Simon’s narrative. The embedding of this imago in Simon’s narrative is demonstrated in his behaviours and in his justifications for them. As stated, the Vengeful Suitor has two motives: overcome loneliness by evoking the acceptance of the Happy Family imago of childhood through intimate relationships; and overcome any subsequent rejections by taking revenge. These motives are maintained and increasingly displayed in the behaviours he reports in the narrative of his adulthood. Simon’s seeking of multiple sexual partners, becoming increasingly experimental sexually, and the increasing frequency of his violent behaviours demonstrate that he has accepted both of the Vengeful Suitor’s established motives as important aspects of his behavioural repertoire. The Vengeful Suitor imago is thus becoming an increasingly dominant mode of interpersonal interaction for Simon.

In this period the Vengeful Suitor becomes fully identified with Simon’s self. This is shown in Simon’s comments that the violence associated with the Vengeful Suitor was due to his wanting to “show who I am” as well as in his comments that the jealousy of the Vengeful Suitor imago was ‘just who I am’. The Vengeful Suitor imago, in becoming identified with Simon’s self, thus gives support and justification

⁸ See transcription references: 30 – 32, 60 – 66, 97, 99.

for his actions. This justification is shown in Simon's not expressing regret for his violence and only occasionally expressing regret for his infidelity. It is clear from his narrative that Simon felt his violence against the Rejecting Woman was justified and reasonable, in contrast to the indiscriminate violence of his teenage peers in the Comrades.

The activities of the Vengeful Suitor are still kept separate from the Eldest Brother imago (and its residual association with the idealised Happy Family imago), and Simon appears to feel sadness and regret when these imagoes come into contact. This is shown in his reaction to the question of whether his wife knew about his affairs.

Alongside this consolidation in the characteristics of the Vengeful Suitor imago there are a number of developments in its motives and behavioural repertoire. The changes in behaviour relate to the violence meted out by the Vengeful Suitor imago in revenge for rejection. As mentioned, the violence has a particular focus in the Rejecting Woman imago. This violence also seems to have developed into a behavioural routine, as shown in Simon's statements that he would usually kick the woman with whom he was arguing a few times before stopping. This violence also increasingly become a means of displaying dominance and control, as shown in Simon's reasons for being violent towards partners who argued with him: "I wanted to be the dominant partner... maybe I wanted to show that I'm the boss, I'm the strongest. I must dominate to be the man". In childhood the Lonely Child imago could only react to its surroundings and had no control over his circumstances (particularly the death of his parents). The Lonely Child's violent lashings-out could be interpreted as an attempt to assert itself and control its environment. Now that the Vengeful Suitor imago supplies Simon with a means to overcome loneliness and rejection (intimate relationships and violence) the desire for control becomes explicit and is openly expressed.

This implied desire for dominance and control inherited from the Lonely Child imago could be hypothesised as a developing motive in the Vengeful Suitor imago. This hypothesis is supported by Simon's stating his need to dominate; the reasons he gives for his raping his partners ("maybe it's the control. Maybe it was in the fact that it made me feel in control") and his subsequent confirmation that his reason for committing rape was to show this control. Thus the developing motive of dominance

and control is expressed in Simon's behaviour of rape. The strength of this developing motive is demonstrated in the fact that any challenge to Simon's dominance is now interpreted as a rejection and thus deserving of violence. This shown, for example, in Simon's being violent towards his wife when she disagrees with him.

To summarise, in this period the Vengeful Suitor imago becomes embedded in Simon's narrative and fully identified with his self. It maintains the motives established in its origin myth, to which it adds the developing motive of dominance and control. This developing motive affects the Vengeful Suitor imagoes' behaviour, where violence is not only provoked by rejection, but increasingly motivated by the desire for control; and where both sexual and non-sexual violence (raping and / or kicking his female partners) are established as part of the routine of violence. The behavioural repertoire of acceptable and justified violence is expanding. No further proposed features of the prototypical imago (McAdams, 1988), beyond the five already identified, are noted in the Vengeful Suitor at this stage.

ii) Interaction between Vengeful Suitor and Rejecting Woman embedded⁹

As shown above, the fear of rejection suffered by the Vengeful Suitor is routinely given expression in anger and violence, focused on the Rejecting Woman imago. This interaction between the imagoes reflects their shared origin myth. In this period, the relationship between the Rejecting Woman and the Vengeful Suitor comes to offer Simon his standard and justified behavioural response to real or perceived rejection, and increasingly to any challenges to his dominance. The Vengeful Suitor imago offers him a clear behavioural plan and the beginning of his justification for his action. The Rejecting Woman imago, associated with various girlfriends and his wife, completes his justification for action and gives his violence a focus. The Vengeful Suitor imago entirely justifies all violence against Rejecting Women in Simon's narrative. This violence, justified as vengeance and "jealousy", continues despite Simon's having multiple sexual partners. This alludes to the strength of the Rejecting Woman's continued influence. In giving his violence a focus, the interaction between

⁹ See transcription references: 64, 65.

these imagoes serves to shield the Eldest Brother imago (and emergent Good Family Man imago) from Simon's anger.

iii) The origin of the Good Family Man imago¹⁰

This process sees the Eldest Brother imago becoming associated with Simon's self, as part of a new imago. Upon leaving school Simon is able to begin meeting the aspirations embodied in the Eldest Brother imago. Where previously Simon appeared indifferent to achieving personal goals and depended on the physical presence of his eldest brother to keep him working, in his adulthood he takes a more proactive attitude towards achievement. This provides the beginning of the Good Family Man imago, which seeks to meet the vocational and communal goals of the Eldest Brother imago. For example, Simon marries his wife, as the Eldest Brother imago was married, and as the Eldest Brother imago was hardworking, so is Simon in his role as electrician. The adoption of Eldest Brother imago's aspirations in Simon's characterisation of his self is further evidenced by his ongoing interest in learning and study.

Simon states that achieving these aspirations is a positive factor, and one he is proud of. The Good Family Man imago is Simon's other dominant imago of adulthood, alongside the Vengeful Suitor. The Good Family Man's motive appears to be to re-establish communion with the idealised Happy Family imago of his youth, and so gain acceptance and solace. While it shares this aim with the Vengeful Suitor imago, the Good Family Man tries to achieve it by attaining the aspirations it inherited from the Eldest Brother imago. The influence of the emergent Good Family Man imago contributes to making the period of Simon's narrative from when he left school until 1997 a relatively stable one.

While the Good Family Man imago lacks a distinct origin myth, it subsumes many the characteristics of the Eldest Brother imago, including its interactions with other imagoes. The Good Family Man displays the same four features of the prototypical imago as the Eldest Brother imago: an association with a person (Simon himself);

¹⁰ See transcription references: 23, 30 – 32, 43 – 46.

associated wishes, aspirations, goals, occupational or personal strivings; associated personality traits and associated behaviours (McAdams, 1988).

Like the Eldest Brother imago, the Good Family Man becomes the focus of Simon's positive perceptions of the idealised Happy Family imago of his youth. The Good Family Man thus inherits the Happy Family and Eldest Brother imagoes' ability, especially when acting in conjunction with the direct influence of his brother, to control Simon's behaviour. This is shown, for example, by the fact that Simon was never violent towards his family; and by Simon avoiding expressing anger at Nandi while his eldest brother is alive.

As he did with the Happy Family and Eldest Brother imagoes, Simon attempts to shield the Good Family Man imago from any association with the negative emotions or with the less socially acceptable aspects of the Vengeful Suitor imagoes' behaviour. Simon appears to find any failure to adequately protect the Good Family Man from these emotionally distressing: as shown by his reaction when asked whether his wife (associated with the Good Family Man) knew about his infidelity (associated with the Vengeful Suitor). This may be because such contact evokes in Simon the realisation that he has failed to meet the Good Family Man's aspirations. Interaction between the Vengeful Suitor imago and Good Family Man imagoes is thus avoided.

This in effect means that the Good Family Man imago, along with the controlling influence it has over negative aspects Simon's behaviour, is kept segregated from a significant portion of his life. This lack of interaction between the Good Family Man and the other imagoes of Simon's adulthood also suggests that the Good Family Man becomes an increasingly isolated and compartmentalised character. Notwithstanding the influence it retains, as Simon moves further into adulthood the Good Family Man imago appears to move on a separate course from the other developing imagoes. The limitations of the Good Family Man imago are highlighted by the fact that both his wife Thembeni, and his girlfriend Amelia (associated with the communal aspirations of the Good Family Man imago) occupy minor roles in his narrative, in contrast to the persons aligned with the Rejecting Woman. It appears the Good Family Man imago,

as shall be shown, still needs his eldest brother's physical presence to control the negative aspects of Simon's behaviour.

iv) Emerging crisis in the late 1990's and the affect on Simon's imagoes

This crisis takes the form of a number of external events which gain their significance from their affect on Simon's imagoes and the interactions between them. After this crisis, and the changes in imagoes it represented, Simon began to commit the offences he was imprisoned for. Simon implicitly confirms the significance of the convergence of multiple factors, imagoes and external events, in motivating his offending by stating that "many things" caused his crimes. These events had two affects on the imagoes: strengthening the Rejecting Woman imago, and weakening the Good Family Man imago.

- **Strengthening of the Rejecting Woman imago¹¹**

This strengthening of the Rejecting Woman imago occurs due to the person of Simon's eldest brother's wife, Nandi. As mentioned, although Simon did not appear to be consistently sexually interested in Nandi, their tempestuous relationship seemed to evoke strong feelings of rejection in Simon, if only because she refused to fully accept him. This relationship, combined with the fact that Simon blamed her for the misfortune suffered by his admired elder brother (who is so deeply entwined with the Good Family Man imago), led to Nandi being strongly associated with the Rejecting Woman imago. Nandi's influence is, like that of the Rejecting Woman imago, a subtle and pervasive theme in his story and a repeated goad to Simon.

Prior to Nandi's entrance in the narrative, the characteristics of the Rejecting Woman imago were less clear, being associated with any woman who rejected Simon. In contrast to the Vengeful Suitor, the Rejecting Woman's influence was expressed implicitly and she seldom took centre stage. This changes when the Rejecting Woman imago is associated with Nandi. The Rejecting Woman imago is now particularly associated with materialism and with attacks on Simon's aspirations (especially, in this period, in the person of the Simon's eldest brother). Having more specific

¹¹ See transcription references: 6, 8, 9, 73 (the last referring to living arrangements)

characteristics helps widen range of stimuli that will provoke violence in Vengeful Suitor. This imago thus displays an additional proposed feature of the prototypical imago: associated personality traits (McAdams, 1988). The full range of these associated personality traits cannot be assessed, as Nandi's traits were not described in detail in Simon's narrative. This strengthening of the Rejecting Woman means the dynamic between Vengeful Suitor and Rejecting Woman becomes more powerful and difficult to control.

Apart from these changes, the Rejecting Woman imago remains the same, a repository for negative emotions and associations (alongside the Vengeful Suitor). Whereas the Vengeful Suitor directly affects Simon's behaviour, the Rejecting Woman only influences it insofar as it provokes the Vengeful Suitor. The degree to which the Rejecting Woman imago causes the Vengeful Suitor to be expressed is not clear, although they frequently appear together in the story. The interactions between the Vengeful Suitor and the Rejecting Woman influence much of Simon's offending behaviours and the emotions he attributes to these behaviours.

- **Weakening of the Good Family Man imago¹²**

In conjunction with this strengthening of the Rejecting Woman imago, there were a series of attacks on the Good Family Man imago. To understand the effect of these attacks on the Good Family Man imago, it is first necessary to understand more about its structure. This is best shown through the example of Simon's eldest brother being expelled from the church. Despite this expulsion, Simon does not speak negatively of his brother and instead blames Nandi for the misfortune that befell him. Simon never discusses what his brother thought or felt, then or at any other time. Simon's story represents his brother in constantly positive and superficial terms, not as a real and fallible person. He describes his family in similar idealised terms and avoids associating anything negative with them. The imagoes of his family and his brother (and by extension the church), as represented in the Good Family Man imago, thus become the embodiment of an ideal. However this idealised imago is one-dimensional and lacks the nuances of character associated with the Vengeful Suitor imago. This

¹² See transcription references: 6, 9, 11, 12, 31, 32, 42.

one-dimensionality, in Simon's narrative, appears to make the Good Family Man imago vulnerable to external pressures.

Two events weakened the Good Family Man imago. The first of these events struck at the heart of the Good Family Man: Simon's eldest brother died. Simon had, up to this point, retained an unthinking obedience of his eldest brother, and relied on his proximity to ensure his good behaviour, that is, to ensure the continuing influence of the Good Family Man imago over his behaviour. The Good Family Man was thus an imago that was not only kept separate from the other imagoes; it relied on external others to support it, despite it being identified with Simon's self. It could be hypothesised that this need for an external person to support this imago means that Eldest Brother imago's aspirations and characteristics were so idealised that they could never be adequately incorporated into Simon's imagoes of self. Whatever the reason, the loss of his eldest brother meant the Good Family Man imago lost a significant controlling influence over Simon. The first indication of this loss of control is given in Simon's venting his pent up anger towards Nandi.

The second of the events weakening the Good Family Man imago represented a blow against the aspirations embodied in this imago and inherited from his brother: Simon was allegedly prevented from becoming a church minister. This event was foreshadowed by Simon's being imprisoned on the false testimony of a church minister. Now, when the "church elders stood in the way" of Simon becoming a minister, the Good Family Man imago's influence over Simon was further diminished. This loss of influence occurred due to the close association in Simon's narrative between the idealised Happy Family and Eldest Brother imagoes, and religious belief. These imagoes, which formed the basis for the aspirations and beliefs of the Good Family Man, were inextricably linked with religious belief and the church. Thus not only does rejection by the church undermine the basis for the Good Family Man, it robs Simon of another way to regain the communion of the family. This is shown in the fact that Simon's failure to be taken seriously by the church elders is perceived as rejection and evokes the same emotions (loneliness and "anger at God") that Simon reports when he is rejected by women, and that he associates with the profound rejections the deaths of his parents and eldest brother represent. This further undermines the Good Family Man imago and strengthens emotions associated with the Vengeful Suitor. Simon's

starting to buy pornographic videos around this time, with pornography always associated with the Vengeful Suitor imago and kept separate from the Good Family Man imago is possible evidence of the waning influence of the Good Family Man.

5.1.3.4 Nomsa Mathetsa

One of the charges Simon was eventually convicted of was the rape of Nomsa Mathetsa, the teenage daughter of someone he had a secret affair with. He seemed reluctant to discuss Nomsa's rape. When questioned directly, he discussed the offence in a quiet and hesitant voice. His accounts of the offence are unclear and had to be analysed in some detail before they made sense.

Simon says that on the 10th April 1996 Nomsa asked for a lift to East London, as she had heard from her mother that Simon was travelling there. Simon said that he had once "proposed" to Nomsa before then, but had never had sex with her. He said that on the trip to East London he was touching and kissing her. He says "She never said 'don't touch'". Simon says when they arrived in East London,

SM: We went to the sea and then we, I had sex with her...

BH: She said it was OK to have sex?

SM: Mm...Ja...we had sex [stammers] Maybe she allowed me to have sex with her, maybe she was afraid of me. Maybe she felt she was, how can I put it? She depended on me. I was in East London, I know East London, she was not from East London she was from Jeffreys Bays. So she had to, she had to give me, or let me have sex with her, so that I cannot leave her in East London or maybe that I cannot hit her, all that stuff ...and then we went to another house...my home.

According to Simon, after the rape, Nomsa said that she wanted to go home. Simon refused as it was getting late, and they had what he describes as a "big fight". He says "she forced" and so he slapped her twice and she bit him. After this, Simon concludes

briefly: “She slept at my home for the rest of the night....she woke up early in the morning and went to run away...she took off” without waking him. Simon puts her sudden and secretive departure down to her fear of him.

Simon’s account of the rape is however given a different slant when compared with media and police records. Initially these narratives concur with Simon’s, stating that he stopped his vehicle at a beach in East London and raped Nomsa. The narratives then diverge. According to police records Simon then began to strangle Nomsa, but she recovered. Simon then took her to another house, where he tried to rape her again. When she resisted, he hit her. Nomsa later fled to another house, and told the occupant what had happened to her.

Asked whether he considers his offence against Nomsa to be rape, Simon pauses, then concludes: “Now [pause] yes it was rape...Thinking of it now and reading the papers and look at television and woman’s rights [laughs], it was rape”. This implies that at the time Simon did not feel this offence was rape. Furthermore when asked to give explanations for his offences Simon tends to, as will be shown, focus on events in 1997, after this offence occurred. Thus he minimises the severity of this rape, despite his being convicted of it during his later trial.

The events of 1997 tipped Simon into crisis. Aged 29, he had already committed a rape, his marriage was disintegrating, and he was diagnosed as being HIV positive. Simon reports that his wife’s former husband approached her about access to their children and Simon “feared he was going to take her away from him”. According to his narrative this fear of rejection led to Simon becoming aggressive, hitting his wife. His sister was obviously concerned enough about Simon’s violence to make an appointment for him to see a psychologist, but he never went. At the same time as Simon perceived his home life as threatened, he was diagnosed as HIV positive:

BH: How did that make you feel?

SM: I was angry. It made me angry because at home, there was a time at home when I was the breadwinner. I was the breadwinner because I lived at home, with my two brothers and one sister. So I had to see that there

was enough food on the table and all that stuff. So I was angry, I didn't want to accept it...when it happened I couldn't believe it, I could not accept it. I had to be strong, not for myself, but for my family's sake I must be strong.

Simon continues in a lower tone, with frequent pauses, that he wishes he could meet the person who gave him HIV, so he could revenge himself. I asked him whether "all these things", his offences, happened because he was infected. Simon answers, after a long pause, "I don't know" and falls silent. Later I asked:

BH: Do you think if anything had happened differently that you wouldn't have committed these murders?

SM: [very quiet] Yes.

BH: If things had happened differently. What things would have needed to be different?

SM: Maybe if my work hadn't gone down... Maybe I wouldn't have been there. Or maybe if I didn't have extra motives. Maybe.

BH: So your work went downhill and you had this extra [inaudible]...and it put pressure on you?

SM: [Affirmative noise]

BH: OK.

The three murders Simon was convicted of all occurred in 1997. He was also charged with two counts of rape (one of which related to the above-mentioned offence against Nomas Mathetsa, in 1996), and one of attempted rape. Two charges of robbery and one of theft relate to offences he committed in the course of the murders. Simon does not make causal links and correlations in telling about his offences, and does not describe them in chronological order. However they will be discussed in the order in which they occurred.

a) Imago analysis: Nomsa Mathetsa

Simon's account of the rape of Nomsa Mathetsa is confused and unclear. This suggests this offence lacks the clear justification and rationale that his narrative brings to accounts of violence against partners who have rejected him, that is, to violence committed by the Vengeful Suitor imago against the Rejecting Woman imago. This lack of clarity also contrasts with his accounts of his murders, and suggests that his narrative and imagoes do not supply unequivocal support for this offence

i) Possible role of Vengeful Suitor imago¹³

It is notable that Nomsa's resistance brought the violence normally associated with the Vengeful Suitor into expression. This violence included rape which, based on the Vengeful Suitor imagoes' previous actions, is associated with the desire for dominance and control. From this we could hypothesise that Nomsa's resistance and lack of compliance was interpreted as rejection, invoking the emotional pain of Lonely Child and so justifying the Vengeful Suitor's violence. This is supported by Simon's blaming her for "forcing" him to use violence. By presenting his violence against Nomsa as a rational and justified response (in this case, to an unreasonable demand) Simon demonstrates the influence of the Vengeful Suitor imago in her rape.

Beyond this influence, Simon's behaviour during the rape of Nomsa is not entirely explicable in terms of his imagoes. It could be hypothesised that with the weakening in the Good Family Man imago, Simon felt free to take sex from women by force; but neither the Rejecting Woman imago nor the Vengeful Suitor imago could be said to have provided either the justification or the behavioural template for the commission of rape, especially against someone who did not appear strongly identified with the Rejecting Woman imago. This lack of behavioural influence from the imagoes' is perhaps reflected in the confusion and vagueness in Simon's narrative of this crime. Although the Nomsa's rape does not cast significant light on Simon's imagoes, the events that come after it have a notable affect on his narrative.

¹³ See transcription references: 67 – 69.

ii) *Crisis in 1997 and the affect on Simon's imagoes*¹⁴

Simon had already committed a rape prior to this crisis. This suggests that the imago interactions and characteristics linked to his offending were already largely in place. It also suggests it is not easy to make a clear division between Simon's 'pre-murder series' and 'murder series' narratives, and that there is an overlap between them. More specifically, the imago interactions and characteristics as already laid out in the 'Adult Life (pre-murder series)' imago analysis section with the overlap between Simon's pre-murder and murder narratives represented in the rape of Nomsa Mathetsa.

After this crisis in 1997 Simon commits the three murders he confesses to, was convicted of, and provides clear narratives for. This suggests this crisis may have removed the final barriers to him associating his self with 'justified' murder. In a continuation of the emerging crisis in the preceding years, the crisis in 1997 sees further weakening of the Good Family Man imago. Here, it is coupled particularly with further strengthening of the Vengeful Suitor imago's motives.

- **Further weakening of Good Family Man**

1997 brought the final blows to the Good Family Man imago, and these tipped Simon into crisis. The threatened disintegration of Simon's home life meant he was failing to live up to the aspirations of the Good Family Man imago, inherited from the Eldest Brother imago. This was exacerbated by Simon's failure to live up to another aspiration of the Good Family Man, when his work "went down". At the same time as all this, Simon was diagnosed as HIV positive. It is consistent with the interpersonal interaction of the Vengeful Suitor imago that Simon would not blame himself for this, and rather focus his anger on the woman who infected him. What is notable is that his anger is couched in terms of its harming his ability to meet the aspirations of the Good Family Man imago: Simon links his diagnosis directly to how it would prevent his being the "strong" breadwinner for his family. This diagnosis thus limited his ability to meet his positive aspirations, and so undermined the Good Family Man imago.

¹⁴ See transcription references: 27 – 29, 34, 45, 77, 84, 85.

Although he cannot articulate a precise cause, Simon gives a clear impression of a series of pressures leading him to murder. These pressures struck at all aspects of the Good Family Man imago: brother, family and church. Even work, the area where the Good Family Man appeared to have the most influence, suffered. As with the previous rejections he suffered at the hands of women, the church, and through the deaths of his parents and eldest brother; Simon perceives these pressures as coming without provocation from a hostile world that is beyond his control. This fatally weakened the Good Family Man. The Good Family Man was already a compartmentalised character, one Simon appears to have identified as much with others as with himself, and one he kept separate from the other imagoes up to this point. The limited influence of the Good Family Man imago at this stage is demonstrated by Simon's sister's failed attempts to get him to see a psychiatrist. This supports the earlier hypothesis that Simon needed his eldest brother's physical presence to support the Good Family Man imago.

From this point on the Good Family Man is only a sporadic influence and an occasional character in Simon's unfolding story. While this weakening doesn't see the Good Family Man imago lose any of the four proposed features of the prototypical imago (McAdams, 1988) it displays, it does see the strength of the association with one of these four lessen with the lessening influence of the Good Family Man imago over Simon's behaviour.

- **Strengthening of Vengeful Suitor imago**

In addition to undermining the Good Family Man imago, the perceived threat to Simon's home life (in the person of his wife's former partner wanting to see his daughter) appears to have evoked a strong violent response from Simon. In a similar vein he wanted to revenge himself on the woman who gave him HIV. This suggests that these events were perceived by Simon as a threatened rejection or a cause of future rejection respectively, so drawing the predictable response from the Vengeful Suitor imago.

As established, the Vengeful Suitor imago was motivated to overcome rejection and the loneliness it caused, through violence. Thus by increasing the threat of rejection, the Vengeful Suitor is motivated to react more strongly. This is evidenced in the fact

that Simon's violence against his wife had escalated to a point that concerned his sister enough for her to suggest he seek psychological treatment. The fact that Simon did not seek this treatment may also suggest that he felt his reaction was justified, which further supports the hypothesis that the Vengeful Suitor imago was becoming stronger. The strengthening of the Vengeful Suitor's motive here contrasts with what occurred during the emerging crisis, when it was mainly the Rejecting Woman that was strengthened (which merely meant more provocation for the Vengeful Suitor). Now, with the crisis, both sides of the destructive dynamic between the Vengeful Suitor and Rejecting Woman have become stronger. From this point in the narrative on the Vengeful Suitor imago appears to wield a more consistent influence over Simon's behaviour than the weakened Good Family Man.

The developing motive of dominance and control associated with the Vengeful Suitor, and possibly expressed in rape, could also be hypothesised to become stronger in response to the events of this crisis. That is, since Simon perceives himself to have no control over these distressing events, the Vengeful Suitor would be more motivated to regain this control, possibly through rape.

It should be remembered that Simon was already offending before 1997 brought the further blows to Good Family Man and the strengthening of the Vengeful Suitor. Thus the events of 1997 did not cause his offending. However, these events and the affects they had on his imagoes may have accelerated his criminal career along the path that the dynamic between the Vengeful Suitor and the Rejecting Woman already dictated to him. In discussing each of his offences, it should become apparent how the destructive relationship between the Vengeful Suitor and Rejecting Woman imagoes flourished and drove his offending behaviour at a time when the Good Family Man was in decline.

5.1.3.5 Paulina Mbuli

The offence against Paulina Mbuli occurred around the time of the crisis in Simon's life in 1997, although the exact relationship between the crisis in his life and this offence is not entirely clear. Simon was charged with and convicted of attempted rape in connection with his offence against Paulina on 24th May 1997. Paulina Mbuli was a 28 year old school teacher who Simon, driving Nandi's vehicle, agreed to give a lift to a neighbouring town. Police accounts state they were travelling at night and were just before they reached their destination Simon stopped the car at the roadside, grabbed Paulina and began to throttle her until she became weak. He tried to remove her clothes but she fought back violently. Simon responded angrily and in the ensuing struggle Paulina fell from the vehicle. Simon drove off with her luggage, containing her clothes. Paulina walked into town and laid a charge. This case was however only linked to Simon after his arrest. It is not clear from court accounts whether this was due to Paulina not knowing who Simon was, or whether it the police Paulina reported the offence` to did not take action immediately.

Simon denies involvement in this offence and claims it was attributed to him opportunistically, once he was arrested for the other murders. Notwithstanding this, there was enough evidence to convict him. Simon is quick to point out that Paulina Mbuli gave an incorrect make for the vehicle he was driving and Nandi, he implies, gave false testimony in stating Paulina Mbuli's clothes were in her car "but they [the prosecution] did not bring those cars to the court, or those clothes to the court, and all that stuff, and said 'these were Mbuli's things'. But I said, I don't mind. BH: '[Sympathetic] So you just had that case put on you?' SM: '[Emphatic] Yes.'

When we discussed this offence, Simon looked away, repeated his denials, then looked away and down again. I noted at the time that I was not sure whether this was a sign of dishonesty, or simply due to his awkwardness around the topic.

There are obvious parallels between this offence and the rape of Nomsa a year earlier: both victims sought a lift with him, both attacks occurred at the roadside en route, and both victims elicited an angry reaction from Simon and were throttled when they resisted. Furthermore, as in his account of the rape of Nomsa, Simon's narrative

around this incident is vague, and he stammers while giving it. His denial is not clear and unambiguous, and the reasons he gives for Paulina's story being false are confused and unclear. Overall these similarities suggest both the rapes attributed to Simon were part of a pattern of offending.

a) Imago analysis: Paulina Mbuli

i) Role and limitations of the Vengeful Suitor imago¹⁵

The pattern of offending that began to be established with Nomsa Mathetsa appears to have been repeated with Paulina Mbuli. The motives for both these offences (that is, why Simon decided to rape these women) are not clear from his narrative. However, as with Nomsa, Simon's behaviour during the attempted rape of Paulina Mbuli shows clear associations with the Vengeful Suitor imago. In both, Simon becomes violent in response to resistance and the decision to offend, like the decision to become violent towards his female partners, appears to be taken impulsively.

These two rape / attempted rape offences highlight the limits of the Vengeful Suitor imago's influence. The Vengeful Suitor imago does not provide a clear behavioural template for rape offences. This is shown in Simon's offence behaviour appearing neither decisive nor goal-directed. While there is an association between rape and the Vengeful Suitor imago, Simon's narrative does not establish a similar link between this imago and the use of strangulation to control the victim. Attempted or threatened throttling was seen in the offences against both Ms. Mbuli and Ms. Mathetsa, but Simon's narrative neglects to mention it in either of the cases.

There are two possible, non-mutually exclusive, reasons for these limits to the Vengeful Suitor's influence. The first is that the Vengeful Suitor imago is not able to entirely justify an attack against women who appear to have supplied minimal provocation and thus have minimal association with the Rejecting Woman imago. This suggests that at this stage the dynamic with the Rejecting Woman imago is required by the Vengeful Suitor to justify its violence. The second possible reason for

¹⁵ See transcription references: 70, 108.

these limitations is that the behaviours associated with the Vengeful Suitor imago are still evolving. This refers particularly to the use of strangulation to control the victim, where these offences could be seen as a behavioural ‘try out’ for future offences.

Unfortunately, given that Simon denied involvement in this offence and does not discuss it, the above interpretations cannot be confirmed with reference to his narrative. Based on the above discussion it can be hypothesised that Simon’s denial may be due to this offence lacking the moral justification which the interaction between the Rejecting Woman and Vengeful Suitor imagoes supplies his violence against partners. This justification may not have been supplied because Paulina Mbuli was a stranger and thus would not be associated with the Rejecting Woman imago, who Simon’s narrative applies to his associates. This would be exacerbated by the Vengeful Suitor imago not providing a clear template for rape which, alongside the unclear motive for committing rape against a stranger, increases the likelihood of his denying this offence.

5.1.3.6 Stella Mogotsi

Simon’s first conviction for murder was in connection with Stella Mogotsi. He was also convicted of theft in relation to this offence. Four days after the attack on Paulina, on the way to fetch his wife, Simon bumped into an ex-girlfriend of his, a young police officer called Stella Mogotsi. He had had a sexual relationship with Stella, an associate of Nandi’s, three months before. Simon says he wanted to talk to Stella. He wanted to find out why Stella stopped their relationship and began ignoring him. In his words: “Was it because I had nothing, or was it because what Nandi said to her?” Stella didn’t want to listen to him. She told him that Nandi thought he wasn’t good enough to her. Simon said he didn’t want to believe what she said:

SM: ...Stella said it so, that made me angry afterwards. Because the friendship with Nandi was going down. It was back to where we started, we were splitting up again. She was starting make enemies for me. That is how I look at it, you see.

BH: So Nandi was starting to make you enemies.

SM: Yes.

BH: So who were you more angry with when you were sitting there in the car with Stella?

SM: I was angry. Very angry.

Simon's reaction was predictable. Stella, as a police member, was carrying her service pistol, a Z-88.

Nandi made me angry, and Stella made me angry. But I didn't want to kill Stella but I wanted to hurt Stella, I wanted her to know that she hurt me. So I got to hurt her... She was talking so boldly, she was so sure of herself. Only because she had that gun with her. Maybe the gun made her bold, the gun made her strong. But when I took the gun away from her she was no longer that strong, self-assured person.

Unlike with his rapes, Simon narrates the murder of Stella in a quiet, clear voice. He speaks fluently and with certainty, without pauses.

BH: What did you say to her? Did you say things to her, while...?

SM: I never talked a lot with Stella. I never talked a lot with Stella. I just tied her hands behind her back.

BH: Did you shout at her, or swear at her?

SM: [pause] I never shouted at her. I said I was angry and I said the things that made me angry and I left her there.

BH: You said to her what was making you angry.

SM: Yes.

Simon is vague about what actions he carried out. He says he started by tying her hands behind her back then tying them to her neck. He clarifies that he tied her with wire, and continues:

SM: I never killed her. No way what I did to her killed her. Maybe the hold on her neck choked her... so I never had any part in the killing of Stella... I'm not going to lie, I said to myself 'You didn't kill Stella', I didn't kill Stella. I said to myself I didn't kill Stella, I did nothing to kill her. At least, what I did killed her, but I didn't have any intentions of killing Stella...

BH: How did you feel when you were tying her up?

SM: I have to say I was angry.

BH: And just after, when you dropped her off at the roadside?

SM: Relieved...I can say maybe I was relieved I got rid of her.

BH: Relieved to have stopped her talking.

SM: Ja.

According to Simon he didn't rape her. He claims he left Stella by a bus stop, and then drove directly to pick up his wife the schoolteacher. He omits details that later came out in court. He strangled Stella with wire in his car after tying her hands behind her back. It appears that either during the struggle, or after she was dead, her hands were freed and the wire around her neck was attached to her belt. He drove on for a distance then dumped her body near a bus stop.

He had taken Stella's service pistol.

BH: Why did you take Stella's pistol? What made you take it?

SM: I don't know, why I took it [laughs]. I had no plans for the gun, but I took it.

BH: Did you like the gun, or say 'I want this?'

SM: [pause] To tell you truth I'm afraid of guns. But I took it really. I don't like guns.

BH: So just took it with you?

SM: Ja.

BH: Where did you keep it afterwards?

SM: I gave it to Nandi to keep it with her...

BH: So you just took it on the moment and got rid of it later. Did it remind you of Stella?

SM: Yes [emphatic] that's why I immediately got rid of the gun, gave it to someone else.

Even though Simon reports feeling no regret at the time, the above quote reveals he did not want to be reminded about Stella. Two days later, when he heard her body had been discovered, he slept all day. Regret for Stella's killing, it seems, later consumed him:

BH: Did it make you feel bad?

SM: It made me sad, not bad as such, but sad... Sometimes you do something that you cannot use. There's this guy who sings a song 'If I could turn back the hand of time.'

BH: Is that how you felt about Stella?

SM: Ja.

Saying this, Simon broke down in tears. The reasons for this regret become more apparent when Simon says that just after arriving in prison, he felt like he was going mad, tormented by “many things on my mind”. He immediately recalls that:

SM: I remember, with Stella. I have never seen something like that. A person that’s dying, instead of asking God to help her, she said ‘God, please forgive Simon.’ I will never forget. Even today, I won’t.

Simon appears to still wonder about this, and it bothers him. His narrative returns to her many times, a victim he cannot free his mind of and forget.

a) Imago analysis: Stella Mogotsi

This offence clarifies the characteristics of Simon’s imagoes and confirms the notable interactions between them. Furthermore it highlights how these may have changed with the first murder Simon admits to. It is not clear whether the changes to these imagoes precede or were encouraged by this offence.

i) Behaviours associated with Vengeful Suitor evolve and are confirmed¹⁶

This offence does not see changes in the motives or characteristics of the Vengeful Suitor imago. While some of the offence behaviours associated with this imago changed, these represent a simple evolution of the behaviours displayed during the rape of Nomsa Mathetsa and attempted rape of Paulina Mbuli. As seen in the cases of Nomsa and Paulina, this offence was precipitated by Simon’s violent reaction to rejection or resistance, is begun impulsively, and involves throttling. The Vengeful Suitor imago thus remains motivated to overcome rejection and loneliness by getting rid of the provocation of the Rejecting Woman imago who evokes all these emotions. As has been established, the Vengeful Suitor imago supplies the means of overcoming the rejection and loneliness the Lonely Child could not.

¹⁶ See transcription references: 9, 53 – 60, 65, 71, 72, 82, 83, 85, 89, 112.

In all three cases Simon's post offence behaviour, unlike his behaviour during the offence, does not appear logical and coherent. An example of this in Stella's case is Simon's stealing of her firearm, but being unable to articulate clearly why he did so. This illustrates the limits of the behavioural plans associated with the Vengeful Suitor. However this offence does provide a possible explanation for why Simon sleeps for two days after this offence, which may be due to the Vengeful Suitor drawing on its origins as the Lonely Child, and seeking isolation and separation from others.

The most notable behavioural difference in Stella's case is that the throttling involved the use of a ligature and led to her death. In his previous rapes Simon does not confess to the use of throttling. Now he does and so associates this behaviour with the Vengeful Suitor (although he still denies meaning to kill, despite the fact that a conviction of murder can only be secured if intent is proven). A possible reason for his deciding to use a ligature, and confessing to it, is the changes in the Rejecting Woman imago, as will be described below

As mentioned in the previous imago interpretation section, all the above behaviours have already been strongly associated with the Vengeful Suitor imago. However this offence sees these behaviours becoming fully and permanently associated with the Vengeful Suitor.

ii) Role and characteristics of Rejecting Woman imago described further¹⁷

The Rejecting Woman is more clearly described in this offence. This more detailed description shows that the role associated with the Rejecting Woman imago has remained the same: this imago serves to provoke and thus justify the Vengeful Suitor's anger. This offence therefore demonstrates the importance of an association between the victim and the Rejecting Woman imago. Whereas in the cases of Paulina Mbuli and Nomsa Mathetsa the association between the victim and the Rejecting Woman imago was largely hypothetical, here Simon's narrative makes the link between Stella and the Rejecting Woman imago clear. Stella was a former girlfriend whose rejection of Simon was obvious and explicit. Stella was also a friend of Nandi,

¹⁷ See transcription references: 9, 53 – 60, 65, 71, 72, 82, 83, 85, 89, 112.

the person Simon associates with the Rejecting Woman imago most. In fact, the argument appears to have been started by mention of Nandi. Stella's rejection of him, her association with Nandi, and her boldness, must have seemed so like the Rejecting Woman imago in character that it would inevitably provoke the Vengeful Suitor imago, with predictable consequences. By associating Stella with the Rejecting Woman imago, the violence inflicted by the Vengeful Suitor imago is encouraged and justified. This encouragement and justification is evidenced in Simon's throttling of the victim escalating to the point of murder, and in his narrative of the offence which, unlike that for Nomsa or Paulina, is more detailed and narrated fluently. Provoked by the Rejecting Woman, the Vengeful Suitor imago suggest a behavioural plan and bestows his actions with a moral justification. Thus the murder of Stella Mogotsi confirms the importance of the interaction between these two imagoes in motivating Simon's offences.

This offence gives further descriptions of the characteristics Simon associates with the Rejecting Woman imago. First among these is implied in his description of Stella as being "strong, self-assured" and "confident". While they could have previously been inferred as characteristics of the Rejecting Woman, they are now stated explicitly. They are now added to the existing characteristics of the Rejecting Woman imago as being rejecting of Simon, and materialistic.

