David Goldie's two part documentary, *Without Consent*, raised the issue of rape, once again, before the public in Australia. He was aware that this would be the case and approached the Australian Institute of Criminology months in advance of the program's broadcast with a suggestion that the Institute follow up where the documentary left off with a conference on the subject of sexual assault. It was hoped that the public's (and the government's) attention and agendas would therefore remain focused on the issues which *Without Consent* had highlighted. Rape, like other violent crimes against women, flourish within a context of secrecy. Discussion, therefore, serves more than an educative or informative function; it also keeps the subject in the light and hopefully breaks down some of the walls of silence.

Over the three days of the conference, workers in the field of sexual assault, academics, lawyers, politicians, and most importantly, survivors of rape, met, listened to research papers, attended workshops and heard about the experiences of those who have either worked in the field or who have lived through the violence of assault. Given the heterogeneity of the participants, it was predictably inevitable that some left the meeting with ambivalent feelings; what they had hoped would happen had not occurred. The lawyer academic may have wanted more of a focus on specific substantive law reform issues; the survivor may have wanted less academic prose and more sharing and caring amongst those who had been victimised. And, some may have wished that answers would have been more forthcoming.

None, or just little vignettes, of the above took place. What did occur was what David Goldie had wanted—rape was placed in the spotlight. We did learn about the background to rape (Part 1) and a lot about its effects upon the survivors (Part 2), less about its perpetrators (Part 3) and, finally, some suggestions concerning prevention and what needs to be changed were made (Part 4).

It is a start—not the finished product that some may have hoped for—and possibly even a catalyst for those who attended the conference to take some sort of action, from a state legislator who initiated a senate inquiry into sexual assault to an individual who stopped denying her own victimisation. At a macro scale, the media attention might have been a springboard for intensive journalistic scrutiny of judges' comments during the months following the conference. At the time of this writing, that coverage has yielded a veritable tidal wave of opinion from the public, politicians, and even some judges concerning the need for the judiciary to receive training in gender-based issues such as rape.
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