This offence also sees the strengthening of Nandi's association with the Rejecting Woman imago. In 1997 Nandi helped strengthen this imago in Simon's narrative. Now this association is re-iterated through Nandi's role in causing the argument that lead to Stella's death, and in Simon's giving Stella's pistol to Nandi. By giving an item taken from the victim to the epitome of the Rejecting Woman in his narrative he is further drawing Nandi into, and implicating, her in his offences. This association between the Rejecting Woman and Nandi thus sees this imago have a wider sphere of influence. Previously the Rejecting Woman imago only goaded the Vengeful Suitor by rejecting Simon. Now the Rejecting Woman is blamed for poisoning Simon 'relationships with others. Furthermore, in this offence the Vengeful Suitor's anger appears focused on both Nandi and Stella, where previously was just focused on the person who rejected him. This introduces the possibility of the Vengeful Suitor imago accepting a proxy victim (Stella) rather than target the source of his rejection and

anger (Nandi). These factors expand range of stimuli that will provoke, and so justify the violence of, the Vengeful Suitor.

iii) The residual role of Good Family Man imago¹⁸

In this offence, the role of the Good Family Man appears limited to encouraging regret in Simon. By praying in her dying moments Stella evoked the religious beliefs which the Good Family Man imago inherited from the Eldest Brother and Happy Family imagoes. By associating herself with the Good Family Man, Stella not only lessens her association with the Rejecting Woman which justifies Simon's violence, but she appears to have overcome the separation Simon tries to maintain between the Good Family Man imago and the actions of the Vengeful Suitor. This loss of separation alongside Stella's weakened association with the Rejecting Woman may have encouraged Simon to judge his actions against the moral aspirations of the Good Family Man imago, and so experience regret. Alternatively it may have encouraged the realisation in Simon that, by killing Stella, he had again failed in the aim of the Good Family Man to overcome loneliness and re-establish communion with the idealised family.

5.1.3.7 Portia Mashabela

For this incident Simon was convicted of murder and theft. During this time Simon continued to live a semi-nomadic life, constantly on the move across the Eastern Cape, between jobs, his wife, and his girlfriends. As alluded to he also appears to have been struggling financially at this time. Whatever the reason, Simon rented a room in a house Nandi owned in a large regional town. It was a large four bedroom house, with a garage and servants' quarters out the back. Nandi also lived there, renting out the other rooms. One of the other tenants was a 26 year old woman named Portia Mashabela. She was a colleague of Nandi's and, when Simon was asked to narrate what happened with Portia, his first response was "Things were not going well between me and Nandi". He goes on to say that "The friendship between me and Nandi was starting to have problems again...We would quarrel some times". Simon

¹⁸ See transcription references: 9, 53 – 60, 65, 71, 72, 82, 83, 85, 89, 112.

briefly mentions, in an almost inaudible voice, that he had proposed to Nandi, and she had turned him down. Simon often uses the term ‘proposed’ to mean sexually propositioned, but this might mean marriage. It is not clear what his intention was, and he does not refer to it again. Simon implies this rejection from Nandi had an affect on Portia’s attitude towards him:

One day, Portia started to have a [pause] negative attitude towards me. She would joke about my car, my old car, she would say that I...was not giving a good impression to the house because members of the public would come there and see my car. She would say such jokes. I would laugh but inside, I was not laughing.

Simon told me this in a fast, low voice, sounding angry just talking about it. He goes on narrate an incident where he, because he “like(s) to be play physically”, tried to be playful with Portia by tripping her and catching her before she could fall. Portia did not take this well and retaliated:

She said that if you tore my valuables you won’t be able to pay for that because the money you’re working is not, is too...won't be able to pay for these items, *ei!* [exclaims] she was making me angry. I wanted to slap her but something said to me ‘no don’t’.

Voice not slowing, Simon says that after this incident he told Nandi that he would be moving out because of his clashes with Portia. He left the house and went to live with his girlfriend, who lived locally.

Simon subsequently returned to Nandi and Portia’s house to collect his remaining possessions. He does not say how long it was after he moved out. It was just under four months since the Stella’s death. He arrived at the house on a Wednesday at around 2pm and found the locks had been changed. He phoned Nandi, to ask why

people were “making funny tricks”. Nandi dismissed him by saying he must take his things and get out the house. Simon waited outside the house.

When they were driving this latest BMW, this E class. They parked the car in the driveway... Portia went into the house, I said to Portia ‘don’t lock the house’ because I wanted to get my things out of there. Portia walked into the house with the key, she came back and locked the house then got into the car and drove away.

Here it appears that the women’s flaunting their wealth angers Simon almost as much as their ignoring him. Similarly, Portia appears to be displaying a materialist character trait that Simon had previously associated with Nandi.

Simon wasn’t able to return until the Friday evening, and “I had to do without changing my clothes”. He arrived at half past seven in the evening. Nandi, who Simon refers to in this part of his story as “my sister”, was not there. Portia gave Simon a hostile reception:

She asked me ‘*eh* [sneers] what do I [you] want?’ I said ‘I have come to fetch my things’. She was looking behind me. Swearing, telling me my sister told me she doesn’t want me anymore there. I asked her ‘I am I going to get my things?’ She said ‘no, you must get out of here. You must come when your sister is here’, she said.

He had been repeatedly rudely dismissed and insulted by a woman he appears to have found desirable. To make matters worse she was associated with Nandi, who had also recently rejected him. This provocation was more than Simon could bear. In his haste to tell this part of his story, Simon’s words come out in a jumble:

That made me angry. There are three steps in the house, down steps. I kicked her, she fell down. And then I put my knee on her, when she fell there. Then I proceeded to choke, choke her. She had pantyhose in her hands. And I pulled the pantyhose up, then I pressed with my knee in the back of her. I was telling her all the things that she said that made me angry, all of them. After about five minutes I let her go. I thought 'OK, I have killed'.

As with Stella, he had strangled Portia with a ligature, while telling her how she had brought this on herself.

"Funny..." at this point Simon sighs, as if sitting back satisfied. His speech slows and becomes more measured and clear:

SM: To tell you the truth I didn't feel sad [pause]. I didn't feel sad. I was not worried.

BH: So you felt angry while you were doing it, then afterwards?

SM: I was not sad as such. Or worried that I had killed someone you see. Maybe inside of me there was a thing that said 'You've revenged, she did you wrong. You took your revenge'. You see, 'what you did maybe is right,' you see. Maybe that's how I felt, but to tell you the truth I was not sad, [pause] you see... in Portia's case, I was not angry with myself after that one. I can I can say I sort of felt relieved, as if I have solved the most difficult problem I ever had.

Later, I asked him "Which killing didn't you mind doing? Was that Portia?" He replied

SM: Yes.

BH: Did you enjoy it?

SM: I don't think enjoying it is the right word. I revenged.

BH: It was necessary.

SM: Ja.

As with Stella, Simon appears to have committed this offence impulsively. He says he didn't rape her, and he left her fully clothed.

SM: I told myself now *ei*, I have killed someone, so I took her to the garage, put mats over her. Then thought what to do.

BH: Did you drive her in the car? Or did you leave her in the garage?

SM: I left her in the garage...After a week, I took her away.

BH: So she stayed in the garage for about a week?

SM: [very quiet] Yeah.

BH: OK, she just laid there, no one knew what had had happened to her?

SM: [very quiet] Ja.

Simon left the address and returned to his girlfriend's house. After a week, Simon returned to the address, retrieved Portia's corpse from underneath the mats in the garage and loaded it into his car. He drove to a settlement about 50 kilometres away, Fort Beaufort.

BH: Why did you choose Fort Beaufort?

SM: I didn't choose Fort Beaufort, I [stutter] I wanted to get rid of her. No matter where, just to get rid of her... On that particular day I was going to Fort Beaufort with my girlfriend, her sisters' son. So they didn't know what I loaded in the car. They were going to Port Elizabeth. I dropped

them in the house, I came back, I dropped the body there, then I went back to fetch them.

Portia's body was found wrapped in a floral sheet and a plastic bag from Nandi's garage. The stockings she was strangled with were still tied tightly around her neck.

While his behaviours at the crime scene seemed clear, his behaviours after the offence are not. As with Stella, Simon stole an item from Portia. This time, he took his victim's cell phone, but again he can't explain why he committed this theft:

BH: Why did you take that?

SM: I don't know.

BH: Was it the same for the gun?

SM: Ja.

BH: Did you try get rid of it, or did you use it?

SM: I used it.

BH: Did you get rid of it later, or just keep it until you're...?

SM: I got rid of it.

BH: What did you do with it?

SM: I gave it to a man... [inaudible]... an exchange.

a) Imago analysis: Portia Mashabela

This offence confirms the characteristics of, and interactions between, the imagoes displayed in the previous offence. More importantly, the murder of Portia Mashabela epitomises the way in which the interaction between the Rejecting Woman and Vengeful Suitor imagoes serve to justify Simon's offences. As has been established this interaction involves the Rejecting Woman imago provoking the Vengeful Suitor, whose revenge determines the characteristics of Simon's offences. This justification

implied in this interaction also ensures there is no remorse, as this offence does not evoke the Good Family Man imago in any way.

i) Confirmation of the role of the Rejecting Woman imago¹⁹

This offence is notable for the degree to which the Rejecting Woman imago is involved in the events preceding the offence. Firstly, Simon states that he propositioned Nandi, who rejected him. Rejection by someone so closely related to the Rejecting Woman imago must have been hard for Simon (or the Vengeful Suitor) to bear. Secondly, Simon attributes the change in Portia's attitude towards him to this rejection by Nandi. This 'double-rejection' would no doubt aggravate the Vengeful Suitor imago further. Thirdly, not only is Portia closely associated with the epitome of the Rejecting Woman (Nandi) but Portia herself comes to display the characteristics and behaviours of the Rejecting Woman in Simon's narrative: materialistic, bold, rejecting and dismissive of Simon. This is best shown in when Portia arrives in a BMW and refuses to pay any heed to Simon's requests. These rejections and provocations from someone who appeared to be so strongly associated with the Rejecting Woman imago in Simon's narrative could be expected to demand an unequivocal response from the Vengeful Suitor.

ii) Confirmation of behaviours associated with the Vengeful Suitor imago²⁰

Simon's anger in this part of his narrative is obvious in his tone and in the haste at which he narrates the offence. This is at odds with his usually hesitant delivery of offence details and suggests that the anger associated with the Vengeful Suitor imago was particularly dominant in this offence. Notwithstanding this, the influence of the Vengeful Suitor imago on Simon's behaviour mirrors that seen in the previous offences, and this offence does not represent a significant evolution of the Vengeful Suitor imago or Simon's associated offence behaviours. As with the previous offences against Stella, Nomsa and Paulina, the murder of Portia:

- Was precipitated by rejection or resistance.
- Was begun impulsively.

¹⁹ See transcription references: 9, 59, 72 – 76, 82, 88 – 91.

²⁰ See transcription references: 9, 59, 72 – 76, 82, 88 – 91.

- Involved throttling.

All of these behaviours continue to be associated with the Vengeful Suitor imago's overpowering anger and could be linked to the emerging motive of establishing dominance and control. Two further issues are of note. First, the behaviours clearly associated with the Vengeful Suitor imago in Simon's offences do not include rape. Second, Simon's behaviour after this offence (as with Stella) is less organised and coherent. This point supports the hypothesis that the influence of the Vengeful Suitor imago does not appear to extend beyond his characteristic anger and revenge, with post-offence behaviour representing a reversion to the Lonely Child imago's retreat from others and seeking of isolation. Simon's narrative does not supply an answer as to why he stole from Portia (echoing his narrative of Stella's murder), which contrasts with the more clear explanation Simon gives when narrating behaviours associated with the Vengeful Suitor.

Once more the Vengeful Suitor imago gives Simon a clear behavioural plan and moral justification for his actions becoming, in the narrative of his offence, an internal voice encouraging Simon in his vengeance. Given that Portia appeared completely and consistently associated with Simon's epitome of a 'deserving victim' – the Rejecting Woman imago – this justification was unequivocal. Her death was more than justified, it became "necessary". Portia, unlike Stella, had done nothing to either distance herself from the Rejecting Woman or associate herself with the Good Family Man imago. Thus any redemption in Simon's eyes was not possible. This offence, according to Simon's narrative, represents the Vengeful Suitor imago's ideal offence: a satisfying revenge against a victim who deserved it.

5.1.3.8 Zondi Tana

Simon was convicted of the rape and murder of his step-daughter Zondi Tana. This offence was motivated by what could have seemed to Simon the ultimate rejection. His wife Thembeni was planning to divorce him. Remember that his wife's ex-husband had already approached her about access to their children (including Zondi) and this had provoked a violent reaction from Simon who feared it would mean he would be rejected. Now in October 1997, just under a month after Portia's death, Simon went to stay with his wife at her house in a township just outside East London, as he implies he normally did over school holidays. 15-year old Zondi was there visiting his wife, her mother.

Simon admits he was the cause of the break up of his marriage. When I asked whether the divorce was due to his wife returning to her ex-husband, Simon corrects me: "No...I was the cause. She filed for divorce but I was the cause of the divorce..." BH: 'Because of things you were doing?' SM: 'Yes, because of things, like...' ". At this point Simon is overcome by emotion and falls silent. I was concerned about his reaction and reassured him that I knew that this must be hard for him and he didn't have to talk if he didn't want to. Perhaps Simon, confronted with the part he played in thwarting his marital dreams, is overwhelmed. Alternatively, it is the story to come that makes him weep. He continues, and the story of Zondi's murder is punctuated by pauses.

SM: That day I woke up early. Her mother had cut our mattress in half.

She wrote me a letter telling me that she doesn't want to see me again.

And she also sent back the watch I gave her for our fourth anniversary.

Then I said '*ish*, she is serious'... I had to get her, I had to get hold of her but there was no way, she didn't want to see me again.

BH: Did you want her back, or were you just angry at her?

SM: I wanted her back, I wanted her back

Simon phoned his wife and asked her to return to her house to speak with him. She refused, saying she would be spending that night at a friend's. He went to where his wife was staying but her friend didn't allow him in. At this point Simon intended to find his wife, kill her, and then commit suicide: "Just to finish it off, *klaar* [finished], there and then....I was going to shoot Thembeni and then I was going to shoot myself..." He tried to find a firearm his sister's house, as he knew where she hid hers, but could not find it. He then returned to their house to wash. His next plan was to drive to Bisho where he knew he could find Stella's Z-88 to fulfil his murder-suicide plans.

Zondi, Simon says, was "at the wrong place. At the wrong time". Speaking slowly and deliberately, with many pauses, he continues: "[sighs] Because that day, I wanted to hurt her mother. [Pause] But unfortunately I couldn't get my hands on her mother. So I took what I knew she really loved, her daughter." Simon was about to take the step he "didn't have the guts" to do at the time of his first rejection by Sweetie. He was about to take revenge, any way he could.

SM: While I was busy washing at my sister's house, I saw Zondi again. Zondi was busy at the fire at her granma's house [*i.e.* next door]. I saw Zondi getting into her grandma's house carrying things. I washed myself and finished washing myself. Then Zondi came out of the house. I told myself 'if I want to get even, now's the chance'.

BH: So you hadn't thought about it before?

SM: Ja. Suddenly I told myself this is a chance to get even, with the father, and with the mother.

BH: The mother, Thembeni.

SM: Ja, to take what they love most. I knew Thembeni loved Zondi, I knew that Zondi's father loved Zondi as well, very much, you see. Now I told myself, this is the time to get even.

It appears that, as before, the decision to murder was taken impulsively. Similarly, the victim was selected opportunistically. However rather than immediately attack his victim, Simon decided to follow her and lure her away.

Simon followed Zondi as she walked to the nearby taxi rank she normally used. Simon planned to catch the same taxi she did. A brown Kombi arrived, Zondi got on, and “fortunately” there was a spare seat for Simon. When the taxi arrived at a nearby Square, Simon knew that Zondi would alight soon so he got off about 300 metres from where she did.

SM: When the Kombi came there, I saw Zondi, and said, ‘listen here there is something I want you to give to a certain guy, a church elder from our church, so can you please come with me and fetch this thing in my flat?’. I had a flat in Atalanta Street...Atalanta is a bar when we came to that bar with Zondi [pause] she said ‘can we hurry’ because she was getting late for school [Sunday school].

It was midday on a Sunday. Simon took Zondi to the Atalanta Bar, above which was the flat he owned. He bought a quarter of gin and two Cokes. He gave Zondi a Coke,

SM: ... then I poured the quarter of gin into the Coke and then I drank it.

BH: What did you do that for?

SM: I’m sure I was taking some strength for what I was going to do. I was taking the shyness out of me. I was trying to get rid of the fright, of being frightened. Because I told myself I had to do this. I was going to pay Thembeni back where it hurt most.

Simon’s reflections did not slow his actions:

SM: Everything happened suddenly. Everything happened so fast I don't know ...I was always thinking of something, then maybe a minute or two, then if I had a problem with this then, suddenly another plan would come. So everything happened fast.

He says it took less than ten minutes from his decision to kill Zondi, to where we was now, with her in the Atalanta Bar. Simon sounds ashamed when he describes, in a clear slow voice, what happened next:

SM: So after maybe three, five minutes I took Zondi 'come here, there is something up in the flat'. I strangled her. I raped her first. I won't lie, you see.

BH: Did you speak to her?

SM: Ja.

BH: And what did she say?

SM: She was crying.

BH: Did you have to hit her at all, or was she too scared?

SM: She was too scared.

BH: And then after you finished raping her?

SM: I strangled her.

Zondi, he says, looked like her mother. Like Stella, he said, she prayed when she died. According to police reports he had strangled Zondi with a nylon rope, which he tied to the leg of chair before he left. Simon left Zondi in the position he had killed her: legs spread and with injuries to her genitals. He locked the door of his flat, and went home.

SM: But I couldn't sleep that night.

BH: What was going through your head?

SM: I was afraid. I was thinking about what I have caused, what have I done. How am I going to forgive myself. Because even now, even today, [Pause] There are certain things that I can forgive and forget, but not Zondi...I regret Zondi.

I asked Simon, whether he had felt that he had “revenged” as he did after Portia. He paused, then replied: “I felt sorrow. For myself and for Zondi.” Simon repeats that, in Zondi’s case, “I won’t be able forgive myself, or to forget...”. While Simon appeared to have regretted killing Stella, his regret was tempered by her ‘deserving it’. With Zondi he did not have this mitigating factor. His regret is unequivocal. When he was first arrested, he denied having anything to do with Zondi’s death. Zondi was Simon’s final victim.

In closing, I asked Simon how to summarise his offences.

BH: You said you're not a serial killer, what would you describe yourself as?

SM: [laughs] I don't know [laughs again] really I don't know. But I'm not one. Because I didn't go around killing people, without a reason, or enjoying killing people...

BH: You say if you're a serial killer you would have done it for no reason or you would have liked doing it.

SM: Ja...

BH: Whenever you killed someone you had a reason.

SM: Yes.

BH: So you never killed anyone who didn't make you angry?

SM: [Pause] And it was not my intention to go around killing people who have made me angry.

a) Imago analysis: Zondi Tana

The previous offence served to confirm the characteristics and interactions of Simon's imagoes associated with offending, the Vengeful Suitor and Rejecting Woman. This offence sees a number of notable changes in these and in the role played by the imago not associated with offending, the Good Family Man. These changes do not affect any one imago in isolation, rather impacting on the established interactions between them, the behaviours carried out as a result, and the emotions experienced as a consequence.

i) The Good Family Man's changing interactions²¹

In previous offences the dynamic between the Vengeful Suitor and Rejecting Woman appeared sufficient to provoke the offence. Now in the murder of Zondi Tana the Good Family Man imago plays a role in provoking the offence. Thus while the murder of Portia was marked by its consistent association with the Rejecting Woman imago, this offence is characterised by association with the less influential Good Family Man imago.

This is due to this offence being precipitated by the final breakdown of his marriage. Simon appears to have found this rejection so profound a blow that his first thought is of suicide. This is perhaps because his failing to hold together his marriage means he has failed to achieve a fundamental aspiration of the Good Family Man imago. There is a consistent association between family life and the Good Family Man imago, springing from the latter's origins in the Eldest Brother and Happy Family imagoes. Similarly, his contemplation of suicide harks back to his attempted suicide as child in response to his parent's deaths, the deaths which provided the Lonely Child's origin myth and which were the separation the Good Family Man strove to overcome.

While vengeance against his wife for rejecting him is still justified by the interaction between the Rejecting Woman and Vengeful Suitor imagoes, this is added to here by the rejection being a blow to the aspirations of the Good Family Man imago. Vengeance is thus more than justified, and focused on the family unit (Zondi,

²¹ See transcription references: 78 – 86, 88 – 90, 92.

Thembeni and Zondi's biological father) that created this feeling of rejection in Simon. However as shall be shown, his narrative's justifications for offending, built around the Rejecting Woman imago, cannot support the Vengeful Suitor taking revenge on a whole family.

ii) Conflict within the Vengeful Suitor²²

The Vengeful Suitor imago retains the strongest influence over Simon's behaviours in this offence. Simon's closing statement is testament to the lasting influence of the Vengeful Suitor imago. Simon states that he, in contrast to his conception of a 'serial killer', did not murder people without reason. Simon implies that he had a clear reason and justification which, as has been shown, was provided by the interaction between the Vengeful Suitor and Rejecting Woman imago. Once again Simon had been rejected by a woman and his behavioural plans were dictated by the Vengeful Suitor's violent response to all Rejecting Women. Again the Vengeful Suitor is evoked in response to rejection and the threat of loneliness. Here this rejection is even more potent, coming with the threat of divorce, a clear demonstration of the Good Family Man's failure to re-establish the idealised family. Notwithstanding this, this murder displays a number of behaviours that either have not been associated with the Vengeful Suitor's previous actions in offences, or are not fully justified by its dynamic with the Rejecting Woman. These behaviours appear to have created conflict within the Vengeful Suitor imago.

Firstly, Simon has aimed his violence not at a victim associated with the Rejecting Woman imago, but at a substitute. The possibility of his doing this was introduced in the previous two offences (where both Stella and Portia could be hypothesised as substitutes for Nandi) but in both previous murders the victims were themselves still associated with the Rejecting Woman imago. This development in the murder Zondi could be explained by the fact that, the blow inflicted by the Rejecting Woman in this case (his wife) would have been especially devastating because it dashed the hopes of the Good Family Man and simultaneously provoked the rage of the Vengeful Suitor imago, so justifying revenge by any means. It can be explained further by the

²² See transcription references: 78 – 86, 88 – 90, 92.

observation that, by attacking someone associated with the Rejecting Woman imago, the Vengeful Suitor imago is recalling its origin myth: to get revenge any way he can, something Simon “didn’t have the guts” to do at the time of the origin myth.

Secondly, in this offence, Simon’s behaviour mimics that used by the Vengeful Suitor to demonstrate his dominance in relationships, rather than that established as part of the Vengeful Suitor’s behavioural repertoire in previous murders. That is, he rapes the victim. This is seen alongside other behaviours not previously associated with (and so justified by) the Vengeful Suitor imago, such taking the decision to offend impulsive but rather than attacking immediately, as before, following Zondi and luring her away to kill her.

By simultaneously attacking someone who is not associated with the Rejecting Woman and undertaking behaviours not associated with the Vengeful Suitor’s previous offences it appears that the overpowering and impulsive anger of the Vengeful Suitor imago has been tempered with a cool headed malice. As shall be shown it is perhaps this, not typically associated with the Vengeful Suitor imago, which provokes the regret Simon associates strongly with this offence.

iii) Remorse: an explanation with reference to imagoes²³

It is clear from Simon’s narrative that this offence is not the same as the ‘justified’ murder of Portia. Here his tone is muted, sad, and his story his punctuated with pauses. An analysis of his imagoes offers a number of hypotheses for this regret. These are not mutually exclusive, and may have operated together.

As alluded to above, some of Simon’s regret may have been due to this offence representing the clearest demonstration his failure to meet the aspirations of the Good Family Man imago in his narrative. This regret and remorse would be added to by the collapse in the separation between those imagoes associated with offending (Rejecting Woman and Vengeful Suitor) and those imagoes which are not (Good Family Man). This pattern, where regret was caused by this separation breaking down, was seen to a

²³ See transcription references: 85 – 87.

lesser extent in the murder of Stella. Here not only did Zondi pray while dying and so evoke the Good Family Man, but she was related to Simon and her murder was in part motivated and justified by the failure of the Good Family Man's aspirations. This collapse in separations is more complete than any previously seen, and so potentially generates greater regret. Finally, it could be hypothesised that regret was a result of the above-mentioned conflict within the Vengeful Suitor imago. That is, by overstepping the justifications contained in Rejecting Woman – Vengeful Suitor dynamic and in the Vengeful Suitor's behavioural template, both of which have been outlined above, Simon feels regret.

Any one of these hypotheses, or a combination thereof, could potentially explain Simon's anxiety before this offence. He, for the first time, needed alcohol to help him overcome his "fear", and appeared to pause to reflect on what he was about to do. They could also explain his initial denial of this offence upon arrest, and in court.

5.1.3.9 Arrest and reflection

In Simon's story, he submitted to capture meekly:

BH: How did you feel when the police came around?

SM: [pause] I had no problems with this. I knew they were bound to come. Sooner or later, they were going to come, they were going to get me...I must get myself ready to face the consequences of my deeds.

BH: Did you try cover your tracks, did you take away fingerprints at the scenes?

SM: No.

Simon's account is contradicted by police accounts. Simon apparently evaded capture for a month and a half after Zondi's death, at one point telephoning investigators to tell them he would hand himself in once he had found a Methodist minister to surrender to.

After five months in custody, Simon managed to escape and was again on the run for a few days before being rearrested. Simon did not discuss either of these events in interview, and thus his motives for trying to avoid prison are not known. Neither did Simon discuss his reasons for initially confessing to most of his offences, then revoking these confessions and claiming innocence.

Whilst discussing his offences and his life, Simon reflected on his relationship with Nandi.

SM: Nandi made me angry. If I wanted to kill her I could have killed many a times. I had the chance. But I didn't want to kill Nandi. She's still alive today.

BH: What kept Nandi alive? Why didn't you kill her?

[Pause, mutual laughter at difficult question]

SM: No, I really like Nandi. Especially now. But, I think maybe the children. Let's say the children. My brother's children helped her stay alive.

BH: OK, so it's because she had your brother's children, you didn't...

SM: Ja.

In prison, Simon appeared to be reclaiming many of the interests that seem to have been neglected in his narrative prior to this. At the time of interview Simon had resumed his studies to be a minister, and repeatedly mentions his bookishness. His aspirations, he says, are still “to help people” perhaps by becoming a psychologist or, as he later suggests, “preaching” in schools about the dangers of crime. Simon also appears to be trying to spend more time with his extended family: stating he is still in touch with his girlfriend and sisters, reminiscing about the times he spent joking with his family and his brother's children, and hoping these times will return. Simon insists

he is now a changed man and would never commit this sort of offence again. He states “The only thing that you really need to do is you must be able to say 'no'.”

a) Imago analysis: Arrest and reflection

Simon’s behaviour immediately before, and after, his arrest casts further light on the roles played by his imagoes in his narrative as a whole. In particular, this episode casts further light on the Good Family Man imago. Given this study’s aims, this discussion will be brief and focus particularly on how this affects the construction of Simon’s narrative.

i) The resurgence of the Good Family Man imago²⁴

According to police records Simon telephoned investigators while evading arrest, saying he would hand himself in once he had found a Methodist minister to surrender to. The only hypothesis that can be proposed for this, based on an analysis of his imagoes, is that he was motivated to obtain forgiveness from someone who, like his eldest brother, was a Methodist minister and thereby reconcile himself with the lost aspirations of that the Good Family Man imago.

The Good Family Man imago, although only sporadically appearing, did still have some influence over Simon’s behaviour. Beyond it appearing to contribute to his regret around Stella and Zondi, Simon implicitly acknowledges that it is the only reason that Nandi remains alive, in his statement that he did not murder Nandi because she was the mother of his brother’s children. It thus appears that Nandi, who was linked to virtually all of Simon’s offences, who he says contributed to his victims’ rejecting him and thereby sealing their own fate, and who the Rejecting Woman imago appeared to characterise was not killed because of her association with the Good Family Man imago. She, by being the mother of his idolised Eldest Brother imago’s children, was protected from Simon’s violence.

²⁴ See transcription references: 11, 93, 106, 107, 110.

In speaking of his perceptions after arrest, Simon is more reflective, and hasty to forgive those who he perceives as having wronged him, such as Nandi or the police members who accused him of offences he says he did not commit. This seems consistent with the religious ideals of the Good Family Man imago. The communal and vocational aspirations of the Good Family Man also appear to have resurfaced in prison. This is demonstrated not only in Simon resuming his studies, but also in him trying to reclaim the lost communal ties of the Good Family Man imago. The latter is shown in his emphasis on his staying in touch with his girlfriend and sisters, reminiscing with his family, planning their future family life together, and wanting to become a minister and lecture on the dangers of crime. All these aspiration and plans express his desire for family as well as social acceptance and achievement. This suggests that the fundamental motive of the Good Family Man imago (which is shared with the Vengeful Suitor) remains unchanged: reclaim the idealised Happy Family imago.

However many of these aspiration and plans appear vague, varied and somewhat one-dimensional, like the Good Family Man imago itself. As before this resurgence in the Good Family Man imago's influence depends on the influence of an external other. Where previously it was his eldest brother, now it is a minister to surrender to, and the prison system. This re-iterates the earlier observation casting doubt on the extent to which the ideals the Good Family Man (inherited from the Eldest Brother imago) were completely associated with Simon's self.

Finally, the increased influence of the Good Family Man could be hypothesised to have had an influence on the re-construction of Simon's narrative in the interview context: it may be the reason why Simon is hesitant to discuss negative events or emotions. For example, Simon possibly doesn't mention his crisis in the late 1990's (and keeps the various strands of his story separate) because he's trying to maintain the Good Family Man's aspired for characteristics of 'calmness' and the ability to 'do anything' which he inherited from the Eldest Brother imago. He is thus motivated to present both himself, and the idealised Happy Family imago, as good.

This last episode does not add further to our understanding of the Vengeful Suitor or Rejecting Woman imagoes, or how they may have evolved in prison. It could be

hypothesised that in prison, separated from anyone likely to evoke the Rejecting Woman and provoke the Vengeful Suitor, Simon's narrative is better able to evolve in line with the less powerful influences of the Good Family Man. There is a possibility that this could lead to Simon identifying his self more strongly with the Good Family Man imago, but there was no unequivocal evidence of this in his narrative.

5.1.4 Epilogue to Simon Mandlenkosi's story

There are two narrative inquiries this story aims to answer: (a) What role do imagoes play in the motivation of a person who commits serial murder? (b) What role do imagoes play in the development of the offending behaviour? Simon's story supplies answers to all three questions, but to fully understand them we first need to summarise the findings.

5.1.4.1 Summary of story structure

The meaning in Simon's story is not initially clear. Simon does not spontaneously make causal links and correlations, and the chronology of events he gives is often vague. Similarly, and perhaps at the root of this vagueness, is Simon's tendency to avoid discussing emotional and negative issues. Thus analysis was required to make the meaning in certain parts of his narrative apparent. Simon's crisis in 1997, and how it contributed to his offending, is an example of this. In the same vein is Simon's not discussing his offences in chronological order (although the interview method may have contributed to this). Overall, therefore, Simon's narrative was occasionally limited by a lack of clarity.

Simon's preferred self-concept is that of a "nice, friendly" joke-loving family man, undermined by his vengeful anger and by rejecting women. This encapsulates his imagoes, and the interplay between these inner characters is clearly expressed in his offences. In terms of Simon's overall role in the narrative, he tends to play the part of someone who has negative circumstances which are entirely beyond his control inflicted upon him. For example, women are depicted as rejecting him without any justification, just as the church appears to have turned against him capriciously. While this blaming of others is partly mitigated by his occasionally narrating how he made a

situation worse (for example, in the murder of Zondi), his story has strong elements of the “condemnation scripts” (Maruna, 2001) previously noted in the narratives of repeat offenders.

While Simon’s implied use of condemnation scripts did not affect the creation of meaning in his narrative, his vague chronology and avoidance of negative emotional issues may have. Notwithstanding this, it was possible to identify imagoes in his narrative, and thus answer the narrative inquiries.

5.1.4.2 Summary of imago interpretations.

Simon’s narrative presented a total of six imagoes. These imagoes arise at various stages in his narrative. Three were associated with other people (the Happy Family, Eldest Brother and Rejecting Woman imagoes) and three were associated with Simon’s self (the Lonely Child, Vengeful Suitor and Good Family Man imagoes). A cross-section of the above two groups – the Lonely Child, Vengeful Suitor, and Rejecting Woman imagoes – could be termed ‘offending’ imagoes by playing a direct role in Simon’s offences, although other imagoes also contributed to this process. All Simon’s imagoes represent a continuum of development. This section will summarise the chronology of how his imagoes developed, how they interacted with each other and related to his offending.

The narrative of Simon’s childhood reveals three imagoes. In Simon’s narrative the imagoes established in childhood personify the themes that pervade his story. The Happy Family imago and Eldest Brother imago are established earliest in his narrative. These are associated with other people and interact with each other. This is in contrast to the imago arising later in childhood, the Lonely Child, who is associated with Simon’s self and appears to be kept separate from the other imagoes.

The Happy Family imago personifies Simon’s experience of his family. Simon explicitly associates this imago with the idealised positive aspects of his family. However these positive associations exist alongside a number of negative associations, which Simon does not acknowledge openly. By not acknowledging his ambivalence towards the Happy Family imago Simon is able to retain the Happy

Family imago as a source of solace in his childhood narrative. The Happy Family imago has a strong communal orientation and Simon associates closeness, lack of conflict, and acceptance with it. It is also associated with religion and with God. The positive aspects of the Happy Family imago suggest a warm, nurturing communal bond which Simon feels a strong sense duty towards. Throughout his narrative Simon is reluctant to associate anything negative with this imago or allow people associated with the Happy Family imago to be aware of any wrongdoing on his part. The Happy Family imago is thus simultaneously a source of, and relief from, isolation and loneliness. The Happy Family imago does not persist beyond his childhood, and its influence and associations are incorporated into later imagoes. Many of Simon's imagoes after his childhood appear motivated to reclaim the acceptance and solace, and overcoming the rejection, of the Happy Family imago. The ambivalent Happy Family imago therefore provides a fundamental motive and foundation for many of the imagoes arising subsequently in Simon narrative.

The Eldest Brother imago arises at the same time as the Happy Family imago. It is an idealised representation of Simon's eldest brother, who is immediately established in Simon's narrative as his role model and the source of his aspirations. Simon seeks to emulate his brother in vocation, physical skill, emotional temperament and intellect. The Eldest Brother imago shares a number of features with the Happy Family imago. Both have a strong communal orientation, an association with religion, and are presented as unequivocally and unambiguously good. The main difference between the Happy Family and Eldest Brother imagoes in Simon's childhood is that the Eldest Brother acts as a source of aspiration for Simon; while the Happy Family is a source of acceptance and solace. While the Happy Family is source of unacknowledged ambiguity the Eldest Brother imago is entirely positive. The entirely positive perception of the Eldest Brother imago is maintained throughout Simon's narrative and forms an important part of his imagoes of self.

Unlike Simon's other two childhood imagoes, the Lonely Child imago has a clear origin myth: the death of Simon's parents and the powerful feelings of rejection, anger and loneliness this engendered in him. The Lonely Child imago arises as a personification of these emotions and as a means to handle them in the narrative. The Lonely Child thus becomes a repository for the feelings of rejection, loneliness, and

anger. Unlike the vocational aspirations of the Eldest Brother imago, the Lonely Child imago's goals are implied in its role: to handle the loneliness, anger and rejection present in Simon's narrative of childhood, and handle his thwarted desire for acceptance. Being associated with Simon's self, this imago becomes one of his dominant ways of interacting with the world. Simon's narrative clearly explains the motivations of the Lonely Child: rejection leads to loneliness, which is then handled through anger at the rejecting person(s) and violence against them. This violence has a dual purpose for the Lonely Child: achieve emotional release, and assert his self in an attempt to control his environment. Alongside this violent reaction to rejection, the Lonely Child imago also encapsulates Simon's desire to be alone, seeking isolation and separation from others. The Lonely Child imago does not interact with the Simon's other childhood imagoes, rather becoming Simon's means to assert his agentic desires, through violence. The character of the Lonely Child imago emphasises the link between loneliness and violence in Simon's narrative.

Simon's childhood imagoes persist into adolescence, before evolving and being incorporated into the imagoes that will carry him into adulthood. The Lonely Child imago remains the dominant imago of self in Simon's early adolescence, with a largely unchanged role. However from around the age of 15 the features of the Lonely Child, including its associated anger, were progressively channelled into an emergent imago of self. The process of change accelerated markedly with his first serious sexual relationship, aged 18. This relationship supplied the origin myth for two of the dominant imagoes of Simon's narrative: the Vengeful Suitor and the Rejecting Woman.

Simon's first significant intimate relationship is described in strongly positive and emotional terms. These positive associations suggest this relationship gave Simon a means to access the acceptance that the Lonely Child craved. We can further hypothesise that this relationship allowed him to reclaim the acceptance and sense of communion associated with the idealised Happy Family imago. This relationship thus encouraged a change in Simon's imagoes: relationships with women, rather than violence, were beginning to be established as the preferred means to address loneliness.

This waning of the Lonely Child imago accelerated sharply when the woman in this relationship rejected Simon. This evoked the rejection, loneliness and anger of the Lonely Child imago, and supplies the origin myth for the Vengeful Suitor imago. As the name implies, the Vengeful Suitor had two motives: to overcome rejection through violence, and to reclaim the lost communion of the family and the Happy Family imago. This imago's origin myth illustrates how these overlapping motives are aspects of a single mode of interpersonal interaction, and how one causes the other: Simon tries to reclaim the family via an intimate relationship and when this fails, tries to overcome the rejection through anger and violence.

The changes in the role, targets, and aims of this anger mark the evolution from the Lonely Child to the Vengeful Suitor most clearly. The indiscriminate anger of the Lonely Child is now articulated as revenge being taken on a single group of people. Thus the Vengeful Suitor offers Simon clear and unambiguous behavioural plans to take physical revenge on any woman who rejects him. This implies the Vengeful Suitor is partly defined by its relationship to other imagoes, and where the Lonely Child used violence as a means to achieve emotional release and so manage loneliness, now the Vengeful Suitor uses it as a means to *overcome* loneliness and rejection by directly attacking the person that evokes it.

Where previously the Lonely Child was unable to overcome the loneliness and rejection it feared, the Vengeful Suitor provides Simon two means to do this: intimate relationships which evoke the acceptance of the Happy Family imago, and revenge to overcome any subsequent rejection. The characteristics and functions of the Lonely Child imago are thus subsumed into the Vengeful Suitor imago and its relationships with other imagoes.

The Rejecting Woman imago shares the Vengeful Suitor's origin myth. This origin myth sets the template for all future interactions between these imagoes. That is, the Rejecting Woman provides a provocation and focus for the Vengeful Suitor imago's anger and vengeance. By becoming a focus for the Vengeful Suitor's negative perceptions and hatred of rejection, the Rejecting Woman refines a role previously associated with the Lonely Child imago: it ensures no negative associations are made with Eldest Brother imago or idealised Happy Family imago of childhood. These

imagoes are thus free to continue to act as sources of aspiration for Simon. At this stage, the characteristics of the Rejecting Woman imago are vague and this imago is associated with any woman who rejects Simon.

In Simon's early adolescence the Eldest Brother imago takes on a stronger role as the only source of control over the Lonely Child imago. Initially these positive effects were only seen when Simon was in direct contact with the person of his eldest brother (this being the brother with whom the Eldest Brother imago attempts to emulate). As Simon ages he appears to increasingly adopt the intellectual and education aspirations of the Eldest Brother imago as his own. Thus Eldest Brother imago begins to be associated with Simon's self, along with its existing association with the person of his brother. This increasing association of the Eldest Brother imago with Simon's self is the starting point for the development of Simon's most positive imago of self, the Good Family Man imago.

The direct influence of the Happy Family imago over Simon fades as the controlling influence it had in his childhood is subsumed by the influence and aspirations of the Eldest Brother and embryonic Good Family Man. Notwithstanding this the solace and acceptance it offered remains a goal in Simon's narrative, and one he tries to achieve via the Good Family Man and the Vengeful Suitor.

The period of adulthood immediately prior to Simon's committing the murders for which he was imprisoned sees a number of changes in the characteristics of his imagoes and the interactions between them. In Simon's adulthood the Vengeful Suitor imago becomes embedded in his narrative and fully identified with his self. It thus supports and justifies Simon's violence against Rejecting Woman, and so prevents his feeling regret. The Vengeful Suitor maintains the motives established in its origin myth (overcome loneliness by regaining the communion associated with the Happy Family imago through sexual relationships, and overcome the subsequent rejection through violence) and these are increasingly displayed in the narrative of his adulthood.

To these motives the Vengeful Suitor adds the developing motive of dominance and control. Now that the Vengeful Suitor imago supplies Simon with a means to

overcome loneliness and rejection, the desire for control formerly implied in the Lonely Child's violence becomes explicit and is openly expressed in Simon's behaviour. This developing motive affects the Vengeful Suitor imagoes' behaviour where violence is now both provoked by rejection and increasingly motivated by the desire for control; and where both sexual and non-sexual violence (raping and / or kicking his female partners) are established as part of the routine of violence. The behavioural repertoire of acceptable and justified violence is expanding. The activities of the Vengeful Suitor are still kept separate from the Eldest Brother imago (and its residual association with the idealised Happy Family imago), and Simon appears to feel sadness and regret when these imagoes come into contact.

In Simon's adulthood prior to his murders, the interaction between the Rejecting Woman and the Vengeful Suitor is embedded. This interaction now offers Simon his standard and justified behavioural response to real or perceived rejection, and increasingly to any challenges to his dominance. The Vengeful Suitor imago entirely justifies all the violence against Rejecting Women in Simon's narrative. In giving his violence a focus, the interaction between these imagoes serves to shield the Eldest Brother imago (and emergent Good Family Man imago) from Simon's anger.

Upon leaving school Simon is able to begin meeting the aspirations embodied in the imago of his Eldest Brother imago. This provides the beginnings of the Good Family Man imago, which seeks to meet the vocational and communal goals of the Eldest Brother imago, now increasingly associated with Simon's self. While the Good Family Man imago lacks a distinct origin myth, it subsumes many the characteristics of the Eldest Brother imago, including its interactions with other imagoes. The Good Family Man shares a motive with the Vengeful Suitor: to re-establish communion with the idealised Happy Family imago of his youth, and so gain acceptance and solace. However the Good Family Man tries to achieve it by attaining the aspirations it inherited from the Eldest Brother imago. Alongside the Vengeful Suitor, the Good Family Man imago is Simon's other dominant imago of adulthood. Like the Eldest Brother imago the Good Family Man becomes the focus for Simon's positive perceptions of the idealised Happy Family imago of his youth. It thus inherits these imagoes' ability to control Simon's behaviour (especially when acting in conjunction

with the direct influence of his brother). This helps make period of Simon's narrative from when he left school until 1997 a relatively stable one.

However Simon still shields the Good Family Man imago (like the Happy Family and Eldest Brother before it) from any association with the negative emotions or with the less socially acceptable aspects of the Vengeful Suitor imagoes' behaviour. Interaction between the Vengeful Suitor imago and Good Family Man imagoes is avoided. This increasingly means that the Good Family Man imago is kept segregated from a significant portion of his life. This lack of interaction between the Good Family Man and the other imagoes of Simon's adulthood also suggests that the Good Family Man becomes an increasingly isolated and compartmentalised character, which still needs Simon's eldest brother's physical presence to fully control the negative aspects of Simon's behaviour.

The emerging crisis in Simon's narrative during the late 1990's takes the form of a number of external events, gaining their significance from their affect on Simon's imagoes and the interactions between them. In this period the Rejecting Woman imago is strengthened due to its association with the person of Simon's eldest brother's wife, Nandi. Nandi appears to evoke potent feelings of rejection in Simon which, alongside her perceived negative impact on his eldest brother, lead to Nandi being strongly associated with the Rejecting Woman imago. This identification with Nandi lead to the Rejecting Woman imago having more clear characteristics. The Rejecting Woman imago is now particularly associated with materialism and with attacks on Simon's aspirations. This helps widen range of stimuli that will provoke violence in Vengeful Suitor. Strengthening the Rejecting Woman means the dynamic between Vengeful Suitor and Rejecting Woman is more powerful and difficult to control.

Alongside these changes, the Rejecting Woman imago, like the Vengeful Suitor, remains a repository for all negative emotions and associations. Whereas the Vengeful Suitor directly affects Simon's behaviour, the Rejecting Woman only influences it insofar as it provokes the Vengeful Suitor. The degree to which the Rejecting Woman imago causes the Vengeful Suitor to be expressed is not clear, although they frequently appear together in the story. The interactions between the Vengeful Suitor

and the Rejecting Woman influence much of Simon’s offending behaviours and the emotions he attributes to these behaviours.

At the same time as the Rejecting Woman being strengthened, the Good Family Man imago was weakened. The Good Family Man appears to have been particularly vulnerable to external pressures due to it being a one-dimensional, idealised imago lacking the nuances of character associated with the Vengeful Suitor imago. This one-dimensionality appears to make the Good Family Man imago vulnerable. Two events weakened the Good Family Man imago. First, Simon’s eldest brother died. As mentioned, not only was the Good Family Man kept separate from the other imagoes, it relied an external others for support; despite it being identified with Simon’s self. The loss of his eldest brother meant the Good Family Man imago lost a significant controlling influence over Simon. Secondly, Simon was prevented from becoming a church minister. Given the association between the Eldest Brother, Happy Family and the Good Family Man imagoes and religious belief, rejection by the church undermine the basis for the Good Family Man and robs Simon of another way to regain the communion of the family. This is shown in Simon’s perceiving this event as a rejection. This further weakens the Good Family Man imago, and strengthens emotions associated with the Vengeful Suitor imago.

Table 7: *Summary of Simon’s offences and victims*

Victim	Offences*
Nomsa Mathetsa	Rape
Paulina Mbuli	Attempted rape, theft
Stella Mogotsi	Murder, theft
Portia Mashabela	Murder, theft
Zondi Tana	Murder, rape

*Refers to offences for which Simon was convicted.

Around this time, Simon committed the first offence he was later imprisoned for, the rape of Nomsa Mathetsa. His account of this rape is confused and unclear. The contrast between this and the clarity with which he describes some of his murders

suggests this offence lacks the clear justification and rationale that the interactions between his imagoes bring to his murders. This lack of support from the imagoes may also suggest the behavioural influence they, particularly the Vengeful Suitor, usually have on his offences is also lacking. It is notable that Nomsa's resistance brought the violence normally associated with the Vengeful Suitor into expression. This violence included rape which, based on the Vengeful Suitor imagoes' previous actions, is associated with the desire to express dominance and control. However beyond this influence, Simon's behaviour during the rape of Nomsa is not entirely explicable in terms of his imagoes.

After this rape, in 1997, Simon's narrative implies that a crisis occurred. Simon had already committed a rape. This suggests that the imago interactions and characteristics linked to his offending may already largely be in place. It also suggests there is no clear division between Simon's 'pre-murder series' and 'murder series' narratives and that rather they overlap. After this crisis Simon commits the murders he confesses to and provides clear narratives for. In a continuation of the emerging crisis in the preceding years, this crisis sees further weakening of the Good Family Man imago coupled with a further strengthening of the Vengeful Suitor imago's motives.

The Good Family Man was further weakened by trio of blows: Simon's home life was threatened, his work "went down", and he was diagnosed as HIV positive. These pressures struck at all aspects of the Good Family Man imago: brother, family and church; and all represented blows to the Good Family Man's aspirations. The Good Family Man, already a compartmentalised character that Simon appears to have identified with others as much as with himself, and kept separate from the other imagoes up to this point, was fatally weakened. From this point on the Good Family Man is a sporadic influence and an occasional character in Simon's unfolding story only.

Furthermore the perceived threat to Simon's home life (in the form of his wife's former partner wanting to see his daughter) appears to have evoked a strong violent response from Simon. This suggests Simon perceived these events as a threatened rejection or a cause of future rejection respectively, which drew the predictable response from the Vengeful Suitor imago. The Vengeful Suitor imago is motivated to

overcome rejection and the loneliness it causes through violence. Thus by increasing the threat of rejection, the Vengeful Suitor is motivated to react more strongly. This contrasts with what occurred during the emerging crisis, when it was mainly the Rejecting Woman that was strengthened. This merely meant more provocation for the Vengeful Suitor. Now, with the crisis, both sides of the destructive dynamic between the Vengeful Suitor and Rejecting Woman have become stronger. From this point on the Vengeful Suitor imago appears to wield a more consistent influence over Simon's behaviour than the weakened Good Family Man. This could be added to by fact that these events could increase the Vengeful Suitor's desire for dominance and control, already identified as a developing motive in this imago.

Simon was already offending before the crises in 1997 and therefore these events did not cause his offending. Notwithstanding this it appears that this crisis and its affects on his imagoes may have accelerated his criminal career along the path that the dynamic between the Vengeful Suitor and the Rejecting Woman already dictated to him. His offences demonstrate how the destructive interactions between the Vengeful Suitor and Rejecting Woman imagoes increased, driving his offending behaviour at a time when the Good Family Man was in decline.

The pattern of offending that began to be established with Nomsa Mathetsa appears to have been repeated with attempted rape of Paulina Mbuli. The narrative does not present clear motives for either of these offences. However Simon's behaviours in both offences suggest strong clear associations with the Vengeful Suitor: he becomes violent in response to resistance, with the decision to offend seemingly taken impulsively.

These two rape / attempted rape also offences highlight the limits of the Vengeful Suitor imago's influence. Namely, it does not provide a clear behavioural template for rape, demonstrated in the offence behaviours being neither decisive nor goal-directed. Neither is there a clear link in Simon's narrative between the Vengeful Suitor imago and the use of strangulation to control the victim seen in both crimes. There are two possible reasons for these limits to the Vengeful Suitor's influence: the dynamic with the Rejecting Woman imago is required by the Vengeful Suitor to justify its violence and / or the behaviours associated with the Vengeful Suitor imago are still evolving.

These possibilities are not mutually exclusive. The latter reason suggests that the offences against Paulina and Nomsa are behavioural ‘trial runs’ for later offences.

Since Simon denies involvement in this offence the above interpretations cannot be confirmed with reference to his narrative. It can be hypothesised that this denial could be due to its not being justified by interaction between the Vengeful Suitor and Rejecting Woman. Additionally, the Vengeful Suitor’s lack of a behavioural template, or clear motive, for raping a stranger increases the likelihood of his denying this offence.

The murder of Stella Mogotsi, which Simon discusses in depth, clarifies the characteristics of Simon’s imagoes and confirms the notable interactions between them. This offence does not see changes to the motives or characteristics of the Vengeful Suitor imago. While some of the offences behaviours associated with this imago changed, these represent a simple evolution of the behaviours displayed during previous offences. In all three cases Simon’s post offence behaviour, unlike his behaviour during the offence, does not appear logical and coherent. This illustrates the limits of the behavioural plans associated with the Vengeful Suitor. However, the murder of Stella Mogotsi suggests that Simon’s sleeping for two days after this offence represents the Vengeful Suitor drawing on its origins as the Lonely Child, seeking isolation and separation from others.

The most notable behavioural difference in Stella’s case is that the throttling involved the use of a ligature. In contrast to his previous offences Simon now admits to the use of throttling, and thus associates this behaviour with the Vengeful Suitor. A possible reason for his deciding to use a ligature, and confessing to it, is due to changes in the Rejecting Woman imago. This offence sees these behaviours fully associated with the Vengeful Suitor, and they remain so from this point on.

In the murder of Stella the Rejecting Woman is more clearly described. The Rejecting Woman’s provoking role remains the same, with the importance of an association between the victim and the Rejecting Woman imago emphasised. Simon’s narrative makes the link between Stella and the Rejecting Woman imago clear. Stella was furthermore a friend of the person who Simon associates with the Rejecting Woman

imago most, Nandi. The association between Stella and the Rejecting Woman imago encourages and justifies the violence inflicted by the Vengeful Suitor imago. This is shown in Simon's throttling of the victim escalating to the point of murder, and in his detailed and fluent narration of this offence. The interaction between the Vengeful Suitor and Rejecting Woman thus not only provokes the offences, but suggests a behavioural plan and bestows his actions with a moral justification. The murder of Stella Mogotsi therefore verifies the importance of the interaction between these two imagoes in motivating Simon's offences.

This offence also gives further descriptions of the characteristics Simon associates with the Rejecting Woman imago and strengthens Nandi's association with the Rejecting Woman imago. This association between the Rejecting Woman and Nandi also sees this imago have a wider sphere of influence. Where previously the Rejecting Woman could only provoke the Vengeful Suitor by rejection, now it is also blamed for poisoning Simon relationships with others. The fact that the Vengeful Suitor's anger appears focused on both Nandi and Stella in this offence, where previously was just focused on the person who rejected him, also introduces the possibility of the Vengeful Suitor imago accepting a proxy or substitute victim in lieu of the person who rejected him. These factors mean a wider range of stimuli will provoke, and so justify the violence of, the Vengeful Suitor.

In this offence, this role of the Good Family Man imago appears limited to encouraging regret in Simon. By praying in her dying moments Stella evoked the religious beliefs of the Good Family Man imago which weakens her association with the Rejecting Woman and appears to have overcome the separation Simon tries to maintain between the Good Family Man imago and the actions of the Vengeful Suitor. This loss of this separation appears to encourage regret in Simon.

The subsequent murder of Portia Mashabela confirms the imago interactions and characteristics shown in Stella's murder. It adds to this understanding by epitomising how the interaction between the Rejecting Woman and Vengeful Suitor imagoes justifies Simon's offences. It also shows how this justification also ensures there is no remorse, with the Good Family Man imago not being evoked in any way.

This offence is notable for the degree to which the Rejecting Woman imago is involved in the events preceding the offence. Portia Mashabela's characteristics, actions, and association with Nandi all closely mirror the Rejecting Woman and thus guarantee a violent response from the Vengeful Suitor. By completely and consistently associating Portia with the Rejecting Woman, her murder was not merely justified, it became "necessary". Simon's narrative suggests the murder of Portia represents a satisfying revenge against a victim who deserved it, the Vengeful Suitor imago's ideal offence.

The influence of the Vengeful Suitor imago on Simon's behaviour is consistent with that shown in previous offences, and does not appear to evolve here. As in these previous offences, Portia's murder was precipitated by rejection or resistance, begun impulsively, and involved throttling. All of these behaviours continue to be associated with the Vengeful Suitor imago's anger, and could be linked to the emerging motive of dominance and control. It should also be noted that rape is not a behaviour clearly associated with the Vengeful Suitor imago in Simon's offences, and as before the limitations of the Vengeful Suitor's influence and its reversion to the Lonely Child's avoidant behaviour are demonstrated in Simon's post-offence actions.

Simon's final murder, of his stepdaughter Zondi Tana, sees a number of changes in all his imagoes and the interactions between them. These affect his offence behaviours and the emotions evoked by them. Where previously the dynamic between the Vengeful Suitor and Rejecting Woman appeared sufficient to provoke the offence, this offence is characterised by association with the less influential Good Family Man imago, who even played a role in provoking it. This association occurs due to Zondi's murder being precipitated by the final breakdown of Simon's marriage. This breakdown suggests Simon has failed to achieve a fundamental aspiration of the Good Family Man imago. This implies that in addition to vengeance against his wife for rejecting him being justified by the established interaction between the Rejecting Woman and Vengeful Suitor imagoes, it is further justified by this rejection representing a direct attack on the aspirations of the Good Family Man imago. Vengeance is thus more than justified, and focused on the family unit of Zondi, Thembeni and Zondi's biological father that Simon feels created it.

In this offence the Rejecting Woman – Vengeful Suitor interaction continues to supply much of the justification and behavioural plan, but it also displays a number of behaviours that are not fully justified by the Vengeful Suitor’s interactions with the Rejecting Woman, or have not been previously associated with the Vengeful Suitor’s offences behaviours. This appears to have created conflict within the Vengeful Suitor imago.

The first of these is demonstrated in Simon’s aiming his violence at a substitute victim, rather than someone who is herself associated with the Rejecting Woman imago. This possibility was introduced in the two offences prior to this. This development could be explained by above observations suggesting that, in this case, the blow inflicted by the Rejecting Woman was especially devastating. This development can be explained further by hypothesising that in attacking someone associated with the Rejecting Woman imago, the Vengeful Suitor imago is recalling its origin myth.

The second possible cause of conflict in the Vengeful Suitor is that Simon’s offence behaviour here does not draw on the Vengeful Suitor’s behavioural repertoire established in previous murders. Rather, it mimics that used by the Vengeful Suitor to demonstrate his dominance in relationships, as shown in his raping of Zondi. This is added to by Simon displaying behaviours not previously associated with or justified by the Vengeful Suitor imago, such as following Zondi and luring her away to kill her. These behaviours, not typically associated with the Vengeful Suitor imago, perhaps help provokes the regret Simon associates strongly with this offence.

As shown in Simon’s tone, the murder of Zondi is not the same as the ‘justified’ murder of Portia. Unlike his previous murders he drank alcohol to encourage him to commit the offence, and upon arrest and at his trial Simon denied involvement in this offence. An analysis of his imagoes offers a number of hypothetical factors which may have acted together to create Simon’s manifest regret for this offence. Some of Simon’s regret may have been due to this offence representing the clearest demonstration of his failure to meet the aspirations of the Good Family Man imago in his narrative, added to by the collapse in the separation between those imagoes associated with offending (Rejecting Woman and Vengeful Suitor) and those imagoes

which are not (Good Family Man). Zondi's praying while dying could be seen to evoke the Good Family Man, her murder was in part motivated and justified by the failure of the Good Family Man's aspirations, and in addition to this she was related to Simon. This collapse in separations is more complete than any previously seen, and so could create greater regret. A final hypothetical reason for this regret is Simon's above-mentioned overstepping of the Vengeful Suitor's behavioural template and the justifications contained in Rejecting Woman – Vengeful Suitor dynamic. That is, the conflict within the Vengeful Suitor imago could have lead to Simon feeling regret.

Simon's behaviour immediately before and after his arrest casts particular light on the role of the Good Family Man imago in the construction of Simon's narrative. The Good Family Man imago, although only sporadically appearing, still had some influence over Simon's behaviour. In particular, Simon implies it is the reason he did not murder Nandi. The communal and vocational aspirations of the Good Family Man also appear to have resurfaced in prison, suggesting Simon is trying to reclaim the lost communal ties of the Good Family Man imago. This suggests that the fundamental motive of the Good Family Man imago remains unchanged: to reclaim the idealised Happy Family imago. This motive is shared with the Vengeful Suitor. However like the Good Family Man imago itself, many of these aspiration and plans appear vague, varied and somewhat one-dimensional. Again the resurgence in influence of the Good Family Man imago's influence appears to depend on the influence of an external other. This casts doubt on whether the Good Family Man's aspirations are entirely associated with Simon's self. The increased influence of the Good Family Man could be hypothesised to have had an influence on the re-construction of Simon's narrative in the interview context. That is, Simon may be reluctant to discuss negative events of emotions, because the aspirations of the Good Family Man encourage him to present both himself, and the idealised Happy Family imago, as good.

5.1.4.3 Answers to narrative inquiries.

To summarise the above discussions, Simon's narrative contributes to our answers to the narrative inquiries in the following ways.

a) What roles do imagoes play in the motivation of a person who commits serial murder?

This question asks what role Simon's imagoes had in *causing* his offences. The reasons Simon gives for having committed the offences can be considered his motives. These motives arise at different times in Simon's narrative, and once they arise they do not disappear again. They develop and vary in strength at different stages of the narrative, with different motives become more dominant at different times. However the two motives established earliest persist most strongly, and are a relatively stable influence throughout the narrative. The various motives in Simon's narrative are embodied in, or arise as the result of interaction between, his imagoes. This is summarised in Table 8 below. Imagoes can thus be said to play a significant role in his offending.

There are two aspects to this role: (a) the role of imagoes in creating and embodying motives specifically for offending, (b) the interaction between imagoes in creating or strengthening motive. With reference to (a), the Happy Family imago appears to create the motives of reclaiming communion by its being source of unacknowledged rejection in Simon narrative. The motives relating to his offending behaviours are subsequently embodied in the Lonely Child and the Vengeful Suitor imagoes. Later the Vengeful Suitor becomes the embodiment of Simon's motives of revenge, dominance and control. The imagoes' role in creating motive, (b) above, is shown particularly in the interaction between the Vengeful Suitor and Rejecting Woman. This interaction created the motive of overcoming rejection through revenge, strengthened it and encouraged the Vengeful Suitor's motivation of dominance and control.

Table 8: *Summary of Simon's motives and their relationships to his imagoes*

Motive	Relationship to imagoes	Period of life first noted	Notes
1. Reclaim communion	Arises due to unacknowledged aspects of Happy Family imago.	Childhood	Pervades his narrative, providing a fundamental motive for all later imagoes. Expressed in the offending imagoes as 'indifference to others'
2. Handle rejection and loneliness	Lonely Child	Childhood	Arises shortly after 1, in late childhood. This 'handling' is expressed as anger.
3. Overcome rejection through taking revenge	Arises in interaction between the Vengeful Suitor and Rejecting Woman	Adolescence	This is associated with 1, which persists as a motive of the Vengeful Suitor.
4. Dominance and control	Vengeful Suitor	Adulthood	Develops immediately prior to first offences, and then strengthens as offences progress, becoming associated with rape and strangulation.

b) What roles do imagoes play in the development of offending behaviour in serial murder?

Simon's narrative suggests imagoes play a significant role in the development of offending behaviour in a person who commits serial murder. Simon links his offending behaviours to his key imagoes and the interaction between them. His offending behaviour is repeatedly linked back to motives established and developed by his imagoes, with imagoes also being alluded to in the events that lead to his committing murder.

Thus imagoes not only embody Simon's motives for *offending*, they are the means by which these motives expressed in behaviour. In his narrative his imagoes encouraged the development of his offending behaviours in four ways: (a) by encouraging separation between those imagoes involved with offending and those that are not; (b) by removing barriers to offending in Simon's narrative; (c) by encouraging the expression of his offending behaviours, and (d) by setting the behavioural template for his offences.

The first way, (a), encourages the development of offending by allowing the development of the offending imagoes without control from the rest of the narrative. In his narrative this separation also encourages the association of negative emotions with his offending imagoes, rather than his non-offending imagoes (the Happy Family, Eldest Brother, and Good Family Man). This strengthens the offending imagoes and the behaviours associated with them and minimises his regret for his actions.

His imagoes remove barriers to his offending in his narrative, (b) by encouraging the interpretation of life events in ways that create negative emotions, thus strengthening his offending imagoes (e.g. the rejection he feels on failing to be made a minister), while weakening his non-offending imagoes. The latter is shown in the crisis in his narrative in the late 1990's where his non-offending imagoes proved vulnerable to external influence and were undermined. Given the role played by the non-offending

imagoes in embodying Simon's positive aspirations and encouraging regret, their weakening encourages his offending.

With reference to (c), the expression of Simon's offending behaviours is clearly encouraged by the interaction between the Rejecting Woman and Vengeful Suitor imagoes. This interaction meant that the largely indiscriminate violence of the Lonely Child was focused on a specific target group. This also provided a further justification for his violence, made it a means to overcome rejection, and eventually encouraged the motive of dominance and control to emerge. This again shows the interrelationship between motive and development.

The setting of a behavioural template for offending, (d), emerges from the previous points. The routine behaviours Simon carries out on in his offences appear to be affected by his imagoes. This is demonstrated by the congruence between the characteristics of Simon's offences and the characteristics of his offending imagoes and the motives embodied in them. The setting of a behavioural template, which similarities between his offences suggests is what occurred here, would encourage the development of offending by providing him with a clear plan for committing an offence, and so simplify the choices he needs to make. The behavioural template that can be linked to his imagoes does not however explain all his behaviours during the offences he was imprisoned for, such as his raping Nomsa and trying to rape Paulina. The close relationship this behavioural template has with his offending imagoes, and its importance in the successful completion of his offences, is demonstrated by the loss of coherence in both behaviour and narrative when it is not justified by his imagoes. This is shown in the above mentioned rapes, in Simon's post-offence behaviours generally, and in the negative emotions Simon suffers after murdering Zondi, when the Vengeful Suitor does not conform to the 'justified' behaviours seen in previous offences.

5.2 CASE STUDY TWO: JACQUES EKSTEEN

5.2.1 Bibliographical detail

Jacques Eksteen was 33 years old at the time of the interview. He is a white South African Afrikaans speaking male. He had been convicted of five murders, and two rapes (excluding the rapes that occurred in the course of his murders). One charge of robbery, one of theft, and one of using a vehicle without the owner's permission refer to other offences he committed in the course of his rapes / murders.

He committed his offences over a three year period between 1989 and 1992. His victims were a mixture of black and white females. He was interviewed at his place of imprisonment on the 22nd and 23rd of May 2000 in two separate interviews of approximately four hours each.

5.2.2 Prologue to Jacques Eksteen's story

5.2.2.1 Clinical observations

Jacques Eksteen was of medium height and build, tending towards slim. He had narrow, slightly stooped shoulders, and small, almost feminine, hands. His dark hair was short, and he had a moustache and heavy stubble. Dressed in green prison fatigues with a brown jersey over the top and cream white 'loafer' types shoes, he cut a slightly shabby figure (even when compared with his fellow prisoners).

While a slow reader and writer, Jacques had completed high school, and presented as reasonably intelligent, with no gross cognitive disturbances. His memory appeared good, and he could recall some events in meticulous detail.

Jacques' large, very dark eyes showed little expression, and gave an impression of a cold lack of emotion. He was not demonstrative, and his demeanour bordered on the deadpan. His tone in interview, when combined his appearance and slouching posture, suggested someone who is indifferent to how others may perceive him. He did not appear depressed or disinterested in proceedings even though his emotional tone,

facial expression, and affect varied remarkably little during the interview. On the contrary, he was friendly towards the interviewer and willing to communicate openly and at length.

Notwithstanding this his ability to communicate was compromised by his lack of vocabulary, which was particularly notable when we discussed issues around his emotions or his motivations. In these areas Jacques was often ambiguous, inarticulate and lacked confidence of expression. The degree of these difficulties suggested that emotions were not just difficult for Jacques to articulate, but difficult for him to understand or experience. Occasionally, his emotional responses could be incongruent and inappropriate. An example of this is seen in his smiling: Jacques' infrequent wry, almost embarrassed, smiles were most often seen when he described the offences he was imprisoned for. This became more obvious as the interview progressed. However he was unable to say what he found amusing, rather commenting that he was smiling because he "wasn't sure" or "the situation was odd." Other ways in which this issue of Jacques' emotional world was expressed in the interview will be discussed further in the following section.

5.2.2.2 Responses in the interview process

During the interview Jacques would characteristically answer my questions directly and promptly. He did not need much prompting to give his narrative, and would move between linked topics as they occurred to him, of his own initiative. His narrative was extensive and his recall of certain events was extremely detailed, which communicated them vividly.

The detail of Jacques' recall was linked to his insistence on precision in description and word selection. He would take pains to explain things exactly 'as they were', and was a stickler for ensuring that all the events and emotions discussed in the interview were described in a satisfactory manner. For example, he would correct me if I summarised any descriptions incorrectly, and was bothered by factual inaccuracies in the media reporting of his case. As part of his urge for precision in description, Jacques would frequently list items in his responses (for example, listing the characteristics of a 'true friend', or listing his afternoon activities at a school),

illustrate responses with examples, and suffix sentences with “you understand?” Similarly, when I proposed obvious motives for his offences Jacques would correct me with a description of how it felt for him, and the series of events that lead to his committing murder.

Jacques did not take exception to any questions put to him, and tolerated potentially intrusive questions without apparent concern. On the whole, there did not appear to be any particularly sensitive topics for him, nor did any events he disclosed seem to upset or embarrass him. This is epitomised by his response to my question as to whether he would mind me asking about his offences: “You can just ask.” This apparent lack of sensitivity is mirrored in his lack of concern for giving socially acceptable responses to my questions, even when prompted to do so by me. For example, he was not worried about what other people may think of him as a ‘serial murder’ and took an indifferent and slightly amused attitude to many events in his criminal career.

The tone of Jacques’ narrative closely mirrored this lack of concern. Narrating his story in a dry, ‘factual’ voice, the longer I listened the more his seeming indifference to what he was narrating, alongside his lack of emotion, became obvious. The tone of his voice would seldom vary and while his delivery was not a monotone, it was distinctly unaffected by emotional content. A characteristic phrase he frequently used when tiring of a description was “or whatever”.

The tone of his narrative and his attitude towards questioning point towards the most notable factor in Jacques’ interview: his response to questions around emotions, motives, and self-reflection. When asked any questions about these, Jacques’ speech slowed down, and the volume dropped. He paused for thought more and would have to search for words and explanations. He would sometimes speak in the second person (“you”) and would look to me for reassurance that his perceptions were accurate. When asked to describe his emotions Jacques would often respond with a series of intellectualised hypotheses around what a certain emotion could mean, or resort to lengthy descriptions of what behaviours a person with that emotion could be expected to carry out. In a similar vein, questions around motive elicited response about the events that preceded his offences. Jacques would prefer descriptions of the physical over the abstract (for example, when asked to describe his “nature” as a child, he

chose the adjective “quiet”). His explanations of his motives and emotions could therefore seem vague and ambiguous, despite his striving to describe them as accurately as possible.

Jacques’ difficulty in self-reflecting and in defining emotional or motivational terms of his own accord created the strong impression in the narrative of someone for whom his own emotions and motives are not clear, and who is not deeply engaged with these issues. Emotions are not something he could immediately understand, or that frequently impinged on his consciousness. Rather than being something he *felt*, emotions were described in Jacques’s narrative as if they were a complex abstract theory he was trying to understand, or a set of behaviours to be carried out correctly.

This factor, taken alongside his demeanour, tone and attitude towards questioning, gives the impression of someone who is split from his emotions to the point of almost seeming emotionless. Eschewing emotive words for precise descriptions, for the vast majority of the interview Jacques does not refer to any of the people in his life by their first names. Jacques’ emotional world and the ways it affects his interpersonal transactions are a recurrent theme in his narrative, and will be discussed in more detail in his story.

5.2.2.3 Reflections on the interview process

This interview was split into two sessions, on subsequent days, of approximately four hours each. In the first session the interview flowed easily, with Jacques introducing topics of his own accord, and moving between related topics. The second session flowed less, in part due to my use of the IMAGO interview format, and in part due to my returning to unresolved questions I had after the first session. The second session resembled the question-and-answer format of a structured interview more. Despite the greater structure of the second session, it was marked by Jacques telling more jokes and humorous anecdotes.

I found myself laughing at a number of Jacques’ descriptions, many of them being delivered in an ironic tone. On reflection, I cannot say whether Jacques always intended these to be funny, or whether the irony was an unintentional consequence of

his lack of emotional articulation. I also found myself adopting some of Jacques' characteristic modes of expression, for example not referring to his victims by their names. This reflected his adoption of many of the phrases I offered in summary of his motivations and emotions. Thus, overall, the atmosphere of the interview became increasingly informal and relaxed.

Notwithstanding this atmosphere and Jacques' willingness to describe his life, I felt at the time that I was struggling to interview him adequately. This concern centred on the vague way in which he discussed his emotions and motivations. Not only were they hard to discern, but I also sometimes found it difficult to know how to respond appropriately to unusual emotional reactions from Jacques (such as his casual indifference when his best friend died). It was also not immediately apparent at the time of the interview what motivated certain requests or questions Jacques had (e.g. a request for a letter from me telling him what I thought of the interview, to put in his prison file). These issues lead me to worry after the first session that I was either influencing him to give me responses that he thought I wanted to hear, or that I was missing some essential aspect of his experience. My concern was exacerbated by my conducting the interview in Afrikaans, my second language.

This emphasis I placed in the interview on discerning Jacques' motives and emotions means that I did not realise the degree to which the various aspects of his life are described in isolation for each other (for example, his significant relationships are not correlated with his offending patterns). This made establishing connections between the various aspects of his life and ensuring all aspects of the narrative were in their correct chronological order more difficult, but does not seem to have limited the creation of meaning in his narrative. This characteristic of Jacques' narrative will be discussed in more detail later. Notwithstanding this I felt that Jacques presented an extensive and detailed narrative, with a clear chronology. Jacques' desire to fully explain and explore his experience meant that his narrative leant itself to having summaries within it and these are reflected in the below case study. As in the previous case study, the chapter structure was imposed to give a clear chronology to the narrative, support the interpretation of imagoes, and allow for comparisons between case studies.

Returning to significant topics repeatedly, I felt that we had reached saturation point at the end of the second session. I could not think of any more questions to ask, or avenues of enquiry to pursue. The details of his responses, the length of the sessions, and the struggle to decipher his emotional world, left me tired and I found I struggled to focus. I noted after the second session that I felt it had been an effort to get “depth” in his responses and feared the interviews were not sufficient.

After transcribing the interviews, I feel that the assessment I made at the time is too harsh, and that it is possible to draw reliable and valid conclusions from Jacques’ narrative, which was coherent and presented a story with notable themes and patterns. Jacques’ characteristic emphasis on extensive and accurate descriptions, which often incorporated even apparently minor details, gave me further reassurance that the events were being described accurately. This reassurance was heightened by Jacques’ obvious lack of concern around other people’s perceptions of him, and his willingness to correct me if he felt my interpretation of an event was not accurate. His emphasis on precise description of experience also fits well with the phenomenological orientation of narrative psychology.

5.2.3 Jacques Eksteen's story.

This consists of Jacques' narrative of self gained from the semi-structured interview, presented alongside archival information when discussing the offences.

5.2.3.1 Childhood

Jacques was born into a middle-class Afrikaans family, living in Pretoria. His mother had worked as teacher before he was born, after which she gave up full-time work to care for him. His father worked as an electrician for the City Council, and then as a delivery man. Jacques was an only child, although his mother gave birth to two other children who died shortly after birth. Jacques was not sure about how old the other children were when they died, or what they died of. Jacques also did not know why his parents did not try for more children after him. He states that he does not really care about that sort of issue.

Both his parents were, he reports, "reasonably" religious and attended church regularly. Jacques would also attend, but only "because I had to go, and it became a habit to go". Jacques does not report any problems in his parents' relationship, and says that they never had physical fights. He states that they are still married. Apart from Jacques' grandfather, who died an alcoholic, he does not report any troubles in his extended family. Jacques saw a lot of his uncles and his cousins when he was growing up, when they would share holidays, have Christmas as a family, and go on activities together. He says that he "got on well" with them. Jacques describes himself as a quiet child, "not running around a lot", who did not suffer with any significant fears, phobias or illnesses.

Jacques does not describe his early school years in any detail. While describing himself as "quiet" he says he still had friends, and took part in a range of social activities (such as the Voortrekkers²⁵, church youth groups, and going away on school camps). Jacques says he did not get into fights, did not anger quickly, although he occasionally did "naughty" things. While he participated in school sports, he did not

²⁵ An Afrikaans youth organisation, similar to the English Boy Scouts.

appear enthusiastic. Similarly, Jacques did not appear motivated by school work, and says that it was usually his mother who would ensure that his homework was done.

Notwithstanding this apparent normality, Jacques does not describe his childhood as particularly happy. When first asked whether he got on well with his parents, his response was “I’m not friends with my parents” before clarifying, “they were my parents,” perhaps implying there is no more significant description for them. He immediately follows this by saying “my father’s the sort of person who didn’t talk much with me.” He clarifies that his father was “a quiet man” who:

Would speak to you but wouldn’t, for example, help with school work or something like that... [he] worked, and that is it... he didn’t play with you... not with a rugby ball, or soccer ball or, going fishing or anything like that...[he] wouldn’t say let’s go play ‘just you and me’.

Jacques later says that he doesn’t know anything about cars because his father never told him how motor vehicles work, the things “a father should tell you about”, and never worked on cars with him. When asked whether this fact made Jacques feel different from other boys, who did this with their fathers, Jacques does not answer the question directly:

You see, why, your father just wants to talk to other people, and doesn’t talk to you... he doesn’t give you attention. I didn’t think like that. I just thought he was that sort of person, I can’t pay attention to it...

Jacques feels that his father didn’t “have any influence on me” and “wasn’t involved with me very much.” When asked whether he would have liked his father to have more involvement with him he, after much equivocation, says that maybe he would liked more attention from his father.

BH: Did you feel this growing up? [pause] Did you think, hey, my Dad is a bit cold towards me?

JE: I didn't think. I have now thought hard about it. If I think about it now, I think that he could have been more involved with me, but at that stage I didn't think about it....he didn't pay special attention to me. He'd talk to me, but no special attention.

Jacques' father appears passive and disinterested. As Jacques comments "He worked, he brought the money home, and that's it."

In contrast to the minimal involvement of his father in his childhood, is the character of Jacques' mother. She is introduced immediately after the initial description of his father, in the first five minutes of the interview, with the words "my mother brought me up". In contrast to his father Jacques's mother was very involved with him and "was the boss of the house." He describes his childhood relationship with his mother as characterised by strict discipline. When asked how he was disciplined, he said "scolding, smacks, and bit of rough handling... a hand slapped against the head" and mentions that he would be hit, sometimes with a belt, if he was naughty or if he didn't do his school work. He says that he "could not" misbehave as a child without getting hit. His mother did not allow him to visit friends' houses alone, or go out alone unsupervised with them and says "I could go out alone, but I couldn't sleep over or anything." She would want to "keep me in my place." However he is quick to assert that she never forced him to do anything, or threatened him, repeating "she didn't abuse me, understand." Instead, Jacques concludes "she was just strict". Jacques cannot recall his mother showing him affection during this time. Thus his mother did not supply the "special attention" he never got from his father:

she would make sure I did my homework, and cared for me, bought clothes, and made sure I had food, and whatever...[but] there was never really special attention paid, saying 'How can I help you?' [struggles for example] or, telling me things about life...

Reflecting on his mother's treatment of him, he says that although it didn't feel like abuse, he did feel at the time that she was "a bit strict, and it was hard for me." He hypothesises that maybe the discipline had some "psychological consequences [sielkundige uitwerkings]" but that he can't really be sure. As with his father, the relationship with his mother is limited.

Overall, Jacques' does not appear to have had any emotional connection with his parents in childhood. Rather, they are depicted as either disinterested or rigidly controlling. He says his relationship with both parents was characterised by "distance" and that he and they "never really had a bond". When asked whether he had respect for his parents, Jacques replied that he would "[do] what they asked, I would do, but beyond that, I didn't, know..." and his voice tapers off before commenting "I didn't openly demonstrate that I wasn't showing respect." His resentment of them is only implied in his narrative. These implications take the form of his listing the things they did not do, or by indirect criticism (e.g. pointing out the limits of their relationship). This implied resentment is accompanied by a desire for something more in his relationship with his parents that Jacques frequently hints at, but is unable to articulate. Jacques tends to avoid direct criticism of his parents with comments such as "that was just the way they were" and, at least overtly, insists that he didn't think there was anything wrong with their relationship at the time.

The strict parental discipline appeared to have two interlinked effects on Jacques' narrative. The first of these was loneliness and isolation. In the narrative of his childhood Jacques depicts himself as isolated by parental discipline: not allowed to interact freely with others, strictly disciplined for any misdemeanour, and lacking a nurturing relationship with his parents. This is linked explicitly to the reported loneliness of his childhood, which Jacques' reflections on his childhood return to repeatedly. He introduces this in the first few minutes of his interview, following immediately after his initial description of his relationship with his mother and the strict discipline she wielded. Jacques comments: "if you're an only child" he comments "you're always lonely."

JE:...If you have a brother you can just, someone to talk to, I didn't discuss personal things with my parents.

BH: Oh ja, was it always a bit...

JE: [interjects] The strictness I didn't like...

BH: Did you always felt alone, or lonely, since you were young?

JE: Ja, you can say that. I don't know if I perceived that I was feeling alone, at the time, now thinking back on it, I can say 'yes, it was like that'. But at the time you didn't know whether it was a feeling of aloneness or loneliness.

BH: So it was, to use the term, 'just way things were'.

JE: Ja.

BH: Now, when you're thinking back, you think 'maybe I was a bit alone, a bit lonely'?

JE: Ja...

When asked whether he would have liked to escape this loneliness, he answers "Yes, you could say that, if my parents weren't so strict, if they didn't give me a hiding when I went out" and so lays the blame for his isolation at his parent's door. Jacques says that because his mother was

...a bit strict, and maybe unjust [I] held my frustrations inside, held everything inside, and maybe couldn't communicate.

BH: Since you were small, have you always held your frustrations inside?

JE: Ja

BH: You didn't communicate with anyone.

JE: [quietly] There was no one.

This introduces the second consequence of parental discipline in Jacques narrative: the struggle to understand or demonstrate emotions. This is shown in the below excerpt, part of a lengthy response to a question about his childhood loneliness. This excerpt started with Jacques saying that his parents' discipline lead to him "wishing I was dead".

JE: Because I wished myself dead, I cursed myself... through that, I killed my emotions. I didn't know how to act out love it was a difficulty.

BH: For you, did it always feel like your emotions were dead?

JE: Ja, because I can't [pause, struggling to express himself] know how to handle, certain feelings... for example, how to be cheerful, or happy...

OK, I knew how to be angry, understand, but I can't name all these feelings people get. But I know what they are, happiness.

BH: Or sadness.

JE: Or to love someone. Sadness is just part of anger.

Jacques insisted that he is not able to understand any of the emotions that are "smaller" than sadness or anger.

JE: ... I didn't know how to do them, to live them out

BH: So you got feelings but didn't know how to live them out?

JE: I don't know if I got the feelings. I don't know if I could answer that.

I'm not sure I got them. I wouldn't be able to recognise them as feelings...

I could name them, having looked at it on other peoples faces, but to live it myself, that's the thing...

BH: So you got these feelings but can't live them out.

JE: Ja... I don't how to do emotions.

The inability to “live out” emotions and so communicate openly with others, introduced in his childhood, is a dominant and unchanging theme in his narrative. Jacques consistently links this theme to how his parents treated him in childhood. As with his loneliness, Jacques describes his frustration at being so “introvert”, and not being able to understand and communicate emotion. He claims he wanted to break free of this but comments that given how he was as a person, it “didn't work out”. This emotional inability had the further consequence of deepening his isolation, and Jacques says he was alone most of the time. Thus the twin effects of his parent’s discipline, loneliness / isolation and the inability to express or understand emotions , seem to form a vicious circle in his narrative.

However Jacques’ attitude towards the frustration at his loneliness, isolation, and inability to adequately comprehend emotion is identical to his attitude towards his frustration with his parents. That is, he does not acknowledge it overtly. Rather, he seems to express an unspecified longing for something more. For example, in referring to his isolation and inability to express emotion Jacques takes care to insist that he “didn’t hate” the situation, which is at odds with a sense in his narrative that he wanted to change, but did not know how “I had problems, but I couldn’t discuss them with anyone...I held them inside [I didn’t know I could] go somewhere to work my problems out.” These comments give the impression that Jacques’ childhood was marked with repressed or unrealised frustration.

This is consistent with Jacques’ reporting that he was a well-behaved child. This description of his behaviour accords with reports from his parents. When asked whether he misbehaved when he was young, Jacques supplied the examples of burning food he was cooking, and once breaking a window by accident. Apart from this very minor misbehaviour, the only other possibly unusual feature Jacques reports in his childhood is sometimes “playing too rough” with the family pets when he was about eight years old. He insists he never abused the animals or “hurt them seriously” but a “few times I enjoyed throwing a cat off the roof and seeing how they land...
BH: Was it ever experimenting? JE: I don't know...ja, you could say I was watching their reaction, but I never kicked them or anything.”

Apart from his loneliness and his ‘experiments’ with the family pets, Jacques’ childhood behaviour paints the picture of a unremarkable young child. He did not have temper tantrums, or frequently fight with others. He can only recall ever hitting a peer once, when in high school. Characteristically, Jacques says that although he gets angry he says it would not happen often, sometimes demonstrating his anger and sometimes now, getting over it in an hour or a day. He says he tended to “hold his anger inside”. Jacques says he used to “play doctor-doctor” with girls, but this was never “proper sex.” Jacques, despite his claims of loneliness, says he had “two or three” friends.

When Jacques was approximately ten years old (in Standard 3 / Grade 5) he spent a year in hospital recovering from a series of serious illnesses “brain infection, chicken pox, German measles, mumps, had my tonsils removed”, which meant that he had to repeat the year at school. Jacques did not appear to find either his illnesses or his having to repeat a year traumatic, narrating them with his characteristic indifference and struggling to remember what illnesses he suffered from. While Jacques does not link his illness with this in his narrative, at around the same time (in “Standard 3 or 4” / Grade 5) Jacques started stealing from handbags.

During the interviews Jacques’ first mention of handbag theft occurs in the context of a discussion of his feelings of loneliness in childhood, when he comments that although he had friends at school:

[I] didn't discuss personal things with them, like for example ‘I like that girl and would like to go out with her’ or ‘I took money from my mom's bag, let's go buy sweets’ or something like that.

Jacques resumes the connection between his loneliness and his thefts shortly afterwards.

BH: In primary school, how would you describe yourself?...[F]rom when you were small, would you describe yourself as a lonely child, someone who felt lonely?

JE: No, I wouldn't say that I would try hide away if anyone approached me.

BH: On the whole, how did you feel?

JE: I think I could say I felt alone.

BH: Was it a lonely feeling, or just the feeling of being alone? Good or bad?

JE: I think both [definite tone].

BH: It's a feeling that has both good and bad in it.

JE: Ja, if you feel alone then you can take money from your mother's handbag and go to the cafe and play games on the machine [i.e. video games], but that sort of thing...If you can't go to a friend, but you feel alone, so to make yourself feel, to make...you must make your own amusement, so you go to the cafe and play video games.

Thus these thefts are initially expressed as a direct consequence of the negative experience of his loneliness. As has been discussed, Jacques makes causal links between childhood loneliness and his inability to express emotion, both of which he implies are “psychological consequences” of parental discipline. He expands further on the linkages between these factors and his initial thefts:

JE: OK, so say I had problems, I couldn't discuss them with anyone, I held them inside. I didn't know that I could go over there to be free of my problems. I didn't know.

BH: What sort of problems?

JE: As I said to you, I didn't know how to do feelings. I didn't perceive that what I was doing by stealing out the handbag was a problem and that it can get bigger.

However Jacques does not perceive his loneliness and the resultant thefts as entirely negative. As shown in his comments above, not only are his feelings of loneliness (or being alone) described as both good and bad, but “if you feel alone then you *can* take money from your mother's handbag” [emphasis added] to “make your own amusement.” This amusement was not merely, as implied above, an attempt by Jacques to find solace in his loneliness. As Jacques comments later in his narrative:

I couldn't say, but it's probably when I was in Standard 3 or 4 when I began taking money... I'm not sure, but I would say [I did it for the] for the adventure. I can't be sure, but I would say for the adventure...

As his interview progresses the fact that these thefts were a source of “fun” and “adventure” becomes more apparent. Jacques sounds amused when talking about them and repeatedly makes comments like:

BH: Did it feel good for you, the theft?

JE: Ja, it's fun, it was an adventure. You're enjoying yourself, you've got money to waste or whatever, you didn't work for that... It wasn't planned.

BH: You just thought 'I've got money, it's good'.

JE: Ja...The stealing from the handbags was fun, I can say that. I know they say that if you don't enjoy something you won't do it again...

Jacques' narrative is unequivocal in presenting the acts of theft as fun, an adventure, and a source of money to waste but as shown by previous comments it also repeatedly places these thefts in the context of a continuum of criminal behaviour: “...it was nice to steal money from handbags, and just waste it on anything and, umm, ja. I could say

what started small got bigger.” As can be seen in the interview transcripts, almost every mention of these childhood thefts makes mention of the more severe offences they led to, and when the more severe offences are discussed Jacques makes linkages between them and the handbag thefts of his own accord. For example, when Jacques was asked why he decided to commit rape repeatedly, he said: “JE:... [I]t’s complicated. There are quite few reasons. BH: If you could name them, what are those reasons? JE: Because I began with the handbags and got bigger, that’s one reason...” Jacques’ narrative seems to present the handbag thefts as the beginning of his journey to murder.

The fact that these thefts were a dominant theme in Jacques’ narrative is perhaps most eloquently shown in his response when I asked him whether he ever had nightmares about anything:

No, I don't. But I do think about the things that I've done, it comes back to me a lot. Like, for example, OK, when I think back to the woman I shot in the bath...It just comes into my thoughts [*gedagte*], I don't look to think about it, you understand, because it will always stay with me....I think back about the times I stole money from handbags, that comes very often. It comes, not every day, but it comes often. Say like, you're finished for the day and then you think back to your [INAUDIBLE] but I don't really speak about it. OK if someone asks me then we can sit and talk, but it won't come out of me.

Jacques appears to find memories of his handbag thefts as intrusive, if not more so, than memories of his murders. Again, this demonstrates how Jacques’ narrative links them, possibly implying a moral equivalence.

The constant linking of these thefts to more severe offences highlights the relationship between them but also makes it difficult to describe with complete certainty how Jacques’ motives developed as his offending became more severe. Notwithstanding

this difficulty, by inspecting the context within which many of these comments occur, paying attention to how Jacques describes his feelings in relation to different offences, and placing his descriptions within the chronology of his narrative, some patterns in the development of his offending can be discerned. What is clear is that at this age, about to enter adolescence, Jacques' loneliness lead to his finding enjoyment in theft. While he is reluctant to label his loneliness as either a positive or negative experience, just as he is reluctant to directly blame his parents for it, Jacques acknowledges that these thefts led to more severe offences. Jacques repeatedly emphasises that this last is a fact that he did not realise at the time. He blames this lack of realisation on his inability to understand emotion. Jacques implies that this inability was another consequence of the isolation inflicted on him by his parents.

a) Imago analysis: Childhood

The narrative of Jacques childhood reveals four imagoes. Two of these, the Distant Father and the Controlling Mother, are imagoes associated with others. The other two, the Lonely Boy and Adventurous Thief, are imagoes associated with Jacques' self. McAdams (1993) posits that childhood is where tone and main ideological themes of the personal narrative are created. Jacques narrative seems to support this, as the imagoes established at this stage personify the themes that pervade his story.

i) The origin of the Distant Father imago²⁶

The first imago to be mentioned is the imago of the Distant Father. When asked about his family Jacques immediately says "I'm not friends with my parents" and so emphasises his emotional distance from his parents. He then, of his own accord, introduces the character of his father, the epitome of emotional distance. The Distant Father seems to epitomise the emotional distance between Jacques and his parents. Jacques describes the Distant Father by listing what he did not do in his childhood: he didn't speak to Jacques, he didn't help him with school work, he didn't teach him about cars, he didn't play with him, he didn't pay attention to him, was not involved

²⁶ See transcription references: 115, 116, 120, 129, 173, 262, 265, 267, 297.

with him much, and didn't have an influence on him. Jacques comments that his father did nothing more than work and come home afterwards.

Jacques's characterises the Distant Father imago as absent and passive, a character defined by what he failed to do. The Distant Father imago is also characterised by a lack of emotion and engagement with others. The Distant Father appears to do what is necessary to maintain a 'normal' life but avoids further involvement. In Jacques childhood the Distant Father imago demonstrates two of McAdams' (1988) seven features for identifying imagoes: it is associated with a significant other, and it has associated personality traits. The importance of the Distant Father in representing an early incarnation of the themes of emotional distance and lack of engagement which run throughout Jacques narrative only becomes apparent as Jacques gets older.

ii) The origin of the Controlling Mother imago²⁷

In contrast to the Distant Father imago is the more directly influential and dynamic character of the Controlling Mother imago. This imago is introduced immediately after Jacques' initial description of his father with the words: "she brought me up". Unlike the passive Distant Father, the Controlling Mother was "boss of the house" and very involved in the narrative of Jacques' childhood. She is immediately and strongly associated with discipline. She is depicted as strict, emotionless, and inflexibly controlling. In contrast to the Distant Father the Controlling Mother is characterised by acting (as opposed to failures to act). However, these actions are consistently described in negative terms: she would give Jacques a hiding if he misbehaved or failed to do homework, she would not allow him to go out alone or unsupervised, she would "keep him in his place". Jacques takes care to point out that she never abused him, or made him afraid. Thus while the Controlling Mother is associated with discipline and control, she is not associated with abuse, threats, or fear. Perhaps more tellingly, despite her involvement and action, the Controlling Mother never showed affection to Jacques in his childhood, nor did she supply the "special attention" he failed to get from the Distant Father. As Jacques states, the only

²⁷ See transcription references: 115 –118, 173, 257, 258 –262, 267, 285, 297.

form of attention paid by the Controlling Mother was making sure he did his school work.

In terms of McAdams' (1988) features for identifying imagoes, the Controlling Mother displays two: it is associated with a significant other, and it has associated personality traits. It seems unexpected that the Controlling Mother imago should have the same number of prototypical features as the Distant Father when Jacques' narrative consistently states she had a far greater influence on his childhood. This can partly be explained by the fact that the prototypical features only account for presence or absence of a feature, not the dynamism thereof (for example, both the Distant Father and Controlling Mother have associated personality traits, but the Controlling Mother's are far more dynamic and have more of an affect on Jacques in childhood). The prototypical features also do not take into account the influence that the imago had on the individual or their imagoes of self, preferring to focus solely on the degree to which the characteristics of the imago are adopted by the individual.

The full reasons for this observation will only become clearer as the narrative progresses, but it draws attention to the limitations of the Controlling Mother imago. The Controlling Mother is portrayed only as a mechanism for controlling and trapping Jacques. While it possesses the dynamism and motivation absent from the Distant Father the Controlling Mother, like the Distant Father, fails to provide the "special attention" Jacques desires.

*iii) The origin of the Lonely Boy imago*²⁸

Thus both the Distant Father and Controlling Mother imagoes are targets for Jacques' resentment. As discussed, Jacques' resentment of them is implied in his description of them and their actions and never acknowledged directly. Resentment is similarly implied in his not speaking affectionately of them, even while he portrays himself as an obedient and well-behaved child. While Jacques appears reluctant to criticise them, this implied criticism occurs alongside his frequent hints at longing for something he cannot quite define. From Jacques' repeated insistence that neither of his parents paid

²⁸ See transcription references: 118, 120, 121, 123 – 127, 134, 135, 225 – 8, 261, 263, 290, 295.

him “special attention”, we can hypothesise that this was perhaps a longing for emotional intimacy. This hypothesis is supported when we look at the most overt criticism Jacques has of his parents: that their discipline and lack of involvement with him had “psychological consequences”: (a) loneliness and isolation and (b) the inability to express and understand emotions seem to form a vicious circle in his narrative.

These ‘consequences’ are embodied in the most significant imago of the self in Jacques’ childhood: the Lonely Boy. At this stage of Jacques’ childhood the Lonely Boy demonstrates five of McAdam’s (1988) proposed features of the prototypical imago. The Lonely Boy has an origin myth; it is related to a person (in this case, Jacques himself); it has associated wishes, aspirations and goals; and it has associated behaviours.

Jacques first mentions his childhood loneliness immediately after we first discussed the Controlling Mother, very early in his narrative. The Controlling Mother imago is thus evoked in the origin myth of Jacques’ first clear character of self, the Lonely Boy imago. However no single event provides the origin myth for the Lonely Boy. Rather, the Lonely Boy imago’s origin myth is described in terms of how the imago resulted from the interaction between Jacques, the Distant Father, and the Controlling Mother. Specifically, Jacques portrays himself as a boy trapped inside himself in a world devoid of emotion and of warmth. Jacques is unequivocal in presenting the Lonely Boy’s situation as a result of parental action: the Lonely Boy is trapped by the inflexible discipline of the Controlling Mother, and the emotional absence of the Distant Father. This state of entrapment and isolation results in the Lonely Boy being ill-equipped to comprehend or express emotion (Jacques blames the Distant Father and Controlling Mother, the latter in particular, for making him ‘wish himself dead’ and so kill his emotions). The extent of this emotional dysfunction is demonstrated in Jacques describing not being able to “do” emotion, implying they are only an act. This, in turn, serves to engrain the Lonely Boy’s isolation.

The Lonely Boy is therefore portrayed as helplessly trapped in his aloneness by both his self and by the imagoes of his parents. The Lonely Boy is passive in his helplessness. This passivity is consistent with Jacques’s reluctance to openly express

resentment of his parents or acknowledge his frustration at the Lonely Boy's situation. Similarly, by portraying the Lonely Boy as simultaneously helplessly trapped by his lack of emotional understanding and wishing to break free of it, Jacques' narrative encourages passivity.

Trapped, the Lonely Boy is portrayed as fundamentally isolated and emotionally disengaged. This is demonstrated by Jacques' limited description of school friends, and his repeated insistence that he was not able to discuss personal and emotional things with anyone. This disengagement leads to the Lonely Boy "not realising" certain things about his situation: such as the extent of his resentment of his parental imagoes, or that he was lonely. Notwithstanding this isolation and disengagement, the Lonely Boy is able to handle the demands of everyday existence, as shown by Jacques' participating in school activities, not behaving badly, and maintaining some friendships.

Jacques' narrative does not however show the Lonely Boy as content in his predicament. As alluded to above, there is an impression that the Lonely Boy suffers from repressed or unrealised frustration. The Lonely Boy appears to resent being trapped, frustrated by his own emotional disengagement which deepens his entrapment, and resenting the parental imagoes that created his situation. Not acknowledging this frustration and resentment would allow the Lonely Boy to continue in his passivity and avoid confrontation with the Controlling Mother imago. However as demonstrated by Jacques' repeated struggle to simultaneously blame and avoid accusing his parents, the Lonely Boy is not able to adequately avoid acknowledging his frustration.

iv) The origin of the Adventurous Thief imago²⁹

It can thus be hypothesised that the fourth imago of Jacques' childhood, the Adventurous Thief, originates in this interaction between the Lonely Boy, the Controlling Mother and Distant Father. As has already been discussed, Jacques first mentions committing theft in the context of a discussion of his loneliness. Jacques

²⁹ See transcription references: 123, 125, 128, 135, 146, 147, 166, 183, 214, 246, 268.

states he started committing theft in Standard 3 or 4 (Grades 5/6), at a time when he missed a year of school due to illness. Although Jacques does not make the connection between these events, this illness could have exacerbated the Lonely Boy's isolation and loneliness. We can therefore hypothesise that the Adventurous Thief finds its origin myth in a period of more intense loneliness in the Lonely Boy's story of entrapment and repressed frustration.

However when the Adventurous Thief begins to steal money from Jacques' mother's handbag, his motives are adventure and enjoyment. Jacques consistently describes these thefts in terms such as "fun" and "adventure". Jacques' narrative is unequivocal in presenting the acts of theft as fun, an adventure, and a source of money to waste. He sounds amused talking about these thefts, and they colour his perception of his loneliness. His loneliness is transformed by the thefts from being only a burden, to being a situation where you can "provide your own amusement" by committing theft.

Thus the Adventurous Thief allows the Lonely Boy to maintain his ambivalent attitude towards his loneliness and allows the resentment of the Controlling Mother to remain unexpressed. The latter is particularly supported by the fact that although the Adventurous Thief was stealing from the Controlling Mother, Jacques did not link this to his resentment of her. The Adventurous Thief also allows the Lonely Boy to avoid confronting his own nature and become less isolated and "introvert".

The above suggested that in Jacques' childhood the Adventurous Thief and the Lonely Boy are closely interlinked. The Lonely Boy supplies the Adventurous Thief with his motivation, while the Adventurous Thief provides the "adventure" which allows the Lonely Boy to continue unchanged in his isolation. The Adventurous Thief is the Lonely Boy's means of avoiding both confrontation and change, and serves as a coping mechanism.

The excitement of adventure offered by the Adventurous Thief would have been all the more compelling in light of a school and social life that Jacques' narrative implies is banal and unremarkable. This perception of banality is most clearly shown in Jacques' tone of indifference when talking about this childhood, and in the lack of descriptions of his childhood (contrasting notably, as shall be shown, with his

meticulous descriptions of his offences). The fact that Jacques' narration of his childhood contains very little detail on anything other than the shortcomings of his parents and the beginnings of his criminal career may partially be a function of the interview's focus, but it supports the impression created by Jacques himself that he is indifferent towards the mundane details of his childhood.

Despite the benefits of the Adventurous Thief and the fact that the thefts it committed were fun, Jacques is aware that it represents part of a continuum of offending behaviour. His narrative highlights the importance of the Adventurous Thief in the development of his offending, claiming it led to his committing more severe offences. Jacques emphasises that his lack of emotional understanding meant he did not realise at the time that the Adventurous Thief could create problems for him. This suggests that the "fun" he experienced committing these thefts is mitigated by his reflection, with the benefit of hindsight, on the affects the Adventurous Thief would eventually have on his narrative.

In Jacques' childhood the Adventurous Thief displays an origin myth, association with a person, and associated behaviours; three of McAdams (1993) seven features of prototypical imagoes. These will be added to as the narrative progressed. The Adventurous Thief, as shall be shown, is the first of a series of imagoes of self associated with offending. His "experiments" with the family pets foreshadow future developments in these 'offending' imagoes.

5.2.3.2 Adolescence

In his narrative, Jacques does not differentiate between his primary and high school years, and appears not to consider them as being significantly different. Jacques was made a school prefect in the final year of primary school (Standard 5 / Grade 7) but did not pass the year. Jacques state he was however allowed to go to high school due to his age. Again, Jacques did not consider this incident particularly remarkable.

His family moved to a town called Despatch when Jacques was fifteen, and as a result he changed high school. However the business his parents went there to run failed, so they returned to Pretoria a year later and Jacques returned to his original high school.

Jacques finds this incident unremarkable and adapted easily to the brief period in boarding school that the move to Despatch necessitated. Jacques comments that you just have to “fit in” when you arrive in a new place, and not “make it hard for yourself”.

Jacques was not a spectacular student, getting “most D’s” and comments “I got through, but not well” observing that his school performance varied according to whether the teacher giving the course “made it interesting” or not. He says that “I just learnt because I must learn, I must pass, I must get matric” (Grade 12) and says that he wanted to do this because his mother had told him he must pass these exams. Jacques says the only attention his mother gave him was in relation to his school work. To him, he says, “this is what attention meant.” Jacques wonders whether being forced to work by his mother meant that he never took personal responsibility for his studies, or motivated himself.

Notwithstanding this, Jacques’ moving into high school saw a change in his mother’s attitude towards him: “we were not close in primary school, but in high school she wanted to come closer.” Jacques hypothesises that “perhaps she realised she didn’t have to be so strict”, that her being this way drove Jacques away, and perhaps Jacques’ increasing desire for distance between them encouraged her to close this gap. She began to show him more affection, verbally and physically, and joked with him more. This only “really annoyed” Jacques and made him feel uncomfortable, so he resisted it. Jacques appeared to make an effort to keep distance between himself and his parents, to point where even their introducing him to other people as their son was something which he “didn’t like”. He comments that when he was younger:

I didn't seek attention, because they were strict. I would rather they didn't pay me attention. And when they wanted to pay attention, that's why I didn't want it. I wanted attention, then I decided I didn't want attention any more, now they want to give me attention...maybe I just didn't find this important anymore, like when you reach a certain age and don't want your mom to kiss you any more.

He says he just wanted his parents, his mother in particular, to leave him alone. Jacques mentions the trajectory of his relationship to with his mother – her strictness, followed by her attempts to come closer, and his rejecting them – when she is first introduced in his interview. He emphasises it repeatedly in his narrative.

Much had been made in media reports at the time of his arrest about his relationship with his mother, implying that it was her treatment of him that lead to the offences and citing examples. As Jacques had not disclosed anything of this sort, I asked him about these reports:

BH: Did mother scold you about girls?

JE: No...

BH: Say that girls are sinful, or something?

JE: No, no...

BH: Did your mother ... ever catch you while you were masturbating?

JE: Ja, she said she'd tell my Dad about me...I was in matric, or 9... I was in the bath, and took too long, and she came in when I was busy. She said she'd tell my Dad, but my Dad never did anything about it.

BH: She didn't hit you?

JE: No, no.

BH: Also read that when you went to the toilet your mother wouldn't let you close the door, 'cos she was scared you would masturbate in there.

JE: No, no...

Each example of alleged abuse drew the same, direct and unconcerned, denial from Jacques. His being caught while masturbating seemed a source of amusement, rather than trauma. While I felt embarrassed by these questions, Jacques' only comment was "you must just ask." I was left with the impression that Jacques was telling the truth, and that reports of his mother abusing him had been exaggerated.

Jacques says he masturbated “every three to four days, maybe every week or two” from his early teens. When asked what fantasies he had at the time, he says “I would see a woman that was naked [stutters] Maybe I would think about a woman I had seen. But not every time I masturbated, sometime, I would just masturbate.” He explains that he was not always motivated by someone he saw, and sometimes just got the urge to masturbate.

As in primary school, Jacques did not have a problem making friends, and says “there were always friends...[although]... there were not many”. Jacques appears content with this situation, but goes on to insist that he did not feel a deep connection with his friends:

JE: There were always friends. But to say whether they were true friends...I am not so sure... The kids who sit next to you in class, or who you chat with, or who you eat your lunch with at break; he is my friend, that's all.

BH: So, to put it this way, these people weren't your true friends, just the people who were near you.

JE: Ja, they were my acquaintances, and also my friends, but not my friend – friend [BH laughs].

Jacques goes on to say that although he spent time with them and visited them often at his house or theirs, he could not discuss “personal” things with them: “BH: Did you ever have what you described as a 'true friend', the sort of friend you could discuss any problem with? JE: No. I never had a friend like that.”

As if to mirror this lack of ‘true’ friendship, Jacques says that he would keep these friends until he left school, after which they would have less contact with each other and drift apart. More notable is Jacques’ attitude towards the death of a friend who he “liked more than the others” and who he stayed in contact with for the longest time:

“BH: How did you feel when he died? JE: [pause] Well, I didn't, well, I thought it had to happen some time or another... BH: You felt, he's dead now, what can I do? JE: Ja.” When asked what his friend died of, Jacques says he is not sure.

His seeming indifference towards his friends is mirrored in his attitude towards the opposite sex. He says he never felt uncomfortable with girls at school

JE: Ja, I didn't avoid them...there was no problem with them, the girls. If a girl spoke to me, I spoke with her. I didn't force a girl to speak with me....

BH: Did girls like you, on the whole?

JE: I don't know if they liked me, I couldn't say what they thought, but they didn't show...that they didn't want to be around me...

Jacques had a long acquaintance with the daughter of one of his father's colleagues, but says that although they “communicated well” their friendship remained platonic. Apart from this he says he had some minor flings with girls on school trips “because everyone does when you go out in a group... but when the tour is over, you don't carry on with it...” Jacques says his attitude was not due to his not caring about girls, but because “you can't take things further when you are still in school, and take someone out for hours.” He implies that his activities were restricted because his parents would not let him go out with anyone, friends included: “they didn't let me go out and party.” Jacques accepts this with characteristic passivity, saying he did not really care about going out when he was in high school, and had stopped asking his parents by that time: “maybe I knew they would say no”. Despite this, Jacques comments that he would still be able to go out “now and then”, to his church's youth group [Jeug Aksie] or to a movie on Fridays. Apart from this, Jacques took part in school sport, and went to church with his parents. However, he was not committed to either, and his attendance was erratic. As he put it “I think it's important, but I don't think it's really important.”

Jacques' indifference towards school activities, the opposite sex, alongside the absence of "true" friends, suggests that the emotional isolation and 'loneliness' he reports continued into adolescence. However his rejection of his mother's attention and his seeming indifference towards this situation (which in childhood he found more distressing) suggests that Jacques' attitude towards this isolation changed in adolescence. Where this isolation was previously presented as solely negative, Jacques is now more ambivalent towards it. The following exchange, occurring in the course of Jacques' explaining how he did not like his mother's attempts to become more close to him in high school, highlights this:

BH: You just want to be on your own, is that...?

JE: Ja, ja.

BH: Did you like people [inaudible]... Would you describe yourself as someone who always wanted to be on your own?

JE: Ja, you could say that, but I wanted to break out... I wanted to be alone, but it also wasn't nice.

The last sentence articulates Jacques' ambivalent attitude towards his loneliness and isolation in adolescence as simultaneously something he longed to escape from and desired.

While Jacques' apparently normal schooling continued, his offending was also developing. As Jacques explains it "I had problems, but I couldn't discuss them with anyone... I held them inside." He continues that he didn't know where he could go to solve these problems. As mentioned in the previous section these problems referred to the loneliness Jacques felt, and particularly to his not being able to "do" emotions. Jacques consistently linked these problems to the offences he committed. This linkage was not overt, but Jacques would tend to segue from discussions of his offending to discussions of his emotional problems as a motive for them (and vice versa).

As has already been described, committing theft was, for the young Jacques, a source of “fun” and “adventure”. Jacques states that theft “became a habit [*gewoonte*].” Although he is not specific about when this habit of offending developed, his narrative outlines a number of stages through which his ‘offending habit’ progressed before he first committed murder in his mid-twenties. This, alongside the fact that he first committed theft just prior to entering adolescence, makes it a reasonable assumption that the habit of offending developed in his adolescence.

Jacques compares the development of his offending to a drug habit:

Ja. You could say it is like a person who starts smoking dagga at a young age, now I began stealing out handbags. So like that person then goes on the pills or [inaudible] or mandrax or whatever, I started stealing more money. I would not just steal R5, I would now go onto R50 or R100 or R200.... in handbags, and by people I knew... Like if you are an addict you enjoy smoking drugs. And as you get stronger, you begin to experiment. You experiment, you see if you can use the numbers to draw money from the bank.

Jacques introduces the metaphor of drug use early in his narrative to describe his developing offending, and refers back to it throughout. This ‘drug-like’ process of development, which appears to begin in his adolescence, highlights four notable factors in the development of Jacques’ offending.

Firstly, his offending was becoming more serious: he was stealing larger sums of money from handbags and had started stealing money from acquaintance’s houses. Secondly, he developed onto more severe offending via a process of experimentation. Thirdly, as implied above, Jacques was still enjoying these offences and finding them a source of “fun”. As he recalls during a discussion of how his offending developed: “...At that stage it’s fun [*lekker*] for you, you enjoy it, being able to take money out of handbags...” Jacques insists that the money remained an additional reason for

committing theft. He comments that he was careful not to take too much money from a handbag at any one time, so that when he came back there would “always be more”. It can be presumed that stealing greater sums of money, and not only stealing from his parents, both heightened the sense of adventure and the material benefit Jacques got from these offences.

It is this continued benefit (“fun” and money) that Jacques states led to his offending becoming a habit: “It becomes a habit, and you must do it because it's fun, to do it, because you get something out...it was fun to do. It became a habit. Now, then you got further, and that also becomes normal.” This highlights the fourth key point, that in adolescence Jacques’ offending developing into a habit. He does not however state the strength of his ‘offending habit’ at this stage, nor say whether he feels he could have broken free of it or not. The fact that Jacques’ was caught stealing money and punished by his father, “that was the only time he ever hit me”, did not discourage him and is only mentioned in passing.

a) Imago analysis: Adolescence

The overall tone of this period in Jacques’ life does not change from the previous one. Jacques’ lack of engagement with his school work continues into adolescence. This is characteristic of the Lonely Boy imago’s attitude. As in primary school, Jacques appears largely indifferent to schooling. He does not achieve academically and is not motivated to do so. Jacques blames this indifference, and by implication his own passivity, on the Controlling Mother imago. He comments that because he was forced to work he never developed initiative, or took ownership of his studies. This continued blaming of the Controlling Mother occurs alongside changes both in the Lonely Boy and in its relationships with the Distant Father and the Controlling Mother imagoes.

i) *The Lonely Boy is fully established*³⁰

The Lonely Boy is engrained in Jacques narrative and has seemingly become his preferred way of interacting with others. In his adolescence, it appears his predominant imago of self. The engraining of the Lonely Boy in Jacques' narrative is demonstrated by the shift in Jacques's attitude towards the Lonely Boy's isolation and lack of emotional understanding. Whereas his attitude towards his situation childhood appears to have been one of repressed frustration, this frustration now co-exists with acceptance, and even an active embracing of his situation. This acceptance is best demonstrated in the shift in Jacques's attitude towards his isolation and aloneness. Previously this was a situation he wanted to break free of, but it was enforced by the Controlling Mother. Now Jacques seems to want to be alone, a situation created both passively (for example, by his 'stopping asking' his parents if he could go out by the time he reached high school) and actively (for example by his rejecting the Controlling Mother's attempts to break his isolation). Jacques' attitude towards his parents supplies a further illustration: even in childhood Jacques did not appear to have much affection for parents, his feeling towards them being characterised by obedience and implied resentment. While these feelings persist, they are added to in adolescence by Jacques' desire for distance from them. This expresses the stance of the Lonely Boy imago clearly, and feeds into his sense of emotional separation and loneliness. Thus the five features of the prototypical imago identified in the Lonely Boy in childhood (it has an origin myth; it is related to a person, it has associated wishes, aspirations and goals; and it has associated behaviours) are now added to by the sense that this imago is more strongly expressed in behaviour, and connects with Jacques' philosophy of life (McAdams, 1988). Jacques appears to have accepted and identified more with the Lonely Boy imago. However his identification is ambivalent, with isolation of the Lonely Boy becoming something Jacques both desires and resents.

³⁰ See transcription references: 120, 122, 124, 126, 134, 225-9, 255, 260, 263, 267, 290.

ii) *Incorporation of the Distant Father's perspective in the Lonely Boy imago*³¹

The Lonely Boy continues to be characterised by a disengagement from those around him, best demonstrated in his attitude towards his peers: Jacques dismisses his school friends as 'not true friends' and seems indifferent towards one of his best friends' death. As mentioned, this continuation in the Lonely Boy's characteristic mode of interpersonal transaction suggests that it has become consistent with Jacques' philosophy of life. By embracing the philosophy of emotional distance and lack of engagement, the Lonely Boy imago appears to have adopted the central characteristics of the Distant Father imago. Similarly, the Lonely Boy imago's passivity and indifference towards both friends and school work appear reflections of the Distant Father imago's attitude. It is noteworthy that the Distant Father does not feature in Jacques' narrative of adolescence beyond two brief mentions when the Distant Father's failure to take effective action is highlighted: when his father fails to carry out his mother's threat of discipline for masturbating, and when his discipline of Jacques for theft goes unnoticed. Notwithstanding this, the influence of the Distant Father imago is only fully appreciated now, when the degree to which Jacques has incorporated facets of the Distant Father's behaviour and philosophy into the Lonely Boy become clear. In Jacques' adolescence the Distant Father imago thus comes to display a further two of McAdams' (1988) prototypical features that the Controlling Mother does not: an association with behaviours in the individual (i.e. Jacques) and consistency with Jacques' philosophy of life.

This incorporation of the Distant Father imago's philosophy into that of Jacques' main imago of self occurs at a time when the influence of both the Distant Father and Controlling Mother imagoes over Jacques' behaviour appears to wane. This is best shown in their inability to control Jacques' behaviour via discipline, with Jacques (or the Adventurous Thief) becoming indifferent to it. The imagoes associated with his parents thus appear to become increasingly irrelevant in his narrative as he ages.

³¹ See transcription references: 122, 123, 128, 137, 138, 259, 260.

iii) The rejection of the Controlling Mother³²

Perhaps the most telling change is Jacques (or the Lonely Boy's) rejection of the Controlling Mother attempts to become emotionally closer to him:

we were not close in primary school, but in high school she wanted to come closer ... [in childhood] I didn't seek attention, because they were strict. I would rather they didn't pay me attention. And when they wanted to pay attention, that's why I didn't want it.

As discussed, Jacques mentions the trajectory of his relationship to with his mother repeatedly in his narrative: her discipline and emotional distance in childhood, then his rejecting her attempts at closeness in adolescence. The repetition of this trajectory may suggest that, in Jacques' narrative, it has more lasting importance than the Controlling Mother imago itself.

This rejection of the Controlling Mother by the Lonely Boy supplies two observations in relation in Jacques' imagoes. Firstly, it supports the hypothesis that his adolescence sees the Lonely Boy becoming engrained as Jacques's primary imago of self, with the attendant change in Jacques' attitude towards it. Now rather than accept the changes he longed for in childhood the Lonely Boy rejects the attempts made by the Controlling Mother to disrupt the status quo of their relationship. This rejection does not appear solely motivated by Jacques reacting to abuse from the Controlling Mother, as demonstrated by his contradicting media and criminological reports of his mother's discipline being unusually harsh. It is thus more indicative of a change in Jacques' attitude towards the Lonely Boy imago.

Secondly, the rejection of the Controlling Mother demonstrates that the tight control wielded over the Lonely Boy in his childhood has begun to break down. It also demonstrates the limitations of the Controlling Mother's influence: she seems limited to being a mechanism of control, the means that ensured Jacques' childhood isolation

³² See transcription references: 117 – 120, 259 – 261.

and the development of the Lonely Boy. Unlike the Distant Father, the Controlling Mother's attitudes have not been incorporated in the Lonely Boy's philosophy of life. Thus while the Controlling Mother's influence may initially appear to have been great it does not last beyond Jacques's childhood. Ultimately the loss of the Controlling Mother's influence over Jacques and the seeming absence of any imagoes to provide a similar level of control implies there are now no controls in place to limit Jacques' behaviour.

iv) The development of the Adventurous Thief³³

This gradual collapse in the controls placed over Jacques by his imagoes is reflected and speeded by changes in the imago associated with his offending, the Adventurous Thief. As discussed, the offences associated with the Adventurous Thief still appear motivated by the twin benefits of "fun" and money. These continue to supply the adventure that Jacques suggests was still missing from other aspects of his narrative. However his offences are not only becoming more serious, but offending is becoming a "habit". Where in childhood the offences associated with the Adventurous Thief appear to have been an outlet for the Lonely Boy's sense of entrapment, they are now a habit in their own right. Jacques likens the Adventurous Thief's offending to the process of drug addiction. This habit, Jacques states, was developed by a process of experimentation: "as you get stronger, you begin to experiment". This process of experimentation becomes established as the means by which the Adventurous Thief develops to more serious forms of offending, and the means by which the habit of offending becomes more serious. The increase in the Adventurous Thief's strength appears also be reflected in an increasing indifference towards others. Not only does the Adventurous Thief now begin to target people outside his immediate family but it is now indifferent to being disciplined, as demonstrated by Jacques' indifference to being caught and hit by his father for theft.

The Adventurous Thief is now associated with a wider repertoire of behaviours. In childhood, the Adventurous Thief would only encourage stealing small amounts of money from Jacques's mother's purse. In adolescence, the Adventurous Thief is

³³ See transcription references: 128, 135, 146, 147, 183, 214, 246, 270.

encouraging the theft of money from acquaintances, in their houses. The sums of money being stolen are also larger, and bank cards are being taken in an attempt to get even more cash. These changes in the behaviours encouraged by the Adventurous Thief suggest an increased daring and confidence. As mentioned, there is also a suggestion that the Adventurous Thief is becoming increasingly indifferent to other people. This suggests that the Adventurous Thief has become associated with certain personality traits. In adolescence, the Adventurous Thief therefore adopts a fourth feature of the prototypical imago (McAdams, 1988), to add to the three displayed from childhood.

The increased indifference towards others suggests that the Adventurous Thief has adopted the Lonely Boy imago's isolation from others and lack of emotional understanding. In addition to his shared outlook, there appear to be parallels in their development. That is, the Adventurous Thief becomes stronger and commits higher value offences at approximately the same time as the Lonely Boy imago rejects the Controlling Mother's attempts at closeness. The concurrence of these changes suggests further ways in which they maintain a mutually beneficial relationship in Jacques' adolescence.

Firstly, by increasing the benefit offered by offending the Adventurous Thief allows the Lonely Boy imago decreased dependence on the Controlling Mother or Distant Father for emotional interaction. The Adventurous Thief imago thus supports the Lonely Boy imago's desire for distance from the Controlling Mother and Distant Father. Ensuring this relationship does not change also helps ensure that the Lonely Boy remains Jacques' preferred mode of interaction, reflecting the greater acceptance Jacques has towards the Lonely Boy in adolescence.

Simultaneously, the Lonely Boy is maintaining the emotional isolation and distance which allows the Adventurous Thief's experiments in offending to develop untrammelled. Given how the Adventurous Thief appears to have emerged as a result of childhood loneliness, continued emotional isolation could also provide a continued motive. This hypothetical symbiosis between Jacques' imagoes of self not only results in them becoming stronger but also appears to play a part in rejecting the controls

attempted by Jacques' parents. This absence of control is a further benefit to both imagoes.

5.1.3.3 Adult life (Pre-murder series)

After graduating from high school, around 1985/86, Jacques life appears to have been directionless. Jacques said that he hadn't decided what he wanted to after he left school:

[I] had no idea what I wanted to be so I just went everywhere to get work.

I would do anything. I didn't worry...I didn't care...there wasn't anything I specifically wanted to do, but I would do any work if I was accepted for it.

Jacques parents asked him to find work, but when his attempts were unsuccessful he waited at home for his "army papers" (conscription call-up documents) to come. However he wasn't in the first conscription intake. He applied for a number of jobs, including the Police and the Post Office, with no success. He says "I didn't have a clue what I was going to do, when I was in school", and says that upon leaving he was not concerned with what sort of job we should get: "it wasn't a big thing: 'I must go there, or I must go the other way.' I never had the idea to do that, I didn't know, I just went." He then heard that the Railway Police were looking for recruits. Jacques applied, then went on holiday. When he returned he heard that the Railway Police "still wanted me" and so joined "BH: So it wasn't a decision, now, I will become a policeman. JE: No... I didn't decide 'now I'm going to be this'." Jacques continued to live at his parents address on and off for approximately the next four years (until he moved into the police barracks).

Jacques is explicit about the fact that he did not give much thought to what he wanted, and was not concerned about his lack of a plan, being content to 'wander'. Jacques' work life appears to have been guided more by circumstance than by motivation. Jacques apathy and lack of concern for the direction of his life may have contributed to the chronology of his life at this stage not being clear and he seldom gives exact dates and lengths of time. These factors add to the sense that he was 'drifting':

“Maybe I didn't worry about my future. Today I can see I made mistakes”. Jacques later comments that he didn't have the motivation to fight for anything, and affirms that it was not a sense that the world was against him, rather being a feeling of being lost.

Around the time he was accepted into the Railway Police, Jacques met his future fiancé. Their relationship lasted the five years up to his arrest. This suggests he met her in 1987, when he was 21. This was, as Jacques put it, his “first full relationship”. Jacques, characteristically, never refers to his future fiancé by name. She is referred to throughout as “my fiancé”. He first met her at the church youth group [*Jeug Aksie*], and got to know her through church events, where they would have coffee and talk:

JE: [I] Didn't decide immediately that she's important but as we saw each other more, I said now, ‘come, let's go see a movie together’ and from then on we carried on with a relationship...

BH: Was she your first girlfriend?

JE: Yes, my first girlfriend-girlfriend [real girlfriend].

As in his work life, the chronology of Jacques' relationship is not clear. He characteristically summarises their relationship in general descriptions and lists of activities. Jacques was not able to answer the question about “what type of person she [his fiancé] was”, but goes on to say “she was beautiful to me.” Jacques says his love for her wasn't “mad love”, but he “liked her a lot”. They enjoyed being together, and doing things together, such as playing table tennis, going to movies, or listening to music. He says that they talked together “but not a lot”. He says that their conversations weren't “very intelligent” and did not involve the sort of intelligence that “thinks about things”. Jacques gives an impression of his fiancé being quiet and reticent, commenting that if she had something important to say to him, she would rather write it down. Their relationship seemed amiable, and Jacques said they seldom had arguments. If they did, he comments, they were about “small things” and his fiancé would normally “back down”. The only persistent source of irritation in the relationship appears to have been his fiancé's father.

Jacques states that his fiancé was the only person that he felt at ease with, because

She showed that she thinks I'm important, she wanted to go out with me, she loved me, she showed it... She showed that she loved me. She demonstrated it. She lived it out... maybe that is what attracted me to her.

He says he particularly liked it when she would write love notes for him and “a few times, she would expect them herself.” He said that, unlike previously, the fact that his fiancé demonstrated that she loved him meant he could express his feelings to her: “I said it [I love you] because I knew that she really loved me. Then I could say it, because I really felt it. But I wasn't sure at that stage what the feeling was.”

Despite his fiancé's demonstration of love for him, Jacques says that at the time he did not really know what love really was. He explains that although he knew that he loved her, he wasn't sure that he had the knowledge necessary to recognise feelings of love in himself, or handle them. In typically confused and ambivalent terms, Jacques tries to accurately describe the struggle he had in understanding the emotions his relationship implied:

I didn't have the reasons of that love, so maybe it confused me. I didn't know how to react. It didn't make me angry, so that now I'm going to take it out on women, you understand. I didn't have the ability to handle romance, or to react in an understanding way towards a lady. The things I did maybe didn't show that I loved her, but I did love her... I knew nothing about what to do...

BH: So you got all the feelings but can't live them out.

JE: Ja, or if you for example get someone who loves you, and you want to love her back: you know how to woo her [vry], but to demonstrate that love, it's a completely different situation. To understand the true meaning

of the words, 'I love you', to demonstrate and expound on it, to write words to say what's in your heart, that I didn't know how to do it. OK, I learnt it after I was involved with someone who gave these things to me, but I didn't handle it like an understanding person. Now I know what it is like to love a person, now I know if someone loves you, this is how it is done...But at the time I didn't have the things to know how to do it. To say, 'I love you' is easy, but to really show it, and to do certain things to show you love her... that sort of thing.

BH: You didn't know about these things.

JE: I didn't have the knowledge.

Allied to Jacques' lack of emotional understanding is, as before, an implied frustration around communication. He says that although the communication between them was generally good, they were times when they "didn't do it so well":

I got along well with her, and talked a reasonable amount with her, I, can I say, I was seeking more, more talking. From my side, I should also have talked more, found more to talk about, made more opportunity. From both sides, there were times when we didn't talk... there was communication but there wasn't good communication. I maybe expected more.

Jacques says that although he would ask his fiancé if she enjoyed being with him, or their physical relationship, they wouldn't talk about "very personal" things like how he felt about his work, and their future, and what would happen if they had problems. He says he would have liked more, and describes his ideal of communication in their relationship as being what he saw on a relationship advice television programme.

Over the next two or so years, Jacques' work life and relationship continued smoothly. Jacques appeared to live a sober life. He said he and his fiancé would

sometimes go to discos on a Saturday, but he “wasn’t really a night person...We wouldn’t stay out to a disco until three in the morning. Maybe I’d be there an hour or two, then go. I wouldn’t be there until Sunday.” He occasionally drank alcohol when at social events, but would not drink much. He says he didn’t want to get drunk as he wanted to “know what I’m doing”. Jacques only ever got drunk once, when he was at home alone and decided he wanted to know what it was like to get drunk. He didn’t enjoy this experience, and allied with his seeing the effects of alcohol on his grandfather, it means he did not drink heavily again. Jacques never experimented with drugs, something Jacques attributes to his seeing what “druggies” look like. Jacques would smoke cigarettes, a habit he started after he left school, and one he continued as it helped keep him awake during night duty with the police.

Jacques was enjoying his job with the Railway Police. He explains that although he gets bored quickly and struggles to stay awake, he found his police training “very interesting” and he enjoyed it: “You run lots, shoot lots, and when the evening comes you’re half tired and not keen to study. But it’s still nice and you tried your best...I wasn’t a top student but I studied hard...I didn’t struggle”. He even made a “three or four” friends, even though “I didn’t go out and look for them”. Jacques’ enjoyment continued in his subsequent posting to the main international airport (which at the time was under the jurisdiction of the Railway Police). This gave him plenty of variety, with different and continually changing duties: “at the airport [I] always did something different... You learn something every day.” Jacques also had the opportunity to travel overseas as an escort to consignments of gold. These trips, involving staying for a few days in a number of different countries were, to Jacques, “almost like a holiday.” When directly asked he says that although these trips gave him the opportunity to view pornography (banned at the time in South Africa) he never bought any and was not really interested in it.

Jacques repeatedly emphasises how much he enjoyed his work at the airport. As in school, his interest is reflected in his achievement: “at the airport, because I was interested, I wasn’t a brilliant policeman but I did good work...” He passed his sergeant’s exam while at the airport. Media reports had commented that his fiancé’s father had apparently said that if Jacques was to marry his daughter he should better himself, saying “you can’t be a constable for ever. You have to go further.” Jacques

denies that this becoming a sergeant was the result of pressure, saying “I became a sergeant on my own.”

His relationship with his girlfriend had also, after being together between twelve to twenty four months, developed into a full sexual relationship. Before this Jacques says he had masturbated “every three to four days, maybe every week or two.” He says that they were at his parent’s house (as both of them still lived with their respective parents), his parents were out, and they were and watching television: “we were making out [vry] then we'd watch TV, then make out a bit more [vry] and, then, maybe she was getting frustrated. I had never asked her.” Jacques says that eventually his fiancé took his hands and lead him to the bedroom “I didn't ask her, but she also didn't say, and then I had sex with her”. Jacques says that they had tried to have sex once before, but this first attempt had failed as he couldn't “get in”. Jacques describes the sex with his girlfriend in his characteristic detail, commenting that they were both virgins at the time, and that he withdrew before he ejaculated and “shot on the ground” as he did not want to make her pregnant. “Then we got dressed. She then said, look, you must marry me. I said, yes, I will marry you.” The first time they had sex thus lead to their being betrothed.

He and his fiancé would continue to have sex when they were at his house. This sexual relationship was carried out in secret as their parents would disapprove, although Jacques thinks that his mother probably “realised” as she had once found a condom wrapper but she “didn't know for sure”. Jacques says he wondered whether his fiancé would tell her mother that they were having sex. Jacques says that their sex life had to fit around his work, as he would work shifts, which meant that he only saw his fiancé every six to eight days. He says they wouldn't always have sex, but he would ask

JE: Do you want to do it?...Then she would say yes or no... It's alright,
it's not a problem...

BH: It was no problem for you?

JE: No... it didn't make me angry if I didn't get sex

Jacques says that the sex with his fiancé was always good, although he notes that because they didn't use a condom it meant he would have to withdraw before he ejaculated. He said that he also did not always ejaculate because he didn't want to make her pregnant "at this stage", before they were married. However, he said he never had any problems getting an erection "I wasn't unlucky like that." Jacques says he and his fiancé did not talk about sex much, and he did not ask her "if she enjoyed it, or if it went too quickly."

The changes in his life since he left school did not lessen Jacques' offending. On the contrary, at around the time Jacques met his fiancé and joined the Railway Police, he progressed beyond stealing from handbags. As already shown, while Jacques says he loved his fiancé and enjoyed their relationship he maintains he "maybe expected more" communication with her, still feeling unable to recognise and handle the feelings this relationship evoked. The problems of a lack of understanding of emotions, and emotional isolation, thus appear to have remained with Jacques. Jacques links his increased offending to these problems, which his relationship with his fiancé brought into focus:

Maybe I could experience feelings a bit with my fiancé. Maybe I broke out because I wanted to experience. But I blocked the rest off, I don't understand. Because I didn't perceive my feelings of enjoyment, or I'm doing something and getting something good back.

While Jacques does not make any explicit link between these events, he first entered a stranger's house to steal money about the same time as he met his fiancé, around 1987.

BH: What made you decide to enter [i.e. steal from] a house for the first time?

JE: OK, uuumm, I can't remember what made me decide to do this. As I said, maybe it was an impulse, 'now I'm going in'. It wasn't a decision

that I sat down and took 'OK, now I'm going to break into a house'. I just saw the window's open, the opportunity is there, I'd go in.

He continues that the first few times he would just walk in and steal cash.

JE: OK if I go in to get cash, there are people there. Men, women, children and what not. I just went in and opened the handbag and took cash, where it was in the bedroom or so on.

BH: Was it at night?

JE: At night...but [the people were] not sleeping... they were busy eating, or watching TV, or whatever. A couple of times I was busy, and people came in and they saw me, then I made tracks.

BH: Did you ever attack anyone to get away?

JE: No...

BH: How many times would you say you walked into a house, before the first incident? [i.e. before the first murder]

JE: Definitely a few times, say, ten times at the most...

BH: When you were in a house, how did you feel?

JE: Well, it didn't make me feel brave or anything like that. I ummm, OK look, you're still not sure at that stage, you're still tense, because you don't know because you don't know who's in the house or whatever. You're still careful. But when you see there's no-one there, you're half-relieved.

BH: After the time, did you feel excited, with the adrenaline, from the thrill of it? ...

JE: [Pause] I couldn't say, I couldn't swear by it... if it's empty you can't stay too long, because someone might see you. You look what's there and

make tracks. If someone's there, you must also be quick and make tracks. So you're nervous. If I got money, I was glad. I'd go play games or waste the money or whatever, on anything, food, cold drink, while you're playing. You can say I was scared someone would catch me, or whatever, when I began. But eventually, you don't worry. It becomes a habit, and you just do it because it's fun [*lekker*], to do it, because you get something out...it was just fun to do... it was nice [*lekker*], and it becomes a habit. If you feel you want to go out and go out, and do the thing, find a window that's open....

BH: Afterwards, it just became a habit. After the first few times, you do it and you get a good feeling?

JE: Ja, it was nice and the enjoyment of getting money, to spend it, waste it, it's just there and you didn't work for it. It became a habit, because I enjoyed getting something .

In addition to stealing cash when he entered strangers' houses, Jacques continued in his habit of stealing bank cards. If he took a bank card he would also try to find the PIN numbers and then withdraw money from their savings accounts. He says that he would sometimes steal everything from their handbag, or from their savings account. Jacques says he kept the cash, and anything else he stole, for his own use. Thus these offences continued to being material benefits for Jacques.

Jacques is not clear or confident describing his own motives or the decision making around his offences. Typically, when discussing these offences the volume of his voice drops and he stammers more, his tone becoming less confident. This is in contrast to his precision when describing his actions or thoughts. Jacques would, by preference and of his own accord, repeatedly return to concrete descriptions of what he did during these offences: keep a look out, enter the house still not knowing for sure whether someone was in there, having to be quick in stealing something, then

“making tracks”. In these actions, as well as his tone when describing them, it is clear that Jacques had developed into a confident and daring burglar. He says he never “broke a window” to get inside during these burglaries, preferring places that were left insecure. He said he did not go out burgling every day. Jacques would offend in areas close to where he lived. He was never arrested for, or charged with, these offences.

“One to two years” after his relationship with his fiancé started, and these burglaries began, Jacques committed an offence which foreshadowed what was to come. Jacques mentions the incident in passing, when discussing other crimes that were linked to him after his arrest. He says he didn’t commit any of them, apart from the case where “OK, I tried to rape one, but they didn’t want to carry on with the case.” He says that this occurred about a year before his first murder. Jacques’ description of this offence is particularly vague and brief:

JE: I went in the dwelling and [pauses, struggles for words]... OK,
uummm, the woman was there...but then she screamed, and I ran away.

BH: Was this near your parent's house?

JE: Ja... it was just over the street, diagonally across.

Jacques later expands that this was the first time he had found a woman in a house he had entered. He says he pulled a duvet off her, before she screamed and he fled. I later asked Jacques whether he decided to rape women before his first murder, while his initial reply is vague he goes on to reveal how his offending developed to this point, and then describes his first attempted rape again:

JE: Ja [many pauses, stutters] I, I thought I would try to rape a woman...if I saw her there, and she looked nice. But it wasn't like I saw a window open and decided to go in...It's from when you take money out the handbags. You don't do it at family and friends, you go out to flats to get money. Maybe that caused me to think, ‘why don't I do this also’.

Because you're going further...you are now busy in a process and you come to a point where you see, why don't I do this? There's no special reasons I want to rape woman, you understand. I just thought 'why don't I do this'? Maybe you also enjoyed it, because you do it secretly.

BH: Is that it?

JE: Maybe it's the sneakiness. You enjoy doing it, the sneakiness, no one knows about it. You don't tell anyone. You don't get drunk and hit it out, or tell anyone, the sneakiness you don't tell anyone about. To do sneaking things you get something out of it... [speaks faster, more excited tone] to be sneaky, to sneak around at night, to search for money, then you come to stage where you see there's a woman, you see she's there, you don't know if she has a husband, because you didn't check whether there was a man there. You see through the window that there's one body on the bed, so you go through the window and pull the duvet off. But you don't have the wherewithal to know what to do next, then she screams, and you run away.

Jacques re-iterates the sense he introduced in the narrative of his adolescence, that he is increasingly caught up in the habit and process of his offences.

JE:...Umm [pause] In the beginning, you can't to stop. Then you get bigger, like you said, with the handbags and then later I could go rob banks.

BH: It became harder to stop as you went along, once you had started.

JE: Maybe, the things that I stole out of women's handbags, began [the plans] to have sex with women. I don't know, I just think that.

BH: To put it this way, it was part of the same act. You stole this thing, you saw a woman there and thought ‘hey, I can have sex with her’?

JE: Ja...

The above passages also make explicit the links Jacques makes between the initial handbag thefts, his progressing to burglary, and now his decision to attempt rape. These are added to by further comments Jacques makes elsewhere in his narrative with reference to his decision to commit rape: “because maybe I stole money from women’s handbags, maybe I had to now have sex with a women, you understand” and “BH: What were your reasons, do you think for selecting women in your offences, not men? JE: As I said, it was the handbags they caused me to go into women's rooms.” Jacques is thus clear that the handbag thefts and his rapes are part of the same continuum of offending, with the handbag thefts being given as a reason for the later rapes. Jacques does not however explicitly state that he had now decided to commit rape.

The above passages show that a further motivation appears to have developed at this stage: “sneakiness”. While I have chosen to translate the Afrikaans word Jacques used (*skelms/skelmheid*) as “sneaking” or “sneakiness” it also carries associations of cunning, furtiveness, secrecy, and criminality. In committing these burglaries Jacques appears to have gained additional satisfaction from the ‘sneakiness’ of his offences. This is shown by the excitement in his tone when describing this sneakiness, stating “[doing] sneaking things, you get something out of it” and seemingly additionally satisfied by the fact that “You don't tell anyone...the sneakiness you don't tell anyone about.”

The above gives a clear impression that the habit of Jacques’ offending had not just changed in character. It had become more severe, with Jacques now less able than before to escape it. As Jacques comments:

But as it goes on, going into houses, round by strangers', anything can happen, it's a habit that you learnt, you can't stop. You want to do it more and more, you can't control it. You do it more, as a habit.

All this suggests that what had begun as "fun" and an adventure was, by the time Jacques came to commit walk-in burglaries, increasingly becoming a habit that he couldn't break free off. Jacques links this strengthening habit to the desire for "experience" in adulthood in his comments made when discussing his relationship that "maybe a broke out because I wanted to experience". These links between the desire for experience and the decision to commit rape persist as his narrative progresses.

a) Imago analysis: Adult life (Pre-murder series)

Upon leaving school Jacques appears to have entered a period of aimlessness. He emphasises that he had no specific plans or any direction. This is supported by Jacques' comments that he felt "lost" and did not have the motivation to fight for anything. Jacques acknowledges that this 'drifting' was ultimately harmful to him: "Maybe I didn't worry about my future. Today I can see I made mistakes." This aimless drifting appears to encourage the incorporation of the Lonely Boy in one of Jacques' key imagoes of adulthood.

It is notable that in adulthood the only developments pertain to those imagoes associated with Jacques' self: the Adventurous Thief and Lonely Boy. Neither the Controlling Mother nor Distant Father imagoes are mentioned in the narrative of his adulthood, nor are new imagoes associated with others embodied in his narrative. This serves to highlight the fact that Jacques was becoming increasingly isolated from others. This also confirms that, with the end of adolescence, all controls over him were removed. This isolation and lack of control is bourn out by the increasing severity of his offences in adulthood.

i) *The evolution of the Lonely Boy imago into the Passive Man imago*³⁴

This period in his life sees the evolution of the Lonely Boy imago. Jacques' tone of indifference and emotional disconnection as he narrates this aspect of his story suggests that the passivity and lack of emotional engagement the Lonely Boy inherited from the Distant Father persists into his adulthood. However Jacques' ambivalence towards his isolation (unlike the Lonely Boy's resentment of it), his advancing age, and his engaging with others sufficiently to hold down steady employment and a relationship suggests that the name 'Lonely Boy' no longer accurately describes Jacques' mode of interpersonal transactions in everyday life. That is, while his interpersonal transactions remain characterised by passivity and emotional isolation, they could be seen as age-appropriate and considered 'normal'; facts which the imago name 'Lonely Boy' does not accurately represent.

This period thus marks the emergence of the Passive Man imago. This imago becomes Jacques' preferred mode of interaction with 'everyday' adult life, that is, with life outside his offending. The adult imago of the Passive Man adopts the central characteristics of the Lonely Boy, the key difference being the Passive Man's ability to carry out a 'normal' life. Entering employment and getting engaged both suggest apparent normality, and that the Lonely Boy imago has grown up. The Passive Man thus displays the same five features of the prototypical imago seen in the Lonely Boy: it has an origin myth; it is related to a person, it has associated wishes, aspirations and goals; it has associated behaviours and connects with Jacques' philosophy of life (McAdams, 1988).

As suggested by the name, the Passive Man is characterised by a lack of dynamism. As shown above, Jacques reports feeling aimless and only joins the Railway Police because they accepted his application. He is able to hold down a job, but is not ambitious and engages with his job because it is varied and so maintains his interest (reflecting the Lonely Boy's attitude towards school work). The Passive Man is not interested in socialising, and while he has some friends Jacques emphasises that he "doesn't look" for them and seems disinterested in maintaining friendships. The

³⁴ See transcription references: 138, 139, 167 – 170, 172, 174, 255, 256, 286, 287, 290.

Passive Man seems ruled by circumstance rather than his own motivation. The last mentioned is particularly evident in Jacques' relationship with his fiancé.

Jacques is clear that he received pleasure from his relationship with his fiancé. However in his narrative this enjoyment is diluted by his continued struggle to understand the emotions this relationship requires. Jacques' narrative, echoing the situation of the Lonely Boy in childhood, suggests he was trapped by his lack of emotional understanding. Jacques also describes himself as a passive recipient of another's love, unable to reciprocate appropriately due to a 'lack of understanding'. Jacques continues his characteristic use of the imagery of his emotions being 'trapped' or 'locked up inside'. Any understanding Jacques professes of emotions is couched in terms of behaving, rather than feeling, in an appropriate way. Jacques implies links between his self as the Lonely Boy imago, controlled by the Controlling Mother, and his adult relationship with his fiancé. All the above demonstrate that Jacques' interpersonal interaction with his fiancé adopts the characteristics of the Passive Man. This further implies that despite the change from Lonely Boy to Passive Man, and his becoming involved in a long-term relationship, the central themes of his lack of emotional connection with others and his inability to perceive or understand his own emotions persist.

The fact that Jacques' relationship is governed by the Passive Man is further shown by his seeming lack of emotional engagement with his fiancé, with him appearing unconcerned with her reactions or emotions. As shown in the interview transcriptions, Jacques describes their sex in the same detail he uses to describe his rapes, which could imply they have an emotional equivalence for him. He never mentions his fiancé's name and she does not appear as a distinct character in his narrative. While she appears to have certain characteristics, their relationship appears distant and formal. Similarly Jacques gives an impression that the relationship with his fiancé was not marked by conflict or high emotion. He does not state any desire to develop his relationship further, nor does he appear motivated sexually or sexually frustrated. In contrast to his fiancé, he appears to play a slightly apathetic role in their relationship. This passivity is also shown in the fact that while Jacques implies he would have liked "something more" in relationship, he does not appear to have broached this subject

with his fiancé. All the above are congruent with the behaviours and characteristics of the Passive Man imago.

Jacques' lack of emotional engagement with his fiancé has three implications for our understanding of his narrative. First, it ensured that his fiancé was not internalised or embodied in his narrative as an imago. Rather she remains an isolated, external, influence incapable of making lasting changes to his narrative. Second, this implies that the shift from Lonely Boy to Passive Man has increased, rather than relieved, Jacques's emotional isolation. Third, this increase in emotional isolation appears to have encouraged evolution and divergence in the Adventurous Thief imago, drawing on its origin myth.

ii) Interactions between the Passive Man and Adventurous Thief imagoes³⁵

As already shown, Jacques' relationship with his fiancé appears to have emphasised his continued emotional isolation and lack of understanding. While in adolescence Jacques rejected the Controlling Mother's efforts at emotional closeness and maintained an ambivalent acceptance of his loneliness, his reaction to the lack of fulfilling emotional interaction with his fiancé demonstrates that this was still something he desires.

This desire is expressed in terms that mirror those used in his youth to describe what he felt was missing from his relationship with his parents. For example, Jacques says he "maybe expected more" and "maybe...wanted to experience". Again the sense of his frustration at this emotional lack of understanding is highlighted: "I didn't perceive my feelings of enjoyment, or I'm doing something and getting something good back." The Passive Man thus recalls the repressed and unrealised frustrations of the Lonely Boy, and echoes his unspecified desire for 'something more' at a time when his narrative contains a heightened sense of his emotional isolation.

However the Passive Man imago is not equipped to meet these desires. Like the Lonely Boy imago before him, the portrayal of the Passive Man as simultaneously

³⁵ See transcription references: 139, 212, 229, 230, 290, 292, 310

helplessly trapped by his lack of emotional understanding and wishing to break free of it encourages passivity. In addition to this, as with the Lonely Boy's interactions with Controlling Mother and Distant Father, the Passive Man does not fully acknowledge his desires and lack of satisfaction. This encourages further passivity and continued frustration.

The Passive Man thus needs to utilise the Adventurous Thief to ease these frustrations, and fulfil this 'desire for something more'. In an echo of the origin myth of the Adventurous Thief there is strong implication that these frustrations relate to Jacques' unmet emotional needs. These unmet needs appear to relate to a lack of emotional interaction and continued emotional isolation. As demonstrated by the established relationship between the Adventurous Thief and the Lonely Boy, these unmet needs can be satisfied by things other than emotional interaction, such as "fun" thefts.

The Passive Man thus continues to need its relationship with the more dynamic Adventurous Thief to handle the resurgence in feelings of emotional isolation, recalling the origin myth of Adventurous Thief and echoing the Lonely Boy's childhood. This emotional isolation occurs against the background of Jacques' 'aimlessness upon leaving school, and his comments that he was "lost" and drifting. This combination of factors, which the Passive Man is unable to cope with, could be hypothesised to lead to an increase in the offending associated with the Adventurous Thief. This hypothesis is supported by the correlation between Jacques' starting a relationship and employment at the same time as he starts burgling houses.

This episode highlights a further factor in the relationship between the Adventurous Thief and Passive Man. Jacques insists that he loved his fiancé and enjoyed their relationship, but this did not seem to have a positive affect on Jacques's offending, which becomes more severe. Similarly, his having an enjoyable job also seemed not to have an affect. This suggests that the linkage between these imagoes will now only be evoked in reaction to stimuli, particularly emotional isolation, that have previously encouraged offending. Positive events such as the satisfying interactions in his relationship thus have no affect on the Adventurous Thief, since the established link to the Passive Man is not able to convey this affect.

The nature of this link also means that the Adventurous Thief and Passive Man are almost entirely separate from each other. This makes it possible for Jacques to continue the ‘normal’ life of the Passive Man at the same time as his offending becomes more severe. This separation is demonstrated by the image of his relationship as one of quiet domesticity, and the seeming incongruity of it co-existing with an increase in his offending. This separation is also demonstrated by Jacques not making any explicit correlations between his offending and any other aspects of his narrative, nor linking the chronology of his relationship or work with that of his offending.

This characteristic of the link between these imagoes, and the separation it implies, has positive effects for both imagoes: it encourages passivity and stasis in the Passive Man, while encouraging further offending in the Adventurous Thief. Therefore where the Passive Man imago appears to react to the frustrating circumstances of Jacques relationship with passivity and lack of dynamism, the Adventurous Thief reacts in the opposite way: increased action.

iii) The evolution of the Adventurous Thief imago into the Searching Burglar imago³⁶

As established, Jacques appears to have felt the lack of emotional understanding, his emotional isolation, and an undefined desire to ‘search for more’, acutely at this period in his life. This had a notable affect on the Passive Man imago which in turn encouraged further offending in the Adventurous Thief. Jacques acknowledges this link in his observations that these factors were a motive for this offending at this time. This link is further strengthened by the observation that committing crime as a means to ‘search for something more’ reflects the initial motive of the Adventurous Thief to commit theft.

The offences related to the Adventurous Thief changed in number of ways in this period, which suggests that the imago itself had changed. These changes also mean

³⁶ See transcription references: 143, 144, 146, 147, 217, 237, 239, 265 – 268, 270 – 272.

the imago name ‘Adventurous Thief’ no longer adequately represent this characteristic mode of interpersonal transaction. As with the Lonely Boy and the Passive Man imago, the characteristics of the Adventurous Thief are adopted by this new imago. Jacques repeatedly emphasises continuity between his more and less serious offences, with the less serious (e.g. theft) being seen as part of the reason why the more serious offences (e.g. rape) occurred. This supports the suggestion that the imagoes that motivate them have a similar continuity.

This new imago retains the way in which the Adventurous Thief’s behaviours develop through a process of experimentation. The new imago, like the Adventurous Thief, is fundamentally self-interested, self-involved and indifferent to others: the burglaries are committed for personal gain, no thought is given to the victims, and the imago is motivated by his own desires (as opposed to, for example, being motivated by altruism or revenge). The new imago also retains the Adventurous Thief’s motivations for offending: material gain and “fun” / adventure. The latter is added to by the implication in Jacques’ descriptions that the burglaries encouraged by this new imago have an element of ‘thrill’ to them. This new imago thus retains the four features of a prototypical imago identified at the earlier stages: an origin myth, association with a person, and associated behaviours; and associated personality traits (McAdams, 1988)

The most obvious change is in the behaviours related to this new imago. Jacques is now committing burglaries, characterised by an opportunistic decision to exploit any premises left insecure. He said he would keep watch on the house before entering, enter without being sure whether anyone was there, quickly steal items and make his escape. He is not deterred by the presence of people and is stealing more items. Where previously Jacques appears to have been very nervous about capture, he is now less so: “at first you worry, but soon you don’t”. Previously furtive, Jacques has become more bold and confident. This is reflected in his tone when describing his actions. Similarly, and in notable contrast to the Passive Man, this new imago is established as impulsive, decisive and goal-oriented. The term ‘burglar’ captures this more adequately than the term ‘thief’.

This emerging ‘Burglar’ imago also incorporates developments in Jacques’ motivations for offending. In addition to the adventure and material gain which

motivated the Adventurous Thief, the emerging 'Burglar' demonstrates additional motives of sneakiness / secrecy, habit, and the search for experience. The last of these appears the most fundamental, hence the name 'Searching Burglar' for this new imago. It should however be acknowledged that this name cannot adequately represent all the changes in his imago at this time. An analysis of the context in which these three factors are mentioned in the transcriptions tends to suggest that they emerged concurrently and hence a relationship between them can be hypothesised. These three emerging themes will now be discussed in more detail.

Around this time, Jacques expresses an additional satisfaction in his offences being carried out sneakily, or in secret. This satisfaction suggests that the indifference towards others that the Adventurous Thief displayed in adolescence has become engrained in the Searching Burglar imago. It also implies that the separation between the Searching Burglar and the Passive Man imago is a source of satisfaction for Jacques. Thus the imago associated with offending is becoming increasingly separate from that which deals with all other aspects of this life.

As shown, in discussing his burglaries Jacques gives a clear sense that his offending was becoming a habit that he is increasingly less able to break free of. This suggests that what had begun in the "fun" and an adventure of the Adventurous Thief was, by the time the Searching Burglar emerged, increasingly a habit that he couldn't break free off. The Searching Burglar's offences appear to be a point when "fun" and "habit" motivate his offences in equal measure. Jacques links this strengthening habit to the desire for "experience" in adulthood.

The urge for experience that emerges at this stage appears to be related to the aimlessness and lack of emotional engagement of the Passive Man. This desire for experience is articulated in comments such as "[I] want to know what it feels like", "why not do this?" and "maybe a broke out because I wanted to experience." The Searching Burglar's desire for experience is represented as a development from the experimentation of adolescence. This search for experience suggests that the Searching Burglar had demonstrates a further feature of the prototypical imago: 'associated wishes, aspirations, goals' (McAdams, 1988).

The emergence of the Searching Burglar in Jacques' narrative demonstrates he was in the process of habitually committing increasingly serious offences. This habit was motivated by an increased desire for experience, his enjoyment of the sneakiness of burglary, and the emotional isolation of the Passive Man. Jacques comments that this habit would "maybe" have lead to his committing more serious offences and gives the example of bank robbery. However, he went on to commit rape.

While Jacques does not overtly state that he will now rape women, this choice of offence can be explained with reference to the Adventurous Thief and Searching Burglar imagoes. Jacques makes explicit linkages between the handbag thefts of the Adventurous Thief and the rapes he would go onto to commit, commenting that his targeting of handbags "maybe" lead to his targeting women in later offences. He mentions these linkages alongside comments that the "habit" of offending became hard to break free of. Both these factors allow an implicit connection to be made between the emergence of the Searching Burglar, Jacques' desire for experience, and the increasing desire to commit rape. Therefore when Jacques first tries to rape a woman he encounters during one of his burglaries, his actions are consistent with motives and developmental path of the Searching Burglar imago.

This attempted rape also demonstrates the limits of the influence of the Searching Burglar. Jacques' attempted rape lacks the calm confidence associated with his burglaries. The imago does not appear to have evolved sufficiently to offer him the template for behaviour it provides elsewhere, or the mode of interpersonal transaction needed to justify the progression to more explicit and serious exploitation of others.

5.2.3.4 The first incident

Jacques' refers to all the murders he committed and was convicted of as "incidents", and numbers them sequentially. The first incident occurred in 1989, approximately a year after Jacques' states that he attempted rape. He was still living at his parents' address and, as he said, the first incident "just happened". The victim was a twenty one year old black woman, Thomasina Selepeng, who was working as domestic helper in the house behind Jacques' parental home. Characteristically, Jacques does not refer to his victim by name. He does not comment of her race, or describe her, beyond a single reference to her attractiveness. This incident was precipitated by Jacques wanting to enter the house behind to steal money. Thomasina was living in an outside room, presumably the servant's quarters.

BH: [With the first murder] What happened there?

JE: She came to ask for work. Then I saw she looks good. Then I, saw her the next day, I saw the woman whose house it was going to the shops, I didn't realise she [Thomasina] would still be in the house....I was going in to house to look for money. I saw the door was open to the outside room and it was near the house's back door. It was just alongside my parent's house, over the wall. She was still sleeping, but the door was open... it was early morning. I decided that I was going to have sex with her. Then I go into the room. Then she wakes up. Then she screams and I grab her by the throat, to get her to be quiet. Then I yank the blankets off, the night clothes off... She had on a nightie and sleeping shorts. But didn't have panties on under her sleeping shorts...I then hit her on the stomach to get her calm [*rustig*]. She kept fighting, you understand , and we fell off the bed, struggling. [Pause] Ok, then she passed out, or something...I heard in court about the smothering from the fire, that the nightdress and the clothes fell on her face and they were on fire, and that caused her

smothering. She then passed out... Now I was exhausted from the struggling. So I wasn't keen [*lus*] to rape her...I didn't want to do the act. There were some newspapers on the table and I set them on fire... then I set the place on fire and walked out. The fire spread from the table to the bedclothes, and then on to the night clothes or dress, I don't know which it was, that fell on her face...then I left....

BH: Why did you set fire to the table?

JE: I don't know, it's just what I thought up, I just decided to do it.

A neighbour, seeing the fire, called the police who found Thomasina's body. Jacques claims that he had never set fires before this event, and remained unable to say why he had done so here. Similarly, Jacques later commented that this was the only offence where he broke a window to get into a premises (although it is not clear when he broke windows during this incident). He is not clear about what actions he performed, or about how Thomasina was killed. Jacques says she "passed out or something" during his strangling and hitting her, and asserts she was smothered in the fire. This is contradicted by police documents, which state she was strangled. The documents add that Jacques used a brick, along with his fists, to hit her in the stomach and neck. While these discrepancies do not appear sufficient to cast doubt on his entire description, it clearly demonstrates how his narration of this incident is jumbled and unclear. This is uncharacteristic of Jacques, who normally describes his actions with great precision.

Jacques later says that his decision to rape Thomasina was taken impulsively: "The first one just happened, the reaction to do it was there. I don't get there to rape a woman. I went there to try get in the house for money. Then I saw there was a woman, then reacted..." He says it "just happened" and he did it as a "reaction". He says that the decision to offend was not taken to "get at" women, but rather because he wanted to get money. He continues that it was only when he got into the premises and saw a woman there, that the on the spot decision to "take it further" was made.

The confused impulsiveness of this offence is mirrored in the lack of clarity in Jacques' description of his post-offence behaviour.

BH: How did you feel after the first incident?

JE: [Pause, sighs] As I said, I hadn't known whether she was alive or dead. I was worried. It was the first time I did something like that. So I was very worried; I didn't know, OK, would she say it was me and so on; until I saw that no one was coming. Then I saw...that you'd strangled, killed her, or whatever. Raped, or whatever...So then I saw they weren't looking for me, then I knew I didn't have to run away.

In apparent contradiction to his earlier claim that that his decision to rape was impulsive Jacques had said before this incident that his theft from handbags and his rapes were part of the same continuum of offending. This is shown by his reply when asked whether he thought about rape prior to the murder of Thomasina: "It's from when you take money out the handbags." His reply to whether he had decided to rape women prior to this incident is more however ambiguous:

Ja [many pauses, stutters] I, I thought I would try to rape a woman...if I saw her there, and she looked nice. But it wasn't like I saw a window open and decided to go in. But I didn't do it again until the first incident.

This answer does not make it clear whether he is referring to his previous failed attempt at rape, or this incident. The below exchange is similarly ambiguous: "BH: With the first one, was it just a spur of the moment decision? JE: Ja, at that moment, you decided you're going to do it" with it not being clear whether the 'spur of the moment' decision relates to Jacques' decision to commit a burglary (where he is typically impulsive and opportunistic) or his decision to commit rape.

Notwithstanding the above, Jacques is clear on how this offence affected his future offences. He later comments, in a quieter voice and amidst pauses, that prior to this incident:

JE: I never thought about rape...Maybe after the first incident, I did begin to think about rape.

BH: After the first one?

JE: Ja...

BH: Did you think, before, about raping woman?

JE: Ja, with the first incident, when I tried it, ja.

The murder of Thomasina appears to have led to him thinking more about committing rape in future incidents.

a) Imago analysis: the first incident

The tone and mode of expression in Jacques' narration of this event mirrors that in the attempted rape he committed about a year previously. Similarly, the actions in both are described in vague and confused terms, unlike Jacques' usual detailed descriptions of behaviour.

i) Maintenance and limitations of the Searching Burglar³⁷

The previous imago analysis section highlighted the implicit connection between the emergence of the Searching Burglar, Jacques' desire for experience, and the increasing desire to commit rape. Thus as with his previous attempted rape, his actions in this incident are consistent with the Searching Burglar imago. Jacques' statement that his decision to attack Thomasina was taken impulsively further supports the links between this offence and the opportunistic daring of the Searching Burglar imago's previous offences.

³⁷ See transcription references: 146, 147, 154 – 158, 175, 187, 220, 222.

This incident also re-iterates the limitations of the Searching Burglar imago. The mode of interpersonal transaction it represents is not able to adequately justify, or offer the behavioural template for, Jacques' committing rape. This is demonstrated by the chaotic nature of his actions, as well as in the confused and unclear narrative he gives of this offence. This is in marked contrast to the cool-headed and confident offences committed by the Searching Burglar in the offences of his adulthood.

These factors suggest that this incident does not represent a significant change in the Searching Burglar imago. Rather, the Searching Burglar persists in this incident, with the behaviours committed during it consistent with the Searching Burglar's established *modus operandi* (MO). The differences between the Searching Burglar imago's MO and noted in this offence can be explained by the lack of the appropriate behavioural justifications in the Searching Burglar imago. Therefore this incident does not demonstrate a significant evolution in the Searching Burglar imago. Rather, it reiterates patterns noted in the previous imago interpretation section, and represents a continuation of them.

Jacques acknowledges that his initial reason for entering the premises where he found Thomasina Selepeng was to find money. Beyond this, Jacques does not explicitly mention the established motivations for the Searching Burglar in this offence. These motivations are adventure, sneakiness, habit, and the search for experience. Based on the similarity to his previous offences, an assumption can be made that these motivations persists.

It is perhaps more notable that in his narrative of this offence there are neither implicit or explicit references to any events that evoke the sense of emotional isolation, lack of emotional understanding, or the desire to 'search for more' that had previously affected the Passive Man, and so assisted in motivating the Searching Burglar's offences. This could indicate that these sensations have become so incorporated into Jacques' imagoes that there is no longer any need for a specific event to occur to evoke them. Another explanation is that since this offence represents a continuation, rather than change, in the Searching Burglar imago there is no need for there to be a specific event to evoke this change in behaviour from burglary and attempted rape to

murder. This is consistent with the observation that this murder appears to have been the unintended consequence of a burglary and attempted rape gone wrong.

Finally this offence re-iterates the established pattern that the behaviours of those imagoes associated with offending develop through a process of risk-taking adventure and experimentation. That is, Jacques' decision to try rape Thomasina Selepeng represents a behavioural experiment (as did his development from theft to burglary) which encourages further development in his offending. This is supported by Jacques' comments that after this offence he began to think about committing rapes more. The 'experiment' of this murder thus lead to Jacques' explicitly acknowledging that he would like to commit rapes, where previously this was implied.

5.2.3.5 The second incident

Almost two years passed before Jacques committed the second major offence he was convicted of, a rape. In the interim, as Jacques says, he "went back to stealing money". As his offending remained unchanged over the next few years, so his relationship with his fiancé proceeded largely without incident. Jacques comments that he had had a few disagreements with his fiancé's father. While Jacques is vague on the details, these appear mainly to be concerned with her father being a "perfectionist...everything must be done just so." His prospective father-in-law put pressure on Jacques to gain promotion and get a flat before he would permit Jacques and his daughter to be married. These minor conflicts came to a head one night when Jacques failed to have his fiancé back at her parent's house by 10 o'clock, and her father phoned Jacques and "shouted... I didn't get angry with him. I wasn't keen for... scolding [*skellery*] that night...so I just put the phone down... A father has to be like that, but I wasn't keen for his scolding so I said 'just forget it, leave everything...goodbye'." This incident appears to have contributed to Jacques' wedding to his fiancé being postponed, and their relationship was only saved when Jacques arranged for his church pastor to intervene with his fiancé's father on his behalf. This occurred in October 1991, shortly before the second incident in November.

Jacques explicitly plays down any links between his postponed wedding and the incident.

BH: [Referring to Jacques' offences] Do you think things wouldn't have turned out differently if you had been married?

JE: No, I don't believe I would have stopped. I would have gone on.

BH: Do you ever wonder if it would have made a difference?

JE: No, it wouldn't have made a difference...

Perhaps more pertinently, Jacques was moved from the work he enjoyed at the airport, to the Riot Squad [*Onruseenheid*]. This move had been on the cards since the Railways Police amalgamated with the South African Police Service in 1986, but Jacques had been allowed to continue with his duties at the airport largely undisturbed up until now. In contrast to his employment at the airport he found the work there boring and repetitive: "you always worked in the same place and did the same things". The Squad he was posted to would have been tasked with policing the township during a time when they were in violent turmoil. Jacques comments, in an indifferent, bored tone that "people shot at us, threw stones and petrol bombs" and that at times, he "had to shoot" but he never shot anyone while in the Riot Squad. The violence did not disturb Jacques, and did nothing to alleviate the boredom he felt at the repetitiveness work. Jacques judges that this boredom meant the quality of his work at the Riot Squad was not so good, although he says he was never "called into office to say 'you did this wrong'."

As part of his move to the Riot Squad, Jacques took up accommodation in a large police barracks situated in a residential suburb of Pretoria. As when he was at boarding school, Jacques does not report having any problem fitting in, or finding friends. Jacques quickly lost touch with friends he made at training college or previous postings, saying "you just get other friends. I'm not the sort of person who says, he's my friend, I'll go with him, or stay in touch. If he goes, he goes. It doesn't bother me". His spare time at the barracks was spent visiting friends, watching videos, collecting stamped first-issue envelopes, and sometimes playing video games in the

local café, as he did when young. Jacques says he spent most of his time on his own, and did not appear to find anything unusual or unpleasant with this.

Jacques' move into the Riot Squad and the barracks meant that he was given his own service firearm. This firearm encouraged Jacques' offending. Jacques says that, when he was at the barracks, he began to go out at night "maybe to have sex".

BH: At what stage did you know, if I find a woman I'll rape her?

JE: Ummm, [pause] after the first case, but, when I got the weapon it gave me the strength to do this thing. If I get a woman, I'll rape her... when I could took the pistol home...that gave me strength, to do things. To stand there and say 'I'm here to rape you'. I wouldn't do it without the weapon.

BH: Because you didn't have the power?

JE: Yes, you can say that [tone drops]... because you have power over someone if you have a weapon.

BH: What made you decide, when you had the weapon, that you must rape and not, for example, steal more?

JE: Like you said, because I had the power, and the weapon was my strength. I never stole much, only a little bit, so I can always go back and get more cash... now I knew if I get someone, I can...

BH: Did you decide to rape people because you had a gun?

JE: Yes.

BH: There were no other reasons, like pressure at work, or problems with the relationship?

JE: No, I didn't do it because there were problems with the relationship.

BH: You more did it because you could do it.

JE: Ja.

BH: It was almost as if it wasn't part of your normal life.

JE: Ja ja [strong agreement]... you could say I was two people, one was violent and the other was soft natured, or whatever... that's how it was for me, but it's not like there is another person in me and says 'aaarg, I'm now a werewolf and kill go and commit murders' [pulls face, mutual laughter]. I'm the same person, I just have two sides, one good side and one bad side that no one knows about apart from me...

BH: And the one is normally separate from the other.

JE: Ja... it didn't feel like it wasn't me doing it... it was the same life, it was just a side of me that stood to one side when I decided to go out...

Jacques comments that it was this separation within his self that allowed him to go on normally the days after an offence. Commenting later on how his getting a weapon led to his committing rape, Jacques summarises: "The first time was just a reaction... the second one I got feelings, I had the firearm, now, I can go and do it."

It was as part of his going out at night, "maybe to have sex", that Jacques came to commit his first rape. The rape was preceded by a Jacques committing series of burglaries on the same flat, which was located very close to the police barracks:

Then I went out, and then went into the flat. I saw there were keys there, for a car. So I took the keys, then went downstairs. I see it's BMW keys. Then I see there're two or three BMWs there. I use the keys, and then I find the right BMW. Then I ride around a for a little bit in the BMW, then ride it back and park it in the police parking... next to the station... I think it was a week after that, it rained. I can't say precisely how much, but I can say it was rainy... I took the car and parked it in the parking place I got it from and I went and threw the keys away... I don't know how many

days after that, I went again to the same flat. Again there wasn't anyone there. OK, then I saw there was a one of those CDs, those Walkman you can play CDs with, and I took two or three CDs just to take them. I don't know why I took them, [maybe] it's just because I liked them... A few days after that, I then went later in the night. [Before] I had always gone about eight o'clock, now I was going at one o'clock, I think... And [pause, thinking] I had by then already seen that there are men and women's clothes. I saw photos, but that's not what attracted me. It was always fun to go there, and the windows were always easy...

BH: It was easy to get in.

JE: Ja.

Jacques says that after he broke in for the first time, he felt that he hadn't "looked around" enough, decided to go back later "to see if there was money, but there wasn't, so I took the CD". While stealing the CD's Jacques says he saw photographs of a woman in the house and decided to come back later and see if she was there. "I had already decided. If she's alone, then I would rape her." Jacques repeats twice that this was how he made the decision to return there to commit rape.

Reflecting on the process that lead him to this point, Jacques re-iterates that the 'sneakiness' was part of his enjoyment in offending, commenting that he didn't burgle every night but would rather wait "evening, or a month, or two weeks, or so on and then you go out. I am ready to be sneaky again..." He again emphasises that without the gun he would not have committed rape. He claims that before he had the gun he would have run away if someone screamed, but now he could go through a window when it was open and when he knew a woman was present. In a faster, more excited tone than usual, Jacques expands on this:

JE: Then you stay in the area, because you know there's an opportunity there, you had seen it, and you [can] go into that house. You haven't yet

decided to rape her, but then you see she's there. Then on the spur of the moment you decide 'why don't I do it?' and you decided 'yes'. And now you have the weapon, and now you can prevent her from screaming, and if she sees you, you can kill her. I didn't sit and think 'if that happens, I'll do this, or whatever. When it began, then I decided 'now do this'.

BH: You didn't think about it lots or plan it, it was just...

JE: [interjects] Ja. Later you plan it, think, I'm going out...

BH: [interjects] To find a woman...

JE: To rape, or whatever.

The last time he returned to the flat, it was to commit rape. As on the first occasion, he got in through the front entrance (on the second occasion he climbed the drainpipes outside). He said he never had to break a window to get in, as they were always open.

That evening I decided OK, now I'm going to see if there will be a woman there alone, then I will have sex with her...I didn't decide to go there again [in advance], I just decided I would go back...on that night, to go to the flat. So I get there, then I saw a woman, I saw a person lying on the bed, I didn't know if it was woman or a man, understand. Then I heard this person moan...[when] I heard that sound, I hear it is a woman. Then, when I went closer in, the woman woke up and she saw me. And then I showed her the pistol, the weapon. Then she says 'Don't shoot, put the weapon down'. She said she saw the red light on the pistol... [referring to a luminous dot on the sights]... I don't know how she saw it. She said 'put down the weapon', so I put down the weapon, then I pulled off the duvet. She was then just in her panties, then I yanked the panties off. Then she put her hands over her breasts, and I climb on. But she kept her legs

closed. Well that didn't really bother me I then penetrated and then came. My watch bothered me, and so I left it on the bed under the pillow and I forgot about it. I got dressed, and I went out. I took the telephone, and placed it in the corridor... I don't want her to phone until I had time to get out of there....

BH: Did you say anything to her?

JE: Ja, during it she asked whether I wanted a smoke, or a drink, or a talk. I said no, no, and no. Then she also asked why I took her car, what had I done with her car. I told her I took it for a joyride, and that's it...

BH: How did you feel during this? Good, or bad?

JE: [pause, small bemused laugh] I don't know whether I felt good or bad. What I can say [pause] I didn't want to do the act with her, to have sex with her, because I was horny or whatever...I had seen her photo, but that didn't encourage me to her, to rape her...it was just that I wanted it.

BH: I see what you're saying, it had nothing to do with her.

JE: Ja, didn't matter if she was pretty or whatever...[inaudible] I did see her, she looked good. I can surely say, pretty. But it was just to do that sex act, I don't feel it was lust, because I was attracted to her or she was pretty or whatever. It was just because I wanted to have sex, you understand...

BH: Did you feel horny at the time?

JE: No [pause] I didn't. I could start in the beginning. You could have sex, but it wasn't horniness. It was just, you're looking for something in the sexual act. I don't know. I don't understand it myself... In the beginning, you come on the scene [many pauses, searching for words] and you think 'I must have sex with her'. It's not about horniness. It's about just getting

sex but it's not horniness, it's about the deed that you have decided to do.

The outcome is that you had sex, but it's not the same thing.

BH: It's just a deed.

JE: Ja.

The victim, a white woman in her mid-30's, Sylvia Claasen, concurs with Jacques' report that he disconnected the telephone. However she also reports that Jacques had taken his clothes off before she awoke. She asked that he put the gun down as he did not seem a violent person, and he allegedly responding by shaking her. Sylvia then asked why he had done it, to which Jacques replied 'for fun' and when she asked if he was scared, Jacques responded that he didn't care. Before he left, Jacques allegedly pointed the gun at her and told her to pull duvet over head. Overall, however, there are strong similarities between police reports and Jacques' own narrative of events.

In contrast to his description of the attempted rape and the murder he had already committed, Jacques narrates this offence in precise, clear, terms. This gives the impression of an offence committed in calm and detached manner. The fact that he visited the location at least twice in advance, and returned that night with the express purpose of 'seeing if there's a woman there to have sex with' may have contributed to this calm. As in the first murder he committed, Jacques does not comment on the age or race of the victim, and comments on her physical appearance only in broad terms.

a) Imago analysis: the second incident

The second incident saw notable developments in Jacques' narrative. These changes mainly affected those imagoes associated with his offending.

i) Continuation of Passive Man³⁸

The Passive Man remains a consistent influence in Jacques narrative. As before, the Passive Man continues to be the mode of interpersonal transaction used by Jacques to negotiate his relationships with his fiancé, her parents, and with his employers. The

³⁸ See transcription references: 139, 149, 229, 230, 254, 292.

Passive Man remains indifferent to maintaining friendships and lacking in ambition and dynamism. Jacques appears to handle threats of change in his situation by utilising the tactics previously used by the Passive Man. This is shown by his reaction to his fiancé's father, where he reacts as he did to the Controlling Mother imago: he rejects them and keeps his distance. This means that others do not appear to significantly influence his behaviour, or his dominant imagoes of self. From this point on the Passive Man does not evolve significantly in the narrative: it maintains stasis while the imagoes associated with offending evolve further. This maintenance of stasis in the Passive Man thus benefits the Searching Burglar. As in the relationship between the Lonely Boy and Adventurous Thief, the Passive Man's maintaining of emotional isolation and distance allows the Searching Burglar's offences to continue.

ii) Interaction and separation between the Passive Man and Searching Burglar imagoes³⁹

Two events occur in his period that could be hypothesised to influence the Searching Burglar's offences: Jacques is transferred from a job he enjoys to a role in the Riot Squad that he finds "boring", and immediately before the second incident he comes into direct conflict with his father-in-law. Jacques insists that there is no connection between the conflict with his father-in-law and his offences. This is supported by the fact that this conflict does not appear to have evoked the sense of emotional isolation that previously encouraged his offending, being adequately handled by the Passive Man's tactics.

However the boredom of his job may have encouraged Jacques' offending. That is, his being trapped in a boring job means that the Searching Burglar's desire for experience would be particularly unfulfilled. The Passive Man would lack the dynamism to fulfil this desire in any other way, and thus the Searching Burglar imago's offences were the only means to this fulfilment. The fact that it is this thwarted desire for experience, rather than loneliness, which may have had an influence on his offending suggests that the Searching Burglar was becoming more dominant than the Passive Man in creating Jacques narrative.

³⁹ See transcription references: 138, 139, 252 – 255, 292.

This hypothesis is partly supported by the nature of the link between the Passive Man and Searching Burglar, which only reacts to stimuli that have previously encouraged offending (although previously this stimulus appeared to be emotional isolation, rather than a thwarted desire for experience). On the other hand this hypothesis is mitigated against by the role played by Jacques' gaining access to a firearm. Although there is insufficient evidence to either support or refute associations between the events affecting the Passive Man and this offence, they suggest that by this stage the Passive Man and the Searching Burglar were almost entirely separate from each other. This is supported by Jacques' insistence that there were no links between his relationships and his offence, his agreeing that his offences were 'almost not part of his normal life', and by his comments to the effect of "I was two people, one was violent and the other was soft natured, or whatever... I'm the same person, I just have two sides, one good side and one bad side that no one knows about apart from me..."

iii) The transition from the Searching Burglar to the Habitual Rapist⁴⁰

This incident marks a point of transition in the imago that supports Jacques' offending. It has been established that, from this point on, the imagoes that support Jacques' offending become the focus for change in his narrative. In so doing they become increasingly dominant. The 'experiment' of his first murder lead to Jacques' explicitly acknowledging that he would like to commit rapes, where previously this was implied. For two years he did not act on this urge, instead reverting to the behaviours that have been established as part of the Searching Burglar's characteristic modes of interaction.

This changed when he had access to a firearm. This external influence provides the Searching Burglar with the means to undertake the interpersonal transactions needed to act on its desire for rape. The clarity and precision of Jacques' narrative of this offence provides further evidence that he can utilise the modes of interpersonal transaction necessary for him to carry out this offence. This is in contrast to the first incident, where a lack of this support was reflected in a confused narrative.

⁴⁰ See transcription references: 146, 147, 159 – 167, 176 – 187, 189, 191, 202, 204, 219 – 221, 240, 241.

Jacques describes the firearm's role in terms of the "strength" it gave him. This is the latest example of the role played by external influences in the development of Jacques' imagoes, previous examples include his sickness as a child and the relationship with his fiancé as an adult. In the first two cases these influences appear related to Jacques' unmet emotional needs. However in this case the firearm meets an instrumental need, that is, it provides the means for Jacques to commit his offences. This difference supports the implication above that the Searching Burglar imago already had a desire to commit rape after the murder of Thomasina Selepeng, and all that was needed for the 'Burglar' to become a 'Rapist' was the impetus provided by a necessary instrument.

This offence thus marks the emergence of the Habitual Rapist. As in the previous transition from the Adventurous Thief to the Searching Burglar, this emergence does not mean all the characteristics of the imago change. Rather, the Habitual Rapist adopts the Searching Burglar's motivations and characteristics. The firearm allows the Habitual Rapist to commit rape with the calmness previously associated with the Searching Burglar's offences. The emergent Habitual Rapist retains the Searching Burglar's interest in material gain, the enjoyment of "sneakiness", as well as the association between the offences and "fun" (as shown by his comment to Sylvia Claasen that he does this "for fun"). The Habitual Rapist also appears to have learnt from the Searching Burglar's experience in the first incident: Jacques is careful not to break a window or commit a rape impulsively, rather making a number of visits to the premises before he commits rape. This also demonstrates that the imagoes associated with offending continue to develop through a process of experimentation

The emergence of the Habitual Rapist does appear to put more emphasis on two of the Searching Burglar's characteristics. The first of these is indifference towards others: the act of rape requiring a greater level of indifference to others than burglary. This increased indifference is demonstrated in Jacques' attitude towards Sylvia Claasen: he is not concerned by her reactions to him, does not describe her in detail, and does not desire extended interpersonal interaction with her. She is, to the Habitual Rapist, an object to be taken advantage of in his offending. The second of these characteristics refers to the Searching Burglar being motivated by its desire for the experience of

rape. The search for experience that motivated Jacques' previous offences is particularly noticeable here, as implied in Jacques' repeated emphasises that it was not sexual arousal that motivated his rapes, but rather "it was just to do that sex act... you're looking for something in the sexual act... it's about the deed that you have decided to do." This is not a new motive, just an increased emphasis on a pre-existing one. This above supports the previous suggestion that the transition from Searching Burglar to Habitual Rapist imagoes represents a shift in emphases on a continuum, rather than a complete change in character.

5.2.3.6 The third incident

Jacques summarises the evolution of his offending up to this point:

BH: With the first one [incident], was it just a spur of the moment decision?

JE: Ja, at that moment... just decide, 'now I'm going in'... In the beginning [it was like that] but later you [I] would think 'that window's going to be open, I'll go in later'

BH: For example, in the second incident.

JE: Ja. I would see there's a woman, with the windows open. I would then come back later and see if the windows are open.

BH: And if the windows are open, you go in?

JE: Ja...

BH: Did you walk around the streets to...?

JE: Ja, I climbed over walls, and walked around a bit in the area...maybe I had nothing to do, so then I walk.

Thus from the second incident onwards the pattern of either breaking in first, or at least reconnoitring the location, before returning to commit rape was established. This echoes Jacques' earlier statements that the 'sneaking around' motivated his offences.

Jacques shies away from stating that he returned to a location for the express purpose of rape, preferring to state that he would “maybe” go back after he broke in somewhere to see if there were women there. Jacques does admit that if he found a woman there when he returned, he would rape her. Jacques does not say how many places he broke into where he did not find a woman there to return to.

Notwithstanding this, exactly twenty days after the second incident, Jacques again committed rape. This was the second charge of rape he was eventually convicted of. The home address of the victim, 62 year old white female Jane Ferreira, was close to the location of the previous offences and, according to Jacques, about 50 metres from the police barracks. Jacques was exploring the houses one row back from the barracks, and saw “the windows are open, I'm going in.”

OK, so I went into this flat, and then I was in the bedroom and can see no-one's there, then I saw a light on in the sitting room, kitchen area. I look through the door and see there's a woman there... But I didn't see her face. I see there's a handbag, so I opened the handbag and saw there R20 or something, I'm not sure. I took it, and then I left.

Jacques says that although there was more money there, he didn't take it. He says that he did not take more money because if he did then people would realise they had been robbed and take precautions, this meaning he could not return later to get more money. Jacques says he learnt this tactic stole from handbags as a child, and links the theft directly to his committing rape: “Because I stole money from women, maybe I had to ... now I must have sex with a women”

Jacques returned later that night. This seems to have been the time of greatest excitement for Jacques: “you just decide to go out, then when you are there [just outside the dwelling] then you get excited... you don't really know what's going to happen before you go into a place.” In narrating this offence, Jacques’ speaks faster, his delivery growing in confidence and becoming livelier:

Then I decided I will come back later, at midnight. But I didn't know how many people are there, I just saw the woman, I hadn't seen her face, you understand. Then I went back midnight, one, two, I don't know precisely. I went in, then she woke up and she screamed. The light was off. Then I grab her tightly and give her a little tap on the head. She got a fright and kept quiet. I pulled the duvet off, and pulled her clothes off, and then see that she's an old woman... I didn't rip clothes off, I undressed her. OK, then I just came to the point and asked 'do you have AIDS?' because she looked skinny to me...and she said she doesn't sleep around. Then I climbed on and she wanted to grab something, and I took her hand away, and saw there was a panic button there...Then I had sex with her [more pauses] I lost my erection, it went limp...maybe because she was old and didn't excite me but when you do the act you get excited... Then she took my penis and placed it in her vagina, then I got stiff and I penetrated and had sex with her. Then I was finished, I pulled my clothes on and left...I didn't talk much to her... she was 62 and was not pretty, so it was just the sex... It was just about having sex...

Jacques tends to refer to this victim in more derogatory terms, such as “the granny”. Police reports confirm Jacques accounts of behaviour at the scene, with the exception of mentioning that he kissed Jane Ferreira in the course of rape and, when leaving, threw a blanket over her head and bade her “good night”.

Jacques admits that he did not speak in Afrikaans to his victims, because “maybe” he did not want people to know he was Afrikaans speaking. He says he is “not sure” when he decided to do this, but says he began speaking in English at the first rape and continued.

By now, Jacques' offences were causing panic in the largely middle class suburban area around the barracks, drawing a strong police response:

JE: After the... third incident... they put policemen on the roof. OK, I heard it, but it didn't bother me, that there was a policeman on the roof...I knew they were looking for me... And when I went back to the barracks, if someone spoke about it, I didn't talk, I just listened... I just listened...I wasn't worried...maybe, already, I hoped they would catch me.

BH: Did you feel worried, or very excited?

JE: Ummm, no, I didn't...ja, you can say I was still worried, I knew that they would catch me some time.

BH: You already knew this?

JE: Yes, I knew this. I knew I wouldn't always be able to get away with it. It was definitely a solution that they must catch me. That's why I didn't wear gloves, I didn't wipe out fingerprints or many marks. I still had the [inaudible] in my room... I knew they would catch me, but I didn't decide... I couldn't stop myself...I didn't get advice or talk to anyone. At that stage I didn't know I couldn't stop, but later I realised that I would never have stopped...

BH: Did you hope they would catch you?

JE: I knew that some time or another they would catch me, but, I didn't think about it to much. It didn't bother me incessantly. I knew they would catch me some time or another but I wanted them to catch me, I didn't want to give myself up.

On the contrary rather than giving himself up Jacques would, in the months to come, sometimes go out with the policeman tasked with catching him: “now I'm sitting there and waiting for this murderer, which is half-funny. But I didn't go out to find myself, or say ‘it’s him, I saw him’.” Thus the police hunt for him became a further source of amusement and even ‘thrill’ to Jacques.

Reflecting on his offences up to this point, Jacques finds:

The first time was just a reaction... the second one I got feelings, I had the firearm, now, I can go and do it. After that, I wanted to do it again, I couldn’t control myself, the feeling to do it again. Then I couldn’t stop myself.

Therefore after the second incident Jacques is insisting he had lost control over his desire to commit rape. As the exchange below demonstrates, by the time of this incident the desire for experience appears to have become a primary motive for Jacques.

BH: Did you enjoy yourself?

JE: [much stammering] The stealing from the handbags was fun, I can say that. I know they say that if you don't enjoy something you won't do it again...

BH: Why did you do it many times [rape] if you didn't enjoy it? What are your reasons?

JE: Like I said, I felt like I was in cycle and couldn’t get out, that’s why I did it again. Like I enjoyed stealing handbags, you feel you want to do it again, maybe it was nice I couldn’t say why it was nice. The excitement brought me to doing it. The sneaking around... to rape, to rape maybe to experiment, to find out how it feels to rape or ejaculate inside a woman...

BH: The rapes were for the experiment, for the experience?

JE: Ja, maybe I sought something in the rapes.

BH: What did you search for?

JE: I don't know... [you're] searching for something, but [you] don't get it....

BH: You didn't know what it was, but you were looking for something?

JE: Ja...I'm searching for something and I don't know what it is, so I go on and on. That's what I think... I don't know what you're searching, you just do it....

BH: What were you searching for in all these crimes?

JE: Like I said, I was searching something, but didn't know what it was I was searching for. Maybe to experience things. I don't know if it was like really like that, what I was searching for. I wasn't certain it was this. It was completely confused...I didn't think precisely what it was what I was I was searching for: was it sex? Was it just the act I was doing? But I know it wasn't lust, or because I hate women, it wasn't taking my frustrations out on woman. I just enjoyed the stealing and the sneaking around, and I couldn't tear myself free of it...

He said he didn't think about whether he enjoyed it, but did it because it was fun. Jacques insists he didn't realise at the time that this was what he was feeling, again making the links between his offences and his emotional isolation and lack of emotional knowledge.

BH:...[So] the offences happened because you didn't know what was going on in your head.

JE: Ja, I didn't understand myself and I also didn't want to talk with other people about personal things. ... I didn't have a feeling, [pause] I never had reason to worry what they were feeling. I know now they say it's like a second death being raped. A part of a woman dies, if she's raped. I have perceived this now. I didn't worry about this at the time, what the woman was going through, it was all about myself, to enjoying myself, don't worry about that person.

He says that the offence occurred “because I struggled with emotions, I felt dead.” Jacques later comments that he did these things thinking he would be caught, and not realising at the time that he could not stop. He reflects that it “hadn't really sunk in” that, just as he could not stop stealing cash from handbags, he couldn't stop committing rape. He says he “acted mad” in committing the rapes, had got a lot of adrenaline while committing his offences, and was most excited by the ability to “sneak around and do. It bothered me that they would catch me, but not so much that I would stop.”

a) Imago analysis: the third incident

The behavioural patterns encouraged by the various imagoes associated with his offending (the Adventurous Thief, Searching Burglar, and Habitual Rapist) are all expressed in this offence. For example, as previously seen in offences associated with the Habitual Rapist imago Jacques uses the firearm as the primary means of controlling his victim and ensuring their compliance, whether it be striking them with it or pointing it at them. Similarly, Jacques is again calm post-offence, as could be expected from the Searching Burglar. Furthermore, the pattern of breaking in to a location to commit theft, before returning later to rape, echoes the offence pattern of the hand bag thefts that provided the origin myth for the Adventurous Thief. This behavioural continuity in the influence of his imagoes supports the claims made in Jacques's narrative that all his offences are part of the same process.

This incident sees the continuation of the imago development highlighted in the previous incident. The third incident is thus not marked by major change in the imago associated with his offending, rather representing a consolidation of the patterns already noted.

i) The search for experience becomes engrained in the Habitual Rapist⁴¹

What Jacques had previously characterised as a search for an undefined “something” is now confirmed in this incident as specifically being a search for “experience”. This desire for experience seems particularly to refer to experiences associated with sexual acts, which Jacques has established that he is unable to experience with his fiancé (e.g. knowing what it feels like to ejaculate inside a woman). Thus the linkages already made between his desire for experience and the decision to commit rape persist as his narrative progresses beyond the Searching Burglar imago. As shown in the above excerpts, the search for experience becomes the most dominant motive. While motives such as ‘sneakiness’ and material benefit remain, they are less notable.

ii) Characteristics of the Habitual Rapist confirmed, Habitual Rapist becoming dominant imago⁴²

This incident confirms the characteristics of the Habitual Rapist. Most of these characteristics – specifically those relating to the method of his offending – remain unchanged. This incident emphasises that Jacques’ sense of emotional isolation and his inability to understand emotions are strongly represented in the Habitual Rapist imago. This incident also confirms that Jacques was beginning to be ‘trapped’ in the habit of rape. Jacques’ repeated insurances that he was now in the grip of a habit he eventually would not be able to break free of confirms that by the time of this episode the Habitual Rapist was becoming more dominant than the Passive Man in Jacques’ narrative.

Jacques’ re-iteration of his helplessness serves the dual purpose of emphasising the emerging dominance of the Habitual Rapist and attendant search for experience in his

⁴¹ See transcription references: 165 – 168.

⁴² See transcription references: 146, 147, 176 – 178, 180 – 187, 191, 202 – 204, 270 – 272.

narrative, while absolving Jacques (or the Passive Man imago) of any responsibility for preventing these offences. This also confirms that by this stage Jacques realised the implications of the Habitual Rapist for his narrative. Specifically, based on his statement that after the second incident he would be willing to kill his victims, Jacques appears aware that this combination of emotional isolation, desire for experience, and inability to control the Habitual Rapist would result in murder.

Perhaps as a result of being caught in the habit of offending, the Habitual Rapist imago also appears to be increasingly confident. This confidence is congruent with the calm offending of the Searching Burglar, but here appears to become almost arrogant and dismissive of his victims. This is confirmed by Jacques' tone and the terms he uses to describe the victim. It further emphasises the role played by thrill in his offences, as well as his perceptions of the victims as objects for gaining experience from.

5.2.3.7 The fourth incident

Jacques was now in the grip of his offending. In this incident Jacques committed the second murder, and third rape, he was convicted of. The location of the fourth incident was a house that Jacques had reconnoitred extensively. He says it was the only one he watched "for a long time" in advance: "I was there four or five times before...[I saw the house] from behind, from in front... there were a few people who lived there, men also lived there." After giving a detailed and precise recollection of the layout, Jacques comments that he "first looked to get money, but I never got money there..." and saying that he had initially planned to rape another woman in that house.

OK there was an opportunity that I could have raped her... there was a man and a woman there, they weren't married, but they ate together. Now I saw things had got quiet, and the doors open. Then I go in, and the lights on, and the woman is sleeping on the bed, but I didn't know what happened to the man. Then I went into the living room and saw he was

sleeping on the sofa. So I could have shot him, raped the woman, and shot her, and gone...but I then I felt, against it. I didn't know if there were people in the house, the house was quiet, the curtains were closed, but I didn't know what was going on in there. So I thought, no, leave it.

Twenty days after the third incident, Jacques broke into a part of the house he hadn't entered before, walked into a room, turned on the light and "there is a woman there. I didn't expect her to be there". While she was not the victim he originally intended, "I went forward with this thing". He describes his fourth victim, 27 year old white female Rebecca Marais, as

Not ugly, not pretty. She was a ummm, a big woman, in the body. Not fat, just shaped like a woman. But I didn't look at her for beauty, or looked at her for long...I didn't think 'this woman is pretty, I'm horny for her'. I see it's a woman, I can have sex with her.

Jacques found his victim by entering an open bedroom door, and turning on the light because he "didn't think there would be anyone there...I didn't really think what I was doing". This woke Rebecca, and Jacques said that when she saw him, he closed the door and knew he would have to shoot her.

BH: What made you decide to shoot her?

JE: ...I turned on the light. That's why I shot her.

BH: Why did you turn on the light?

JE: I saw the door was open, and then decided for some or other reason to turn on the light, and I saw there was a girl, a woman. Then I decided to rape her. OK, she also showed resistance but then I hit her on the head. Then, maybe, she became dazed, she didn't pass out completely, but she

maybe became dazed. I didn't take all my clothes off, I just took my pants off...[for the previous offences he got totally undressed] because she showed resistance, I wanted to be quick. Then I couldn't penetrate, but I did come. OK, then she looked at me, then I pulled out the weapon and pulled off the shot... I just turned the weapon and then shot her. I was still on her. The bullet went in here [indicates point on head]...

BH: Did she die immediately?

JE: Ja, I can't remember, she was immediately in coma and don't know how long it took for her to die...

BH: How did you feel once you had killed her?

JE: [tone drops slightly] I don't believe I felt anything about it. I just shot her dead, that's all. I can't say what I felt, whether I was happy or sad. I just did it, and went away.

Jacques says he did not say anything to Rebecca “[I] just went and hit her with the butt, I didn't say anything”. Discussing his reasons for killing Rebecca, Jacques states that he decided to kill any woman who saw him “when I got the weapon...the weapon allowed me to do it” and says that the only reason Rebecca Marais was the first one to be shot was because she was the first one to see his face.

BH: Did you decide on the point of the moment to turn the weapon, or did you think about it when you were busy ‘I must shoot her’?

JE: [pause] Umm, maybe, I couldn't say whether I decided to kill her: when I turned on the light, or when I was finished I decided to shoot her, I can't remember precisely when I decided...

BH: You didn't decide after the second rape that you'd kill the next one?

JE: I knew that if they saw me, then I would kill them...

BH: So, for the first rapes, if the light was on, they would be dead.

JE: Ja, ja. Maybe by the second case I had already decided, if they see me, I'll shoot them.

Rebecca was found with her duvet pulled up to her chin. She was naked under the duvet, with her legs spread. Her hands were by her head and she had an injury on the edge of her left hand. This was caused by the passage of the bullet that killed her, perhaps inflicted as she tried to ward off the shot. Jacques does not comment on this possible defence injury, and insists that he would just leave the duvets on the floor once he had “finished” but then says that sometimes he would look at the victims and think “it doesn't look right” and put the duvet on. This, he says, was merely an automatic reaction. The Senior Investigating Officer (SIO), when I interviewed him, opined that Jacques’ replacing of the duvet suggested “undoing” on his part, which implied regret for this actions.

Jacques asserts that, unlike the rapes, he did not kill his victims for ‘experience’: “to kill is just to kill, I didn't, I didn't do it to experiment, I just did it because the light was on.” Jacques does not appear to associate any emotion or enjoyment with his killing his victims, rather equating the killings with a feeling of being emotionally dead.

BH: For you, when you were committing these offences, it was just that dead feeling.

JE: Ja, I just do it. I worry about [tails off]. I'm not thinking, at that stage.

BH: You didn't think that at stage ‘I'm enjoying this’ or revenge. You just do it.

JE: Ja...

BH: So during the offences, you just had this dead feeling, that you don't care at all.

JE: Ja, what I was doing to people but it was nice to sneak around, to feel the excitement, the adrenaline pumping, you don't know what's going to happen. In the act itself, of shooting someone dead, you just do it. There's not perception of 'this is not nice' or whatever.

BH: You like the adrenaline of the case, and all those things.

Jacques goes on to insist that he was now trapped in the habit of offending. As his offences progress, his narrative increasingly emphasises the role played by this 'habit' while the earlier motives of "fun" and adventure of emphasised less, as shown in the below extract:

JE:... It was fun to steal from handbags...But as it goes on...it's a habit that you learnt, you can't stop. You want to do it more and more, you can't control it. You do it more, as a habit...

BH: Was that how it was for you with the murders, as if it was almost a habit?

JE: But you can't control it, but yes, a habit.

BH: And you didn't know your reasons for doing it.

JE: At that stage, no. It's just sneaking around, you don't know what's going to happen.

BH:...If you sit and think now, can you think of a reason you did it?

JE: [long pause] I didn't think at that stage that it was nice and exciting, an adventure or whatever, I just did it maybe it was out of habit or because I couldn't control myself...

a) Imago analysis: the fourth incident

The behaviours Jacques displays in this offence remain consistent with those associated with the Habitual Rapist imago. The Habitual Rapist imago's offence behaviour for committing a rape is, by the time of this incident, clearly defined: break into a location, return to that location repeatedly either to steal items or to conduct reconnaissance, return later to commit rape during which the victim is controlled by using the firearm, and leave the location taking some precautions to avoid capture. In this incident, those precautions meant killing the victim. It is clear that the Habitual Rapist imago, as expressed in Jacques' narrative, had already taken the decision to kill the victims if necessary to avoid capture in the rape of Sylvia Claasen over a month earlier (the murder of Thomasina Selepeng was not clearly supported by the then Searching Burglar imago, and her murder did not appear to be the result of a decision taken before the offence to kill to avoid capture). Like the violence used in his previous rapes, the violence encouraged by the Habitual Rapist imago in the murder of Rebecca is instrumental: committed only to facilitate the commission of the offence. Similarly, all the violence makes use of the firearm that facilitated the Habitual Rapist imago's progression to rape. The role of the victim remains unchanged: her characteristics are of little concern to the Habitual Rapist and she is considered only as a source of experience and experiment. This is shown in the ease Jacques has in switching between victims as opportunity arises.

Therefore this incident, although the first murder that Jacques committed with obvious intent, does not represent a significant evolution in the Habitual Rapist imago. Rather, like the rape of Jane Ferreira, it represents a refinement of the evolution in the imago seen in the rape of Sylvia. As he has since his earliest offences, Jacques remains interested in the material benefit of his offences. The only notable behavioural differences between this and previous offences were his longer period of reconnaissance prior to offending, and his killing the victim. These differences are thematically consistent with what has occurred prior to this offence and so do not demonstrate a significant change in his imago. They thus rather represent a further strengthening of the Habitual Rapist imago, in particular of certain characteristics, as will be discussed below.

i) *The Habitual Rapist becomes dominant*⁴³

The emerging dominance of the Habitual Rapist imago in the third incident is confirmed in this one. This dominance is most clearly expressed by Jacques' continued affirmations that he couldn't control himself, and that his offences were part of a habit he could no longer stop. The strength of this habit is confirmed by how soon this offence followed after the previous one. The behaviours undertaken by the Habitual Rapist imago also show a growth in confidence. This is reflected in the differences discussed above: the greater degree of reconnaissance undertaken prior to the offence, killing the victim, and the choosing of a better time to offend when the initial victim choice was not available. Further evidence of the Habitual Rapist's confidence and daring is shown in Jacques' decision to attack someone in a location where he knew other people were likely to be sleeping.

This sense of dominance is added to by the fact that at this stage in his narrative Jacques does not highlight any relationships between the Habitual Rapist imago and any other imago. This implies that Jacques is in thrall to the offending habit the Habitual Rapist encourages, and none of his other imagoes appear have any influence over the Habitual Rapist.

The dominance of the Habitual Rapist is more subtly expressed in Jacques' associating the Habitual Rapist with his sense of emotional isolation and, in the extreme, his "dead feeling". This emotional isolation and lack of emotional understanding was previously expressed as an indifference towards others. This is even more marked here, as Jacques kills his victim (the first rape victim he murders) for no reason other than she saw his face, and makes repeated statements to the effect that "I don't believe I felt anything about it." The increased indifference towards others and treating of them as objects is also reflected in his initial plan to rape his intended victim and shoot her house mate. By establishing the Habitual Rapist as the epitome of his sense of emotional isolation and lack of understanding, Jacques is associating a fundamental theme in his narrative with it. This theme of emotional isolation has pervaded his narrative since childhood, forming part of both his

⁴³ See transcription references: 146, 147, 165 – 167, 184 – 191, 202, 203, 212 – 215, 217, 246 – 248, 250, 270 – 272, 281, 283 – 285.

‘offending’ and ‘non-offending’ imagoes. Thus an unequivocal association between this theme and the Habitual Rapist imago implies that this imago is a dominant influence in his narrative.

In this incident the only ambiguity in the imago interpretation of his offence behaviours, is the reason for Jacques replacing the duvet over the victim post-mortem. There are two possible interpretations: (a) that it was an example of ‘undoing’, as hypothesised by the SIO, or (b) it was doing to avoid detection. Jacques’ narrative offers similar levels of support for either interpretation. The earlier hypothesis around the rapes being motivated, in part, by Jacques attempting to overcome emotional isolation supports the possibility of (a). However, the Habitual Rapist imago’ indifference towards others supports (b). There is insufficient evidence to choose between them, and neither interpretation would radically alter our interpretation of Jacques’ narrative.

5.2.3.8 The fifth incident

Two weeks after the murder of Rebecca, Jacques committed the next set of offences he was convicted of: his third murder, and fourth rape. He was walking past a location he had twice previously reconnoitred. He saw two women inside, where previously he hadn’t seen anyone, and noticed a window was open “so I decided to come back later.” Jacques’s narrative shifts immediately to his return:

Then I go in. There are two rooms, both with half-closed doors...I went to the right hand one first, opened it, and saw there was no one there. Then I go to the left-hand one, and heard the woman wake up. She most probably wanted to go to the toilet. When I see her open [the door] I move in front her. She screams and I also hit her on the head with the butt. She falls down but doesn't pass out. We went to the bed. She had a night dress on. Then the dress is taken off and then she has panties on. Then the panties are taken off. Then she lies on the bed, then I just rape her.

Jacques later comments that he enjoyed having sex with this victim, 27 year-old white female Belinda Wiley. He comments, referring to the other rapes he committed, that “it's a pity that I didn't always enjoy it like that”. The other rapes, he says, did not satisfy him and were just “sex act”, no more fulfilling than masturbation. He contrasts this with this offence, which he still seems to enjoy remembering:

BH: Why did you enjoy it?

JE: Because, let's say, I had sex with her for half an hour.... she didn't help me... Maybe it's satisfying. [Tone drops, sounds almost coy, smiling] It's almost as if you know her....

BH: ... You said that with her the sex was the best. What were the reasons for that, just because it was for the longest time?

JE: Ja, because I had sex with her for a long time.... she didn't react, she didn't do anything. You can say, from the beginning, I was in control, maybe.

BH: Was this the one where you felt most in control?

JE: Ja...

Jacques later repeats that he “maybe” he enjoyed this offence the most because he had sex with her for the longest time, “she just lay there. She didn't move or make noises, but I had sex with her for a longer time”.

Jacques narrates that he did not say anything to Belinda and, when he had finished raping her, he saw she had cigarettes, took one and lit it before offering one on to her, which she accepted.

JE: Then we smoked. When we finished smoking she said she wanted to go to the toilet. I went with her to the toilet. When she was finished on the toilet I said to her she must now go for a bath. I'm standing, and smoke

again, when she's in the bath. But she didn't put the plug in, she just ran the bath and sat in the bath... Then I went to the bedroom and got dressed. I first checked that there wasn't any money in the handbag. There was nothing....

BH What were the reasons for telling her to go bath?

JE: There were no reasons for that, I just told her so I could get dressed and check out her handbag. There was no special reason, like 'I've had sex with you, now wash yourself because I don't want them to find the sperm' ...it was just to get her out the way while I was busy...

BH: Then you thought 'she saw my face so I must kill her'.

JE: Ja...

BH: Why did you tell her to go bath?

JE: I don't know. I just decided, I just said 'go bath'.

BH: You didn't think about it much at time.

JE: No...

BH: At what moment did you decide to shoot her?

JE: [pause] Ummm, well, I knew that if the light was on you have to shoot. So most probably [I knew I was going to shoot her] from the start.

BH: Then when you saw her in the bath, you decided 'now's the time'

JE: Ja... Then I went back [pauses, stutters] and then I raise the weapon and shoot her in the head ... She turned her head and then I shot her and then the bullet went in [indicates place]. She turned away when she saw I was holding the weapon so and then the shot went off.

Belinda was found in the bath, naked. A cigarette was found stubbed out on the doorframe of the bathroom, suggesting Jacques stood there. It is not clear whether he

stubbed his cigarette out before or after the shooting. Jacques then left the way he came.

Characteristically, Jacques highlights apparently minor contradictions between his narrative's account and police reports. He admits he is "still bothered" that

they said I washed my hands in the basin, because my hands were full of blood, and so on, and blood was smeared in the basin's drain. I told them I know nothing about that, I didn't touch the woman after I shot her, understand, I said no, it must be the woman who found the body maybe looked what was wrong and got blood on her hands, and then washed them off.

With the exception of this, Jacques' narrative of this offence corresponds precisely with the events suggested by evidence.

Around this time, the investigators in his case decided to check the occupants of the police barracks' fingerprints against those found at the scenes. Jacques avoided capture on this occasion by simply not turning up to the fingerprint-taking parade.

a) Imago analysis: the fifth incident

The behavioural template for committing rape that the Habitual Rapist imago offers Jacques, and which has been used since the second incident, continues to guide and dictate his offending. The Habitual Rapist continues to be isolated from other imagoes. This imago continues its learning from each offence, building its confidence in committing the offences and controlling the victim. In this incident, this learning resulted in what Jacques describes as his most enjoyable offence. The fundamental motivating factors which influence this imago do not appear to have changed either. The Habitual Rapist imago still appears indifferent to the victim's reaction, preferring them as passive object.

There are only three changes in behaviour in this offence. Firstly, where previously he left twenty days between offences, the period shortens to two weeks. Secondly, while Jacques still mentions the material benefit of the offences, here he steals items during the rape (rather than during a reconnaissance prior to the offence). Thirdly, Jacques spends more time interacting with the victim than he did in previous offences. This can partially be explained by the fact that while Rebecca fought him and was controlled by force, Belinda was easier to control. This factor is interlinked with Jacques' observations that he enjoyed raping Belinda the most. This will be discussed more below.

i) *Habitual Rapist reaches the peak of its influence*⁴⁴

The above factors demonstrate this and evidence the continuing and increasing confidence and dominance of the Habitual Rapist. Jacques' particular enjoyment of this rape, and the reasons for this, are key in understanding his imago development here. Jacques' narrative suggests that his enjoyment of the rape of Belinda was due to the time he had to experience the act of sex with her, commenting "it's almost as if you know her". The fact that he had this time suggests that he had complete control over her. However it does not appear that his enjoyment sprang from feelings of dominance and power over his victim. Rather, it appears that the source of his enjoyment is having the complete control necessary to fully experience the act of sex.

By fulfilling his desire for the experience of rape the Habitual Rapist has achieved one of the 'wishes, aspirations, or goals' Jacques associated with it. Having associated wishes, aspirations and goals are one of the features of the prototypical imago (McAdams, 1988). The Habitual Rapist inherited this desire for experience from the Adventurous Thief and Searching Burglar imagoes. This desire for experience was initially established as a means to overcome the emotional isolation and lack of emotional interaction that tormented the Lonely Boy and Passive Man imagoes. This desire for experience was specifically associated with rape during the second incident and fully established in the Habitual Rapist in the third incident. Now in reaching this goal the Habitual Rapist has reached the peak of its influence. As will be

⁴⁴ See transcription references: 143, 146, 147, 184 – 187, 191, 214, 215, 218, 223, 232, 249, 270 – 272, 280 – 282.

demonstrated as the narrative unfolds, this incident appears to have been the point at which Jacques' offence behaviour once more moved beyond the limits of the mode of interpersonal interaction embodied in the dominant imago (as occurred previously during the murder of Thomasina). This has an affect on subsequent offences.

Why should reaching this goal have had an affect on the imago of the Habitual Rapist in subsequent offences? Jacques' narrative and the Habitual Rapist imago offer a hypothetical answer: the Habitual Rapist, given complete control, does not know what to do once the experience of rape has been exhausted. This is shown in Jacques asking his victim to bath, and sharing a cigarette with her, both actions that Jacques does not appear able to fully explain in his narrative. In addition to this, by stating that in raping Belinda for a long time it was "*almost* as if know her" [emphasis added] Jacques is implying that despite having complete control over the victim and satisfying his desire for experience, the Habitual Rapist is still not able to overcome the emotional isolation that Jacques' other imagoes of self suffer from. Thus the Habitual Rapist has achieved the goal of experience, but not achieved the benefit (i.e. overcome emotional isolation and lack of knowledge) that Jacques hoped for, or the function that it served with reference to the other imagoes.

5.2.3.9 The sixth incident

Jacques did not commit another offence for five months and then committed the fourth murder he was convicted of. His narrative is not clear why he waited this long after the acceleration which preceded his previous offence. When he eventually decided to offend again, his chosen victim lived very close to his fiancé's parents' house in Benoni, some distance from his previous offences. Jacques had already seen that 74 year old white female Margaret Welwyn lived alone in her flat. Describing Margaret as "the granny", Jacques continues:

I just decided one night to go there. I hadn't seen her. I went to visit my fiancé. She took me home, but then I decided I wanted to go back by train, and go there, and then go in there [i.e. to break in to that house]. It was a bit different there... It was certainly because I wasn't worried, was getting

[tone drops, mumbles] reckless... I went around the back [of the house], climbed the wall, and felt for windows that were open. The first was locked, and then one around the corner was open so I went in. When I was in the room, I looked if someone was in the other rooms, then turned on the light. Then I saw there was a handbag there. She didn't wake up. I opened the handbag and saw there was money, and took R10, [although] I'm not sure it is R10. Then I saw there was a flashlight. I turned off the light and went to her with the flashlight on. When I touched her so she woke up and screamed, then I hit her with the butt on the head...Then she gripped my hands and I decided now I'm going to shoot her... she grabbed my hands and I pulled the trigger...Then I shot and the bullet went into the mouth and shoots the teeth and the teeth flew into my face.

In narrating the last sentence Jacques smiled, as if amused at the teeth flying into his face, a reaction that I found incongruous. I asked whether Jacques' shooting his victim when she grabbed his hands was due to getting a fright from her reaction. He responds, after some thought, "I didn't get a fright, but I maybe wasn't keen for a struggle and, then I shot her. OK, then I turned the light on and turned the flashlight off." Jacques continues that after turning on the light he pulled the duvet off Margaret, and saw she wore no panties under her nightdress, but decided "no, I don't think it will help to have sex with her".

Jacques then left the bedroom, covering Margaret's body as he left. Looking through a window and seeing cars in the street outside, Jacques sat in the living room and waited until it was time for him to go and get the train back home.

a) Imago analysis: the sixth incident

This offence demonstrates the continued isolation of the Habitual Rapist from Jacques' other imagoes, and the continuation of the fact that it is not influenced by positive external factors. This is shown by Jacques committing these offences immediately after returning from his fiancé's house. Notwithstanding the brevity of this offence it has a number of important implications for Jacques's offending imago.

i) Stability and change in behaviours associated with the Habitual Rapist imago⁴⁵

In some respects the behaviours and characteristics of Habitual Rapist imago remains stable. Jacques still enters his victim's houses at night, uses a firearm to control them, and steals money. He also still appears to retain the Habitual Rapist's cool-headedness as shown, for example, by his waiting at the scene until it was safe for him to make his escape. It could also be hypothesised that his offending far from his previous offences, which were attracting large amounts of police and media attention, is further evidence of this cool-headedness.

There are however some notable changes in behaviour: he does not carry out a detailed reconnaissance before this offence (although he was familiar with the location), and rather than controlling the victim using violence as he did previously, Jacques simply kills Margaret in response to her resistance. These all suggest that, in Jacques' own words, that he was becoming "reckless". The order and structure which the Habitual Rapist brought to previous offences appears to be breaking down.

ii) Conflict within Habitual Rapist imago⁴⁶

As evidenced by the above behavioural changes, Jacques is beginning to deviate from the interpersonal mode of transaction (the Habitual Rapist) which served well in previous offences. Jacques' narrative suggests this deviation from the Habitual Rapist imago's established behaviours may be due to conflict within this imago. This conflict

⁴⁵ See transcription references: 177, 184 – 187, 191 – 195, 250, 251.

⁴⁶ See transcription references: 177, 184 – 187, 191 – 195, 250, 251.

came from two sources. Firstly, as alluded to in the previous imago analysis section, the Habitual Rapist imago had already achieved its goal of gaining experience via rape. This could suggest that after attaining this goal the Jacques did not know what to do next. The long pause before this offence supports this hypothesis. This confusion would be added to by the failure of the Habitual Rapist's search for experience to overcome the Passive Man's emotional isolation and lack of knowledge. Notwithstanding this confusion, the murder of Margaret shows that the Habitual Rapist imago is still influential, and still appears to want the experience of rape (as shown by his considering sex with Ms Wiley's corpse). This suggests the second reason for possible deviation in behaviours: Jacques, as he states repeatedly in his narrative, was by now trapped in the offending of the Habitual Rapist imago and could not stop.

Thus by the time he committed this offence, there was strong conflict within the Habitual Rapist imago between the continued desire for experience, and confusion as to whether it is still a valid goal. This confusion within the Habitual Rapist imago may be the reason for the behavioural changes. However it is not clear from Jacques' narrative why certain behaviours would be affected (e.g. abandoning reconnaissance, killing in response to resistance, or taking a longer break between offences) and others (e.g. stealing money) would not. These changes cannot be explained by his simply reverting to an earlier imago, such as the Searching Burglar or Adventurous Thief, as he did after his first murder. They rather suggest that the imago associated with his offending may be losing the coherence it built up via its various incarnations as Adventurous Thief, Searching Burglar and Habitual Rapist. Evidence suggests a link can be made between this loss of coherence and the conflict within in the Habitual Rapist, particularly in relation to the search for experience.

While this break down in the behaviour encouraged by the Habitual Rapist imago does not herald a markedly different attitude towards his victim, it is notable that the indifference with which the Habitual Rapist imago treated Jacques's previous victims now appears to have sharpened into thinly veiled contempt. This is shown in Jacques' amusement at the victim's teeth hitting his face. This adjustment in the interpersonal attitude of the Habitual Rapist imago may explain Jacques' willingness to use fatal force at the first sign of resistance. This change in attitude may have arisen due to the

conflict within the Habitual Rapist, and is further evidence that the Habitual Rapist was not interested interacting with the victims. This again emphasises that it was the Passive Man, not the Habitual Rapist, that desired an end to emotional isolation.

Despite this confusion, the Habitual Rapist does not appear to lose any of five features of the prototypical imago (McAdams, 1988) it previously displayed. It still has an origin myth, is still identified with Jacques, and associated with certain personality traits. It also retains its wishes, goals and aspirations and associated behaviours. However the strength and clarity of its association with goals and behaviours appears to have been effected by the conflict within it.

5.2.3.10 The seventh incident

Two months after he shot Margaret Welwyn, Jacques stole cash and a wristwatch from a residence in another East Rand town, Kempton Park. Jacques had moved to police accommodation in Kempton Park, although he does not give a reason for his move. A fortnight after his final burglary, Kempton Park was the scene of Jacques' seventh and final 'incident', the fifth murder and rape he was convicted of. Jacques' last victim was 17 year old white female Judith Schoeman. She, like the victims in the previous six offences, was white although Jacques never referred to his victims by name or race. Unlike his previous cases, Jacques committed this offence during the day, and without his customary detailed reconnaissance:

JE: I just saw that the backdoor was open and then I decided to go in

BH: What happened there?

JE: I didn't know who was in there. OK, I already saw there was a girl there... But when I went, I didn't know who was in there. There could have been two women there, a man...

BH: What were your reasons for going there?

JE: Because the door was open, I knew that there would be someone in there, because I saw a girl. There was someone else there, cleaning up, I

didn't know whether it was a white man or black man who was outside cleaning, cutting the grass. That's what I heard in court.

BH: But you decided to go in because you saw a girl in there?

JE: Yes, at the rear of the house, not at the front because the man was at the front...I saw her there before, but not on the same day. I saw the door was open, and decided to go there. There were dogs there, small dogs... As I walked in, I saw that someone was coming out. So I stood back. Then she came out, and saw me, and run back and I grabbed her... she screamed. And she kicked me. Then I kicked her back, on the leg, and she stayed quiet... I pulled her, saw the living room, then decided to take her to the room [unclear which room he means]. I decided to take off her top, and then I took the top off. Then when I went to take her trousers off she said she'd do it herself. So she took her own trousers off. Then she said there was money in her mother's room. So I walked with her to her mother's room. She was naked, I had all my clothes on...Then I put my arms around her shoulders and walked to her mother's room. When we got to the door she walked to her mother's cupboard and I stayed standing in the door. She took out R150 from the cupboard. So I took it and put it in my pockets, and told her to lie on the bed. Then I also took just my trousers off.

BH: Because you were in a hurry?

JE: I didn't know if, because she screamed, if someone had heard, or whatever...Then I tried to rape her, but I couldn't penetrate.

BH: Did she keep her legs closed?

JE: No, she just lay there. I tried to penetrate her, but I couldn't. Maybe I was too excited.

BH: You were too excited, and you couldn't concentrate...

JE: On 'business', ja.

Jacques does not appear worried by his impotence, calling it “one of those things” and attributing it to nervousness, fear of capture, and the desire to be away from the location as fast as possible. He says it was the same with his previous incidence of impotence, in the third incident, when he knew that someone would be asleep nearby. According to Jacques, neither incident of impotence made him feel more nervous, or angry.

JE: Then I came anyway, ‘from excitement’ [said in English]. Then I got dressed, took the gun that I put down, and then pushed it so against her forehead and pulled the trigger. And then I ran out. When I came to the living room I also saw there were some bank cards lying there, and I took them because I saw that the PIN number was on the back of the card. There wasn't much money in it. Just R20.

BH: What made you decide to kill her, because she saw you?

JE: It's in the day, yes, because she saw me.

BH: And she just lay there when you pushed the pistol against her head. Was she afraid?

JE: Ja. She just lay there, and looked [inaudible] what he reactions were.

BH: Didn't you notice her reactions?

JE: She just lay there, lay there like so, looking at me with small eyes.

Judith was found naked on her back in her mother's bedroom. A pair of house keys had been placed on her stomach. She had been shot in the middle of her forehead. The

distinctive star-shaped gunshot injury suggested that Jacques' firearm was in contact with her forehead when he pulled the trigger. Subsequent media reports stated that Jacques found this star-shape 'funny'. When challenged on this, Jacques is adamant "OK, I saw it, but I didn't think it was funny... I saw something develop, but I didn't wonder about it, or stand and think 'that's cute'... I saw it before I was going... it was nothing special". He also, of his own accord, challenges the claim that he left keys on the victim: "I didn't handle any keys, the door was open, why would I be busy with keys?" Jacques is characteristically insistent on small and seemingly inconsequential details, insisting here that he "can remember well" and does not avoid potentially embarrassing details.

a) Imago analysis: the seventh incident

The final murder in Jacques' series continues the developments in the Habitual Rapist imago noted in the previous incident. Therefore it appears that the conflict within the Habitual Rapist imago first expressed in the previous incident continues, and perhaps even strengthens, here. In this incident the confusion within the Habitual Rapist is expressed as a continued combination of stability and change in the behaviours and personality traits associated with the imago, alongside a more marked reversion in the imago.

The Habitual Rapist imago's established behavioural template for murder is ignored here, as it was in the previous murder. The seeming confidence of the Habitual Rapist imago, and the clear structure this gave to his previous offences, is lost. Jacques appears to become more reckless, careless, and even arrogant. This suggests that the associations between the Habitual Rapist and Jacques' behaviours and goals continue to lose strength and clarity.

i) Continued stability and change in the Habitual Rapist imago⁴⁷

Certain personality traits and behaviours associated with the Habitual Rapist remain stable in this incident. The Habitual Rapist imago remains bold and calm, and the

⁴⁷ See transcription references: 184 – 187, 191, 192, 196 – 200, 204, 251, 280, 281.

reason he gives for killing the victim is the same as that given in his previous five murders. The desire for material gain from his offences remains. The Habitual Rapist imago remains unconcerned by victim interaction, and indifferent to the victim's emotions or reactions. The victim is still treated as an object to gain experience from, and the increased indifference towards the victim noted in the previous offence continues here. This calm demeanour and indifference is best demonstrated here in Jacques' pausing after shooting Judith to steal a bank card, a theft which in Jacques' narrative is given virtually equal status as the shooting itself. Jacques' narrative makes the linkage between the pressure of this offence and his failure to penetrate Judith. Despite this impotence, Jacques states he still ejaculates "from excitement". This suggests that the thrill seeking that helped motivate the Habitual Rapist imago (and the previous imagoes associated with offending) continues to do so.

This stability is combined with elements of change. These suggest that the Habitual Rapist imago is losing coherence. As in the previous incident, there is a long break in offending between this offence and the previous one. This suggests the conflict within the Habitual Rapist imago, linked to confusion in motivation, persists. Jacques' impotence is also a new feature of his offending, and one which he did not notably suffer from before. Having said this, it does not appear to adversely affect the excitement of this offence for him. Other changes in Jacques' behaviour in this offence are more notable in relation to the development of his imagoes, and will be discussed further below

iii) Possible reversion in the Habitual Rapist imago⁴⁸

Some of the behaviours associated with the Habitual Rapist imago in this offence suggest that Jacques was beginning to draw more strongly on previous offending imagoes to supply appropriate modes of interpersonal transaction. For example, Jacques uses physical violence to control his victim rather than rely on his firearm alone, and committed this offence without his customary detailed reconnaissance., neither of these behaviours have been seen since his first murder This suggests not just that he is becoming reckless, but also that his offences are drawing more strongly

⁴⁸ See transcription references: 184 – 187, 191, 192, 196 – 200, 204, 251, 280, 281.

on the Adventurous Thief's impulsivity. He also commits this offence during the day, and immediately prior to this incident, Jacques was still committing walk-in burglaries. These echo the behaviours of Searching Burglar.

This not only suggests that the behaviours inherited by the Habitual Rapist from the Searching Burglar, and the Adventurous Thief before that, continue to be expressed but also that the behaviours associated with these previous imagoes are expressed more strongly as the Habitual Rapist loses coherence. It could thus be hypothesised that this loss of coherence encourages a reversion to previous styles of offending. However Jacques' capture immediately after this offence means this hypothesis cannot be conclusively proven.

The above findings re-iterate the continuity in Jacques' narrative between the Adventurous Thief, Searching Burglar and Habitual Rapist. The imagoes of self associated with Jacques' offending (theft, burglary, rape and murder) represent a developmental continuum, with each imago drawing on the characteristics and motivations of the previous. Jacques' narrative calls attention to this by repeatedly highlighting the progression, and implied causal relationship, between his earliest thefts from handbags and the final murders.

5.2.3.11 Arrest and reflection

Reflecting on his offences, Jacques' highlights his key behavioural patterns. He says he was generally a "night person" and that once he started committing rape, his sleep patterns changed to accommodate this: he would carry out reconnaissance at around eight o'clock in the evening, then return home and sleep, then wake later, have a coffee and "go out to find someone, to rape". The decision on which nights to "go out" were, Jacques says, taken on the spur of the moment: "OK, tonight I'm going out". He said he wouldn't think about offending during the day, or "go out" on a daily basis. All the locations at which Jacques committed crimes were, he says, close to where he or a relation lived: the barracks, his parents', or his fiancé's house.

Jacques states that he took few measures to avoid capture, and didn't bother searching for cartridge cases or wiping away his fingerprints, as this "wasn't a solution" to his

situation. However this is partly contradicted by the measures he did take, for example disconnecting telephones, reconnoitring locations, and killing his victims; acts Jacques states were committed as an unplanned “reaction”. Specifically, he explains, killing his victims was simply done to avoid capture.

BH: It seems when you shot the women, it was not important to you. You just shot them to make them dead.

JE: Ja.

BH: After that, she'd just dead, you can go.

JE: Ja... [after the shooting] I would just leave.

Getting in and out of the locations “as fast as I could” was part of the “habit” of his offending, and he links this back to his earliest handbag thefts. Jacques goes on to clarify that after each offence he would feel nervous and, back at home, would run through a list of all the things that could have gone wrong, and would result in his capture. Despite these worries, he says, he would always be able to sleep, and would not worry about his offences the next day. Jacques’ narrative re-affirms that, eventually, the “habit” of his offending took control:

Like when you're drunk, you don't always know what you're doing. The next morning you don't know how you got to the house. I was drunk. It was not nice to be drunk, because I don't feel in control of myself.

Jacques describes his eventual arrest in same tone of indifference in which he narrates most of his story. He said his arrest was precipitated by an officer investigating his murders near the barracks in Pretoria reading about his last murder, in Kempton Park. The investigators then identified all police members who had transferred from the Pretoria barracks, and so came to question Jacques.

I was working in the radio room...they said they wanted to come and talk to me about the murders that happened in Pretoria. I said yes, I've got the

time... I knew OK, maybe, the time is now here to be arrested or whatever. I thought about going way, to make tracks, but then I decided it wasn't worth it... [pause] I stayed there. I swapped my weapon with the station's weapon... I hadn't cleaned my weapon [since the offences] there could be the teeth from the old granny's teeth, blood, I pushed the weapon into the last one's head... after one and a half hours they come there. They asked me where I stayed... Then they asked me if I heard of the murders, I said ja, I had heard about them... [volume drops] they said they wanted to take me to another station to take fingerprints. Then they arrested me, and took me out. Then they brought another man in to see if he recognised me... Then they took fingerprints, and then I said 'OK, it's me'. They had me made... it wouldn't help to make stories or whatever. I wanted to make it go by quicker, it's easier.

Jacques account of his arrest is matched by the SIO's report. Jacques goes on to comment that the police were "alright" to him, and treated him well, "I wasn't going to do anything."

Jacques says that after the last murder, he did not feel so daring anymore. His narrative reflects on the reasons for this, and links them back to his reasons for offending.

JE: I was half-glad when they caught me.

BH: Did it feel bad because you had bottled everything up?

JE: Yes, and I couldn't let things out... I was glad that things came to that point...

BH: Did you feel 'outside reason' before you got caught?

JE: Yes, I knew I could never give up... At the time, I didn't care about the consequences, or that I wasn't in control. I wanted to be in control, I wanted to get help, but I couldn't. Because I knew what the consequences were... it was like a drug. That you had to have more and more. You can't say 'I must stop' and then just stop, you don't have that control... You just go forward. You don't know where you're going. You don't have control, you don't think about it, you just go on...

Jacques states there was a "dead" feeling within him, and says that he "didn't care at all, what I was doing to people... it felt for me like I was going dead inside. You don't realise it then, you realise it now, you see that you were busy dying."

Along with his offending being like a drug, Jacques presents his offending as being explained by his having opposing "soft" and "bad" sides, between which he alternates. He is however unable to say whether he found his offending a pleasant or unpleasant experience, preferring to say that his rapes and murders were motivated by his being trapped in a cycle out of which he could not escape:

BH: What were the reasons you couldn't stop?

JE: [pause] It was like when I began stealing, it half-fun for you. But I wouldn't say the murder or the rapes were fun. I just did them because there was a chance to do them...The excitement brought me to doing it. The sneaking around, to kill, to rape, to rape maybe to experiment, to find out how it feels to rape or ejaculate inside a woman. But to kill is just to kill, I didn't, I didn't do it to experiment, I didn't do it to experiment, I just did it because the light was on.

BH: The rapes were for the experiment, for the experience?

JE: Ja, maybe I sought something in the rapes

BH: What did you search for?

JE: I don't know... [you're] searching for something, but [you] don't get it....

Jacques' narrative links this cycle of searching for experience, developed via experimentation, back to the handbag thefts of his youth. He said the habit that had started with these thefts was one he could not "break away" from "you want to do it more and more, you can't stop yourself". Beyond this, he does not articulate what motivated his offending apart from linking it to a 'search'. As has already been implied, Jacques narrative contains a number of clues as to what this search may be:

Maybe that's why I wanted to get caught... maybe I was searching for something when I committed the crimes, but I didn't know what ... maybe I searched for them, to have those feelings, but I couldn't handle them. I didn't have knowledge.

Thus Jacques' narrative seems to primarily link this search, and so his offending, to his ongoing struggle with emotions. This struggle centres on Jacques' repeatedly stated inability to understand and communicate about emotions with others:

BH:...The offences happened because you didn't know what was going on in your head.

JE: Ja, I didn't understand, and I didn't want to talk with other people about personal things....

BH: Ja, you held yourself inside, and didn't bring anything out.

JE: All your frustrations and your happiness, you pushed down... The reason is because you could never talk with anyone, from when you were small, you weren't prepared to talk with anyone, to say, 'I feel that that

you are too strict with me, you're not giving me the opportunity to make a success of myself'

The result of this process, Jacques states, is that you "didn't know about feelings" and end up "not really caring about anything." As the above quote shows, Jacques implicates his upbringing in this process, but does not directly blame his parents, preferring to just say that they did not get to know him, and "see how he reacts". This distance between him and his parents may, he implies, have contributed to the situation where he "didn't have values, in life". However, Jacques insists "I can't blame anyone" and brings discussion of cause for his crimes clearly back to his emotional struggle.

It is this emotional struggle that offers Jacques, in his post-arrest narrative, an avenue for redemption. Although this is beyond the remit of this study, it is worth briefly commenting on this as it further illuminates his motives.

Jacques asserts that the main aim in his life, now that he is in prison, is to learn more about his emotions and his self, so that they "don't put pressure on me [him] anymore". He says he wants to stick with process of learning to the end, with the "perseverance" that Jacques's says he lacked in his life before. This process of learning, he says, will ensure that he does not offend again.

If I again come into this process, I must go this way, not that way... to know, if this happens I will do it. [I want to] begin to change myself. I'm working towards that. It's not just a case of 'I won't do it again'. You must work at it, and find a solution. The solution is if you have a problem, you must find someone to talk to about it.... It's like an experiment for me, learning to know myself, to experiment with my thoughts to know my new self.... Before I didn't worry about it. It didn't bother me. Now I see what they have been through, that's why... I want to better myself, get

more information, to know myself and what my problems are and get solutions. I'm trying to get help.... I want to always know what I'm doing, and perceive what I'm doing, and can handle it. To understand myself, and perceive that if I'm going in that direction I can know...

As implied in the above quote, a further key part of this learning is, according to Jacques' narrative, learning how to interact, emotionally, with others. Jacques is trying to achieve this by knowing who to approach should he need to discuss emotions, and knowing that he needs to discuss these matters with others, both things which before, he did not realise. He is also trying to do this, and improve his understanding of emotions, by writing to a number of 'pen pals'. These pen pals are the only people in his narrative that Jacques refers to by name and, in talking about them, his tone becomes animated and lively, in contrast to his tone elsewhere in his narrative. Jacques does not appear worried when a long term pen pal either stops writing to him or, in two cases, dies. As he put it "there are always others." The pen pals remain, for Jacques, an important means to discover how people "should behave" around emotions.

Jacques' narrative thus asserts that he is using his time in prison to overcome the lack of understanding of his own emotions, and inability to communicate with others, that lead him to offend before. Notwithstanding these changes, Jacques professes to still being unable to communicate with his parents, the distance between them remaining unbridged. He comments that he has not been able to discuss his offences with them, does not know how they feel about them, and says that he thinks his mother is afraid of him. His mother's fear amuses him, because "she doesn't need to be afraid of me". In talking about them, his characteristic tone of indifference returns. Similarly, the ending of his engagement by his fiancé, upon his arrest, is met with the passive acceptance that characterised much of Jacques' narrative up to this point.

a) Imago analysis: arrest and reflection

This imago analysis gives a brief overview of the affects Jacques' arrest and post-arrest reflection have on our understanding of his imago. This brief discussion will be expanded in the next section, the Epilogue.

Jacques' reflections re-iterate the established features of those imagoes associated with offending (the Adventurous Thief, Searching Burglar and Habitual Rapist) and the other imagoes in his narrative. In particular, they highlight how the desire for experience in Jacques' narrative continued to motivate his offending imagoes in particular, and experimentation functioned to encourage the development of his offending. Most significant, Jacques' reflections serve to re-iterate our understandings of the offence behaviours, and patterns of behaviour, encouraged by the imagoes associated with his offending. Specifically, his reflections confirm that these imagoes provided a series of behavioural templates for Jacques' offending, ultimately leading to the establishment and subsequent collapse of the behavioural template associated with his rapes and murders. In addition to the above, the following issues warrant further discussion.

i) Separation between imagoes associated with offending, and other imagoes⁴⁹

Jacques again highlights the separation between these two groups of imagoes associated with his self which, for brevity's sake, I will refer to as 'offending' and 'non-offending' imagoes. In the former group are the Adventurous Thief, Searching Burglar, and Habitual Rapist; in the latter group are the Lonely Boy and Passive Man. Jacques makes this separation explicit in his description of his consisting of a "bad" self and a "soft" (i.e. good) self. We can hypothesise that his ability to function 'as normal' after offences links back to the separation between his 'offending' and 'non-offending' imagoes of self (here, the Habitual Rapist and Passive Man respectively). However it should be remembered that this separation is not absolute, rather consisting of a linkage between the imagoes which only allows for the expression of the non-offending imagoes' emotional isolation in the offending imagoes' behaviours.

⁴⁹ Evidence given in previous imago analysis sections.

ii) The strength of the habit of offending, and the failure of the offending imagoes⁵⁰

In his reflections Jacques again states that his offending became a habit he could not break. This re-confirms the strength of the offending imagoes' grip on Jacques' narrative as a whole. He repeatedly refers to his offending in terms such as "it was like a drug", "it was a habit I could not break free from", and states explicitly that it was the realisation that he was not in control that led to his relief at being captured. Jacques' statement that he was glad he had been caught, and "didn't feel so daring" after his last offences, re-confirms the confusion in motivation within the Habitual Rapist imago which co-existed at this stage with the 'unbreakable' habit of offending. The contrasting demands of his 'habit' and 'confused motives' could also help explain why the behavioural template offered by the offending imagoes began to break down.

Jacques' statement that he still felt "dead" serves as confirmation that the emotional isolation and lack of understanding associated with the Passive Man / Lonely Boy imagoes remain a notable feature of his narrative. This suggests that the search for experience embodied in his 'offending' imagoes did not serve to overcome the emotional isolation of his 'non-offending' imagoes (as Jacques' narrative implies was intended). In reflecting, Jacques again ties his continuing emotional isolation to the same factors identified earlier in Jacques' narrative: lack of understanding of emotions, and inability to communicate with others about emotions. The persistence of this motivating factor is demonstrated here by his seemingly being emotionally unaffected by parental concern at his actions or by the death of valued pen pals. His reflections again link this motivation back to his parents (and thus their imagoes, the Distant Father and Controlling Mother).

⁵⁰ See transcription references: 143, 144, 146, 147, 199, 200, 202, 252, 265 – 268, 280.

iii) Possible growth of Introspective imago⁵¹

The continuing strength of Jacques' desire to overcome his emotional isolation and lack of emotional understanding is attested to by his actions in prison. This demonstrates that the motives of the Passive Man persist. Robbed of the avenue of expression offered by the Habitual Rapist imago's motives of 'thrill', 'sneaking' and 'experience', the Passive Man now seeks alternative modes for fulfilling this motive and overcoming emotional isolation. Jacques has now channelled his urge to experience more and experiment into introspection (i.e. understanding his emotions) and communicating with others about emotional matters (in this case, via pen pals). His enthusiasm for these is evidenced in the change in the tone of his narrative when talking about his pen pals. Furthermore, in Jacques' post-arrest narrative, this emergent 'Introspective' imago is perceived as holding the opportunity for future rehabilitation: to ensure he would never commit these offences again. However as shown by his continued emotional isolation, although the 'Introspective' imago appears to have developed as a replacement to Jacques' offending imagoes it remains fundamentally self-interested, and identified solely with Jacques himself. This Introspective imago will not be discussed further in the Epilogue, as it is beyond the remit of this study.

⁵¹ See transcription references: 201, 202, 204, 294, 295.

5.2.4 Epilogue to Jacques Eksteen's story

There are two narrative inquiries this study aims to answer: (a) What role do imagoes play in the motivation of a person who commits serial murder? (b) What role do imagoes play in the development of the offending behaviour? Jacques' narrative gives us specific answers to both questions, but we first need to summarise what has been found before we can present these answers.

5.2.4.1 Summary of story structure

Overall, Jacques presented an extensive and detailed narrative, with a clear chronology. His narrative gave the impression of someone who was under the control of influences that he did not entirely understand. Jacques did not need much prompting to give his narrative, and would make linkages between various parts of his narrative of his own accord. This was complemented by Jacques' often detailed, precise, recall and his not shying away from topics that could potentially make him appear socially unacceptable. On the other hand, the clarity of Jacques' narrative was limited by the difficulty he experienced when discussing motivations and emotions. The degree of his lack of ability to articulate emotions suggested that they were difficult for Jacques to understand and experience. This lack of emotional understanding is reflected in the dominant tone of indifference in Jacques' narration. These difficulties did not, however, significantly limit the answers to the narrative inquiries questions that Jacques' narrative could supply. On the contrary, they indicated some of the central motives and thematic concern in his story, as well as linking with his dominant imago.

5.2.4.2 Summary of imago analyses.

Jacques' narrative presented a total of seven imagoes. These imagoes arise at various stages in his narrative. Two, the Distant Father and Controlling Mother imagoes, were associated with other people. Five were associated with Jacques's self. As mentioned the imagoes associated with his self could be divided into two groups, 'offending' and 'non-offending'. The former group consisted of the Adventurous Thief, Searching Burglar, Habitual Rapist imagoes; the latter of the Lonely Boy and Passive Man

imagoes. Both offending and non-offending imagoes represent a continuum of development. The below will summarise the chronology of how his imagoes developed and how they interacted with each other and related to his offending.

The narrative of Jacques' childhood sees the development of four imagoes. The imagoes established at this stage personify the themes that pervade his story. The first two imagoes were associated with his parents: the Distant Father and the Controlling Mother imagoes. The Distant Father is associated with his father and characterised as absent, passive, lacking emotion or engagement with others. The Distant Father appears to do what is necessary to maintain a 'normal' life but avoids further involvement. The Distant Father represents an early incarnation of the themes of emotional distance and lack of engagement which run throughout Jacques narrative. The Controlling Mother imago is associated with Jacques's mother. Unlike the Distant Father the Controlling Mother is more directly influential and dynamic. She is immediately and strongly associated with discipline. She is depicted as strict, emotionless, and inflexibly controlling. In contrast to the Distant Father the Controlling Mother is characterised by acting (as opposed to failures to act). However, these actions are consistently described in negative terms. The Controlling Mother never showed affection to Jacques in his childhood, nor did she supply the "special attention" he failed to get from the Distant Father.

Both the Distant Father and Controlling Mother imagoes are targets for Jacques' childhood resentment. Jacques' resentment of them is implied in his description of them and their actions and never acknowledged directly. From Jacques' narrative we can hypothesise that this resentment sprang from a longing for emotional intimacy,. This hypothesis is supported by Jacques stating that parents' discipline and lack of involvement with him had "psychological consequences": loneliness and isolation and the inability to express and understand emotions. These appeared to become a vicious circle in his narrative, and a motive for his offences.

These psychological 'consequences' are embodied in the most significant imago of the self in Jacques' childhood: the Lonely Boy. The Lonely Boy imago's origin myth is found in the interaction between Jacques, the Distant Father, and Controlling Mother. Jacques is unequivocal in presenting the Lonely Boy's situation as a result of

parental action: the Lonely Boy is trapped by the inflexible discipline of the Controlling Mother, and the emotional absence of the Distant Father. This state of entrapment and isolation results in the Lonely Boy being ill-equipped to comprehend or express emotion. This, in turn, serves to engrain the Lonely Boy's isolation. The Lonely Boy is thus portrayed as helplessly trapped in his aloneness by both his self and by the imagoes of his parents.

Trapped, the Lonely Boy is fundamentally isolated and emotionally disengaged. The Lonely Boy is passive in his helplessness and by portraying the Lonely Boy as simultaneously helplessly trapped by his lack of emotional understanding and wishing to break free of it Jacques' narrative encourages further passivity. Jacques' narrative shows the Lonely Boy is not content in his predicament, giving the impression that the Lonely Boy suffers from repressed or unrealised frustration. Acknowledging this frustration and resentment would perhaps allow the Lonely Boy to end his passivity and confront the Controlling Mother imago. However as demonstrated by Jacques' repeated struggle to simultaneously blame and avoid accusing his parents, the Lonely Boy is not able to do this adequately. This leads to the origin of the second imago of self emerging in his youth: the Adventurous Thief

The Adventurous Thief originates in this interaction between the Lonely Boy, the Controlling Mother and Distant Father. The Adventurous Thief's origin myth is placed in a period of more intense loneliness in the Lonely Boy's story of entrapment and repressed frustration. However when the Adventurous Thief begins to steal money from Jacques' mother's handbag, his motives are adventure and enjoyment. Jacques consistently describes these incidents of theft in terms such as "fun" and "adventure", and Jacques emphasises the material benefit theft brings him. His loneliness is transformed by theft from a burden, to a situation where you can "provide your own amusement" by committing theft. Thus the Adventurous Thief allows the Lonely Boy to maintain his ambivalent attitude towards his loneliness, allows the resentment of the Controlling Mother to remain unexpressed, and allows the Lonely Boy to avoid confronting his own nature and become less isolated. In Jacques' childhood the Adventurous Thief and the Lonely Boy are therefore closely interlinked. The Lonely Boy supplies the Adventurous Thief with his motivation, while the Adventurous Thief provides the "adventure" which allows the Lonely Boy

to continue unchanged in his isolation. The Adventurous Thief is the Lonely Boy's means of avoiding both confrontation and change. Jacques' narrative repeatedly emphasises the importance of the Adventurous Thief in the development of his offending, claiming it lead to his committing more severe offences, and was part of a process of evolution (although he states his lack of emotional understanding meant he did not realise this at the time).

The tone of Jacques's narrative does not change in adolescence. Jacques' continuing lack of engagement with others and his environment is characteristic of the Lonely Boy imago's attitude. Thus in adolescence the Lonely Boy is engrained in Jacques' narrative, appearing to become his preferred way of interacting with others and his predominant imago of self. This may be related to a change in Jacques's attitude towards the Lonely Boy's isolation and lack of emotional understanding. Whereas his attitude towards his situation in childhood appears to have been one of repressed frustration, this frustration now co-exists with acceptance, and even an active embracing of his situation. This change in the Lonely Boy's attitude towards his loneliness and isolation occurs alongside changes in its relationships with the Distant Father and the Controlling Mother imagoes.

Firstly, the Lonely Boy appears to have adopted the Distant Father imago's philosophy and interpersonal style. That is, the Lonely Boy adopts the Distant Father's emotional distance, lack of engagement, passivity, and indifference towards others and towards school activities. Although the Distant Father imago is only mentioned twice in Jacques' narrative after adolescence, it clearly had an impact on his narrative. Secondly, the Lonely Boy imago rejects the Controlling Mother imago's attempts to become emotionally close to him. Jacques highlights its importance to him in his narrative by mentioning this whenever he discusses his relationship with his mother. This demonstrates that the Lonely Boy imago has become more dominant in Jacques narrative and that the Controlling Mother imago was limited to being a mechanism for controlling Jacques, its attitudes have not been incorporated in the Lonely Boy's philosophy of life and so its influence does not last beyond childhood. The loss of the Controlling Mother's influence over Jacques, and the seeming absence of any imagoes to provide a similar level of control, implies there are now no controls in place to limit Jacques' behaviour.

The waning control of the Distant Father and Controlling Mother imagoes is reflected and speeded by changes in the Adventurous Thief imago. The offences associated with the Adventurous Thief still appear motivated by the twin benefits of “fun” and money (material gain). However in adolescence his offences are becoming more serious and offending is becoming a “habit”. Jacques likens the Adventurous Thief’s offending to the process of drug addiction, developed by a process of experimentation. This experimentation becomes established as the means by which the Adventurous Thief develops to more serious forms of offending. The Adventurous Thief is now associated with a wider repertoire of behaviours. In childhood, the Adventurous Thief would only encourage stealing small amounts of money from Jacques’s mother’s purse. In adolescence, the Adventurous Thief is encouraging the theft of money from acquaintances, in their houses. The sums of money being stolen are also larger, and bank cards are being taken in an attempt to get even more cash. These changes in the behaviours encouraged by the Adventurous Thief suggest an increased daring and confidence. There is also a suggestion that the Adventurous Thief is becoming increasingly indifferent to other people, and increasingly associated with certain personality traits.

The increased indifference towards others suggests that the Adventurous Thief has adopted the Lonely Boy imago’s isolation from others and lack of emotional understanding. In addition to his shared outlook, there appear to be parallels in their development. The Adventurous Thief becomes stronger and committing higher value offences at approximately the same time as the Lonely Boy imago rejects the Controlling Mother’s attempts at closeness. The concurrence of these changes suggests further ways in which these imagoes maintain a mutually beneficial relationship in Jacques’ adolescence. Firstly, by increasing the benefit offered by offending, the Adventurous Thief allows the Lonely Boy imago decreased dependence on the Controlling Mother or Distant Father for emotional interaction. The Adventurous Thief imago thus supports the Lonely Boy imago’s desire for distance from the Controlling Mother and Distant Father. Ensuring this relationship does not change also helps ensure that the Lonely Boy remains Jacques’ preferred mode of interaction, reflecting the greater acceptance Jacques has towards the Lonely Boy in adolescence. Simultaneously, the Lonely Boy is maintaining the emotional

isolation and distance which allows the Adventurous Thief's experiments in offending to develop untrammelled (with this isolation and distance providing a continued motive). This hypothetical symbiosis between Jacques' imagoes of self appears to result in them becoming stronger, and rejecting the controls attempted by Jacques' parents. This absence of control is a further benefit to both imagoes.

As Jacques moved from adolescence into adulthood, he appears to have entered a period of aimlessness and drifting. It is notable that in the period of adulthood before his first murder the only developments pertain to those imagoes associated with Jacques' self: the Adventurous Thief and Lonely Boy. Neither the Controlling Mother nor Distant Father imagoes are mentioned in the narrative of his adulthood, nor are new imagoes associated with others embodied in his narrative. This highlights Jacques' increasing isolation from others. This also confirms that after adolescence all controls over him were removed. This isolation and lack of control is bourn out by the increasing severity of his offences in adulthood.

This period marks the emergence of the Passive Man imago. The Passive Man is an evolution of the Lonely Boy imago. The Passive Man imago becomes Jacques' preferred mode of interaction with 'everyday' adult life, that is, with life outside his offending. The adult imago of the Passive Man adopts the major characteristics of the Lonely Boy, the key difference being the Passive Man's ability to carry out a 'normal' life. Entering employment and getting engaged both suggest apparent normality and that the Lonely Boy imago has grown up. However, as suggested in the name, the Passive Man is characterised by a lack of dynamism. He is not ambitious, has no clear life goals, and appears indifferent to maintaining friendships. The Passive Man seems ruled by circumstance rather than his own motivation. The last mentioned is particularly evident in Jacques' relationship with his fiancé: where his narrative suggests he was trapped by his lack of emotional understanding. His narrative suggests he was both a passive recipient of his fiancé's love, with his emotions remaining 'locked inside'. The major themes of his lack of emotional connection with others and his inability to perceive or understand his own emotions therefore persist in his adulthood imagoes.

The fact that Jacques' relationship is governed by the Passive Man imago is further shown by his seeming lack of emotional engagement with his fiancé, with him seemingly not concerned with her reactions or emotions. Similarly, he does not state any desire to develop his relationship further and in contrast to his fiancé, appears to play a slightly apathetic role in their relationship. This passivity is also shown in the fact that while Jacques implies he would have liked "something more" in relationship, he does not appear to have broached this subject with his fiancé. Jacques' lack of emotional engagement with his fiancé has three implications for our understanding of his narrative. First, it ensured that his fiancé was not internalised or embodied in his narrative as an imago, and was thus incapable of making lasting changes to his narrative. Second, this implies that the shift from Lonely Boy to Passive Man has increased, rather than relieved, Jacques's emotional isolation. Third, this increase in emotional isolation appears to have encouraged evolution and divergence in the Adventurous Thief imago, drawing on its origin myth.

The Passive Man recalls the repressed and unrealised frustrations of the Lonely Boy, and echoes his unspecified desire for 'something more' at a time when his narrative contains a heightened sense of his emotional isolation. These frustrations, and this 'desire for something more', appear related to a lack of emotional interaction and continued emotional isolation. This unspecified desire can also be tentatively linked to a desire for experience. However the Passive Man imago is not equipped to meet these desires. He is portrayed as helplessly trapped by his lack of emotional understanding, with his lack of acknowledgement of his frustrations encouraging passivity. The Passive Man thus needs the Adventurous Thief to ease these frustrations which, as demonstrated by the established relationship between the Adventurous Thief and the Lonely Boy, can be done by things other than emotional interaction, such as "fun" theft.

Thus the Passive Man continues to need its relationship with the more dynamic Adventurous Thief to handle the resurgence in feelings of emotional isolation which occur at this time, against a background of Jacques aimlessness upon leaving school. This combination of factors, which the Passive Man is unable cope with, could be hypothesised to lead to an increase in the offending associated with the Adventurous

Thief. This hypothesis is supported by the correlation between Jacques' starting a relationship and employment at the same time as he starts burgling houses.

It is also notable that Jacques' interesting occupation in the police, and the satisfactory aspects of his relationship, do not appear to have made his offending less severe. This suggests that the linkage between the Adventurous Thief and Passive Man imagoes can now only be evoked in reaction to stimuli, particularly emotional isolation, that have previously encouraged offending. Positive events thus have no affect on the Adventurous Thief, since the established link to the Passive Man is not able to convey this affect.

The nature of this link also means that the Adventurous Thief and Passive Man are almost entirely separate from each other. This makes it possible for Jacques to continue the 'normal' life of the Passive Man at the same time as the Adventurous Thief's offending becomes more severe. This separation is also demonstrated by Jacques not making any explicit correlations between his offending and any other aspects of his narrative, nor linking the chronology of his relationship or work, with that of his offending. This characteristic of the link between these imagoes, and the separation it implies, has positive effects for both imagoes: it encourages passivity and stasis in the Passive Man while encouraging further offending in the Adventurous Thief.

These factors lead to the Adventurous Thief imago evolving to become the Searching Burglar imago. The Searching Burglar imago becomes the means of fulfilling the Passive Man's unmet desires. The Searching Burglar represents a continuation and development of the Adventurous Thief. It retains the way in which the Adventurous Thief's behaviours develop through a process of experimentation. Like the Adventurous Thief it is fundamentally self-interested, self-involved and indifferent to others: the burglaries are committed for personal gain, no thought is given to the victims, and the imago is motivated by his own desires (as opposed to, for example, being motivated by altruism or revenge). The new imago also retains the Adventurous Thief's motivations for offending: material gain and "fun" / adventure (the latter now, with burglaries, having an element of 'thrill' to them).

In addition to this continuity, there are notable additions to the motivations and behaviours of the Adventurous Thief imago in the Searching Burglar. The emerging Searching Burglar imago demonstrates additional motives of sneakiness / secrecy, habit, and the search for experience. All are given as additional sources of satisfaction for Jacques, and reasons for his not being able to stop offending. They also re-iterate the almost complete separation of the Passive Man from the Searching Burglar. The last of these motives, the search for experience, appears the most fundamental. The search for experience that emerges at this stage appears to be related to the aimlessness and lack of emotional engagement of the Passive Man. The Searching Burglar's desire for experience is represented as a development from the experimentation of adolescence.

This development in motivation is mirrored in changes in the behaviours associated with the offending imago. Jacques is now committing burglaries, characterised by an opportunistic decision to exploit any premises left insecure. He said he would keep watch on the house before entering, enter without being sure whether anyone was there, quickly steal items and make his escape. He is not deterred by the presence or potential presence of people and is stealing more items. Previously furtive, Jacques has become more bold and confident. In notable contrast to the Passive Man, the Searching Burglar is established as impulsive, decisive and goal-oriented.

Jacques' attempted rape at this point in his narrative is explicable with reference to the Adventurous Thief and Searching Burglar imagoes. Jacques makes explicit linkages between the handbag theft of the Adventurous Thief and the rapes he would go onto to commit, commenting that his targeting women for theft 'may have' lead to his rapes. He mentions these linkages alongside comments that the "habit" of offending became hard to break free of. Both these factors allow an implicit connection to be made between the emergence of the Searching Burglar, Jacques' desire for experience, and the increasing desire to commit rape. Therefore when Jacques first tries to rape a woman he encounters during one of his burglaries, his actions are consistent with motives and developmental path of the Searching Burglar imago. This attempted rape also demonstrates the limits of the influence of the Searching Burglar, lacking the calm confidence associated with his burglaries. The imago does not appear to have evolved sufficiently to offer him the template for behaviour it provides

elsewhere, or the mode of interpersonal transaction needed to justify the progression to more explicit and serious exploitation of others. It is at this stage that Jacques commits his first murder.

The murder of Thomasina Selepeng represents a continuation rather than an evolution in the Searching Burglar imago. The factors that suggest a continuation are: the opportunistic, impulsive decision to enter the property and to attack Thomasina, the material motive for the offence, the offence being initially intended as a walk-in burglary, and the continuing development of offending via risk-taking and experimentation. In addition to this the factors which show the limitations of the Searching Burglar imago during the previous attempted rape also persist in the similarities in tone and mode of expressions in Jacques' descriptions of these events, and in his seemingly confused and muddled actions during the offence (so unlike his cool-headed burglaries). This suggests that the Searching Burglar imago that was motivating Jacques' offending at the time of his attempted rape continues to do so, unchanged, here.

Therefore at the time of Jacques' murder of Thomasina the Searching Burglar imago did not provide unequivocal justification, or behavioural template, for rape or murder. However Jacques' actions were consistent with the motives and development path of the Searching Burglar.

In between the first and second offences the Passive Man remains in stasis, continuing to be the mode of interpersonal transaction used by Jacques to negotiate his relationships in everyday life; indifferent to maintaining friendships, lacking in ambition and dynamism. The Passive Man does not evolve further in Jacques' narrative. This appears to benefit the imagoes associated with his offending, which now evolve significantly. One of the events in Jacques' life immediately prior to the second offence which could have hypothetically contributed to his offending was his being transferred from a job he enjoyed to a post he found boring. While evidence supporting his hypothesis is not strong, it would suggest that the Searching Burglar imago's motive of desire for experience was becoming more strong than the Passive Man's desire to overcome emotional isolation (which had provided the initial motive for the Adventurous Thief imago). This suggests that the Searching Burglar imago

was becoming more dominant, and the separation between Jacques’ offending and non-offending imagoes more pronounced.

Thomasina’s murder, the first incident, thus marks the point at which Jacques’ offending imagoes become increasingly dominant and the focus for change in his narrative. The ‘experiment’ of his first murder lead to Jacques’ explicitly acknowledging, rather than implying, that he would like to commit rapes. However for two years he did not act on this urge, instead reverting to the behaviours that have been established as part of the Searching Burglar’s characteristic modes of interaction. Jacques’ gaining access to a firearm allowed the Searching Burglar to undertake the interpersonal transactions needed to act on its desire for rape. In order to avoid confusion the below table summarises which victim, and what offence(s), were being referred to in each of Jacques’ ‘incidents’

Table 9: *Summary of Jacques’ ‘incidents’ and victims*

Incident	Victim	Offences*
1.	Thomasina Selepeng	Murder
2.	Sylvia Claasen	Rape, theft, using a vehicle without the owner’s consent
3.	Jane Ferreira	Rape, theft
4.	Rebecca Marais	Murder, rape, theft
5.	Belinda Wiley	Murder, rape, theft
6.	Margaret Welwyn	Murder, rape
7.	Judith Schoeman	Murder, rape, robbery**, theft

*Refers to offences for which Jacques was convicted.

** Robbery refers to theft from a person using violence of threats of violence.

The rape committed during the second incident, the rape of Sylvia Claasen, demonstrated a notable evolution in Jacques’ offending imagoes and the interactions between them. Whether this evolution occurred prior to the offence itself, or whether the successful offence (facilitated by the firearm) encouraged this evolution is not

clear. This reflects a central debate in narrative approaches to crime and will be discussed more in the next chapter. Notwithstanding this, the rape of Sylvia appeared to have clear support from his offending imago. This is demonstrated in the contrasts between this incident, his attempted rape, and the first incident. In the rape of Sylvia Claasen his behaviours are confident, clearly orientated towards the goal of rape, and the offence is described with clarity and precision.

This offence thus marks the emergence of the Habitual Rapist. The Habitual Rapist adopts the Searching Burglar's motivations and characteristics, displaying the same five features of the prototypical imago. The firearm allows the Habitual Rapist to commit rape with the calmness previously associated with the Searching Burglar's offences. The emergent Habitual Rapist retains the Searching Burglar's motivations of material gain, "sneakiness", and "fun". The emergent Habitual Rapist imago appears to put more emphasis on two of the Searching Burglar's characteristics: indifference towards others, and the motivation provided by the desire for experience. Neither are new, both being an increased emphasis on pre-existing features of the Searching Burglar imago. This further demonstrates that the transition from Searching Burglar to Habitual Rapist imagoes represents a shift in emphases on a continuum rather than a complete change in character. This shift also demonstrates that the imagoes associated with offending continue to develop through a process of experimentation.

In the third incident, Jacques second rape, the imago development highlighted in the previous incident continues. The third incident, the rape of Jane Ferreira, represents a consolidation of the patterns already noted, specifically in the Habitual Rapist imago. The behavioural patterns encouraged by the various imagoes associated with his offending (the Adventurous Thief, Searching Burglar, and Habitual Rapist) are all expressed in the rape of Jane Ferreira. This behavioural continuity in the influence of his imagoes supports the assertions made in Jacques's narrative that all his offences are part of the same process.

The third incident sees the 'search for experience' motivation engrained in the Habitual Rapist imago, the features of this imago confirmed, and sees it emerging as the more dominant of Jacques' imagoes of self. This incident demonstrates that Jacques' search for experience (particularly experiences associated with sexual acts)

becomes the Habitual Rapist's main motive. While motives such as 'sneakiness' and material benefit remain, they now have less obvious influence. Similarly, while most of the characteristics and offence behaviours of the Habitual Rapist remain unchanged (and the Habitual Rapist retains the emotional isolation and lack of understanding that pervades Jacques' narrative), this incident confirms that Jacques was now feeling trapped in the habit of offending. Jacques had some perception the consequences of this, but was unable to break free of the Habitual Rapist's offending. These statements of helplessness both absolve Jacques (or the Passive Man imago) of responsibility for the offences, and emphasise the Habitual Rapist's growing dominance. This emerging dominance is reflected in the Habitual Rapist's increased confidence, and his increasingly treating victims as objects for gaining experience from.

The fourth incident was Jacques' second murder, and the first that occurred while the Habitual Rapist was present in his narrative. The behaviours Jacques displays in this offence remain consistent with those associated with the Habitual Rapist imago, with the offence behaviour for committing a rape is clearly defined: break into a location, return to that location repeatedly, return later to commit rape during which the victim is controlled using a firearm (alongside instrumental violence), and leave the location taking some precautions to avoid capture. In this incident, those precautions meant killing the victim, Rebecca Marais. It is clear that the Habitual Rapist imago, as expressed in Jacques' narrative, had already taken the decision to kill the victims if necessary to avoid capture after the third incident. The role of the victim remains unchanged: her characteristics are of little concern to the Habitual Rapist and she is considered only as a source of experience and experiment. The only notable behavioural differences between this and previous offences were Jacques' longer period of reconnaissance prior to offending, and his killing of the victim. These differences are thematically consistent with what has occurred prior to this offence and so do not demonstrate a significant change in his imago. They thus represent a further strengthening of the Habitual Rapist imago and a growth in its confidence.

Therefore while this incident does not represent a significant evolution in the Habitual Rapist imago, it does confirm the Habitual Rapist imago's dominance, which was emerging in the previous incident, in Jacques narrative. This dominance is most clearly expressed by Jacques' continued affirmations that he couldn't control himself,

and that his offences were part of a habit he could no longer stop. The latter point is emphasised by the shortening time between offences. This sense of dominance is added to by the fact that at this stage in his narrative Jacques does not highlight any relationships between the Habitual Rapist imago and any other imago. The dominance of the Habitual Rapist is more subtly expressed in Jacques' associating the Habitual Rapist with his sense of emotional isolation and, in the extreme, his "dead feeling". By doing this Jacques is associating a fundamental theme in his narrative with the Habitual Rapist imago. This theme of emotional isolation has pervaded his narrative since childhood, forming part of both his 'offending' and 'non-offending' imagoes. An unequivocal association between this theme and the Habitual Rapist imago thus implies that this imago is a dominant influence in his narrative.

The fifth incident sees the Habitual Rapist imago reach the peak of its influence. In this offence, the murder of Belinda Wiley, the behavioural template offered by this imago for committing rape continues to guide and dictate the offences. The victim's role, as well as the imago's fundamental motives, remains unchanged. The continuing process of learning from each offence resulted in this, the offence Jacques enjoyed most. Jacques particular enjoyment of this rape appears related to his having the complete control over his victim necessary to fully experience the act of sex. By fulfilling his desire for the experience of rape the Habitual Rapist has achieved one of the 'wishes, aspirations, or goals' associated with it in Jacques narrative. This desire for experience was a motivating factor in all the offending imagoes, initially arising as a means to overcome the Lonely Boy's emotional isolation and lack of emotional interaction. Reaching this goal, and the peak of its influence, appears to have an affect on subsequent offences.

This effect appears to suggest that Jacques' offence behaviour once more moves beyond the limits of the mode of interpersonal interaction embodied in dominant imago. In this case, it appears that having achieved complete control over a victim, the Habitual Rapist does not know what to do once the experience of rape is exhausted. It similarly appears that the sense of emotional isolation that the offending imagoes initially arose to counteract remains. Therefore the Habitual Rapist has achieved the goal of experience but not the benefit that Jacques hoped for, or the function that the offending imagoes served with reference to the other imagoes.

Even though the murder of Margaret Welwyn (the sixth incident) is brief it demonstrates a number of important changes in the Habitual Rapist imago. These are expressed in the behavioural changes in this offence: a detailed reconnaissance is not carried out before this offence, and rather than controlling the victim using instrumental violence, the victim is immediately shot in response to resistance. The last-mentioned also suggest that Jacques is becoming increasingly contemptuous of his victims, which re-iterates that it was the Passive Man, not the Habitual Rapist that desired an end to emotional isolation.

What Jacques terms his “recklessness” in this offence suggests the structure the Habitual Rapist brought to previous offences appears to be breaking down. This deviation from behaviours which served Jacques well in previous offences appears related to conflict within the Habitual Rapist imago. This conflict arose from two sources: the Habitual Rapist had achieved its goal of experience but not the benefits it hoped for, which could have lead to confusion, and Jacques was now trapped in the habit of offending embodied in the Habitual Rapist imago. Thus by the time of the sixth incident there was strong conflict within the Habitual Rapist imago between the continued desire for experience via offending, and the confusion as to whether this is still a valid goal. However the Habitual Rapist retains certain behaviours and characteristics: Jacques still enters his victim’s houses at night, uses a firearm to control them, and steals money. He still remains cool headed. The Habitual Rapist is still isolated from Jacques’ other imagoes, and is still not influenced by positive external factors. It is not clear from Jacques’ narrative why certain behaviours and characteristics would be affected by conflict within the imago and others would not. The Habitual Rapist imago does not appear to have reverted to an earlier imago (such as the Searching Burglar or Adventurous Thief) as he did following Jacques’ first murder. Rather the offending imago appears to be losing the coherence it built up via its various incarnations as Adventurous Thief, Searching Burglar and Habitual Rapist.

Jacques’ final murder, that of Judith Schoeman, sees a continuation in the combination of stability and change in the behaviours and personality traits associated with the imago, and a more marked reversion in the imago. The Habitual Rapist imago remains bold and calm, kills the victims for the same reason, is still motivated

by for material gain and thrill, and still treats the victims as an object to gain experience from. However the behavioural changes that occur alongside these stable elements suggest that Jacques' was beginning to draw more strongly on previous offending imagoes to supply appropriate modes of interpersonal transaction. That is, in certain aspects of its behaviour, the Habitual Rapist imago was reverting to previous offending imagoes (the Adventurous Thief and Searching Burglar).

Thus his final offence shows that the behaviours inherited by the Habitual Rapist from Searching Burglar and Adventurous Thief continue to be expressed, and the behaviours associated with these previous imagoes are expressed more strongly as the Habitual Rapist loses coherence. This re-iterates the continuity in Jacques' imagoes of self associated with his offending (theft, burglary, rape and murder). These represent a developmental continuum, with each imago drawing on the characteristics and motivations of the previous. Jacques' narrative repeatedly highlights the progression, and implied causal relationship, between his earliest thefts from handbags and his rape-murders.

Jacques' reflections after his arrest confirm the established features of his offending and non-offending imagoes of self, and the separation between them in his narrative. His reflections re-iterate our understandings of the offence behaviours and patterns of behaviour encouraged by the imagoes associated with his offending, and confirm that these imagoes provided a series of behavioural templates for Jacques' offending. These reflections confirm how strong the habit of offending, and so the offending imagoes, had become. Finally, they confirm that the emotional isolation and lack of emotional understanding first seen in the Lonely Boy imago remained a notable feature of his narrative, despite the efforts of the offending imagoes to overcome it.

5.2.4.3 Answers to narrative inquiries.

To summarise the above discussions, Jacques' narrative contributes to our answers to the narrative inquiries in the following ways.

a) What roles do imagoes play in the motivation of a person who commits serial murder?

This question asks what role Jacques' imagoes had in *causing* his offences. The reasons Jacques gives for having committed the offences can be considered his motives. Jacques gives six motives for his actions. These motives arise at different periods in his life, and once they arise they do not disappear again. However they develop and vary in strength at different stages of the narrative, with different motives become more dominant at different times in his life.

All of the motives Jacques gives in his narrative are either embodied in, or arise as the result of interaction between, his imagoes. This is summarised in Table 10 below. Imagoes can thus be said to play a significant role in his offending. In Jacques' narrative there are two facets to the role: (a) the role of imagoes in embodying motives specifically for offending and (b) the interaction between imagoes in creating or strengthening motive.

With reference to (b), in this narrative the interaction between imagoes appears to have created Jacques' most fundamental motive (emotional isolation and lack of understanding). Subsequent interaction between his offending and non-offending imagoes encouraged the development of motives specifically associated with offending, and embodied in his offending imagoes. In Jacques' narrative the presence of multiple motives (and his imagoes' role with reference to these) encourages a more complex and dynamic understanding of the motives of a person who commits serial murder. This understanding also suggests that motive overlaps with developmental factors, which is discussed in the second research question, and further in the last chapter.

Table 10: *Summary of Jacques' motives and their relationships to his imagoes*

Motive	Relationship to imagoes	Period of life first noted	Notes
1. Emotional isolation from others, and lack of emotional understanding.	Arises due to interaction between Controlling Mother, Distant Father. Embodied in Lonely Boy (later Passive Man)	Childhood	Pervades his narrative, associated with loneliness, distance from others, and the inability to express or understand emotions. Expressed in the offending imagoes as 'indifference to others'
2. Fun / Adventure	Adventurous Thief	Childhood –	Arise in reaction to 1.
3. Money / Material gain		Adolescence	
4. The search for experience.	Adventurous Thief – Searching Burglar	Adolescence – Adulthood	Initially expressed as the Passive Man's search for 'something', eased by offending imagoes. Later becomes the dominant motive, with Habitual Rapist
5. Sneakiness / secrecy	Searching Burglar	Adolescence – Adulthood	
6. Habit	Searching Burglar	Adulthood	Engrained in Habitual Rapist

b) What roles do imagoes in the development of offending behaviour in serial murder?

Jacques' narrative finds that imagoes play a very significant role in the development of offending behaviour in a person who commits serial murder. Jacques conceives of his offending as a process of evolution from handbag thefts, to walk-in burglaries, to rape, to murder and his narrative makes the importance of this process in causing his murders explicit. His narrative links all aspects of this continuum to offending imagoes, and repeatedly emphasises its importance.

Thus imagoes embody Jacques' motives, and are the means by which they are expressed in behaviour. The imagoes allow this expression in three ways: (a) by creating a separation between offending and non-offending images; (b) by establishing the means by which offence behaviours develop; and (c) by setting the behavioural template for his offences. Together, these factors supply the supporting rationale for the development of Jacques' offending by giving him moral support for this actions.

The first factor, (a), encourages the development of offending by allowing Jacques' offending imagoes to develop with minimal interference or control from the rest of the narrative or by Jacques' life events. It is notable that interactions between his offending and non-offending imagoes lessen as his offending gets more severe. As discussed previously, by the time of Jacques' adulthood the only interaction between his offending and non-offending imagoes that appears to have any effect is that which further encourages his offending. The second aspect, (b) relates specifically to his offending imagoes, which encourage the development of further offending behaviours through a process of experimentation.

The setting of a behavioural template for offending, (c), would encourage the development of offending by providing Jacques with a clearer plan for offending, and so simplify the behavioural choices he needs to make when doing so. Based on the similarities between many of his offences, we can hypothesise that Jacques was drawing on a template of behaviours in his offending.

Jacques' behavioural template for offending appears effected by his imagoes. This is demonstrated in the congruence between the motives embodied in his imagoes, and the characteristics of the offence (e.g. the motive for material gain being expressed in theft, or motives of emotional isolation and the desire for experience being expressed in the role Jacques gives his victims). This is further shown in the congruence between the characteristics of Jacques' offences and the characteristics of his offending imagoes. For example, the bold, decisive, cool-headed, and self-interested Habitual Rapist imago is expressed in the offence behaviours of reconnoitring the location in advance, entering the victims' home addresses at night, maintaining control over the victim, and taking measures to avoid being captured. The importance of this behavioural template in the successful completion of his offences, and the close relationship this has with his offending imagoes, is further demonstrated in the loss of coherence in Jacques crime scene behaviours when the Habitual Rapist's motive became conflicted. This last point again shows the interrelationship between motive and development.