

and hate it. A reaction against the new feminism has arrived almost simultaneously, as the discontents of disgruntled and unsettled men are stirred and stoked online, in the so-called manosphere. Cynical politicians crusading against “political correctness,” such as Trump, have fed off this baleful energy. In this clamorous world, “patriarchy” has become “the patriarchy,” a further simplification that makes it seem even more crude and concrete—less of an invisible mechanism, more of a statue to be smashed.

One might reasonably ask whether the patriarchy is truly in any danger, as Steve Bannon fears. It is easier to topple patriarchs, as Susan Faludi pointed out in the wake of Weinstein, than patriarchy. Powerful men who have been called out by #MeToo have left the room, but the room itself still looks very much the same. (Some of the men, too, look very much as if they will be returning to the room quite soon.) If anything can unravel “the rule of the father,” it is likely to be the gradual shift in the way gender and sexuality are being understood. New ways of bringing up children outside traditional family structures will chip away at it. So will the rising generation of bold young feminists who have not internalised oppression like their elders, and who are calling out sexism and misogyny where they see it.

But Bannon can relax. As Mary Beard said recently: “Patriarchy has had several thousand years of practice—of course it’s good at it. It’s very good at bolstering its own sexist values.” If a horde of angry leading women did take a guillotine to the testicles of Harvey Weinstein, patriarchy would survive. The word “patriarchy” ought to be a reminder that Weinstein and his ilk are the symptom, not the disease—but it is easier to tackle individuals than structures, signs rather than causes.

At the moment—although the picture varies wildly across the globe—feminists are increasingly using the tool of “patriarchy” to recognise the subtle depth of the forces that keep oppression in place, from the expectations about the behaviour of women in the workplace to the way they are portrayed in fiction. It will be harder to unravel the effect of this cultural inheritance than it was to get the vote. As Max Weber observed, it is the very longevity of patriarchal traditions and norms that serve to prop it up—“the belief in the inviolability of that which has existed from time out of mind.” The eradication of patriarchy looks like a task of enormous complexity; when it is smashed, it will take a lot down with it. And so the patriarchs—from the bully in the White House to the bully in your workplace—are still in charge. For now.

RESISTING GENDER VIOLENCE

Gender violence in the United States and worldwide is an important public health and human rights issue. Violence, an assault on livelihood, safety, and the control of the body and life, can take many forms and has varying consequences depending on the type of assault, its context and interpretation, the chronicity of violence, and the availability of support. Gender violence implies that harm evolves from the imbalance in power associated with masculinity and femininity. In this chapter we introduce and define the issue of interpersonal gender violence and focus specifically on certain types of abusive behaviors that include stalking, bullying, and physical and sexual violence. Although our focus here is on interpersonal violence, we also make the point that gender violence concerns imbalances of power in society generally that facilitate violence perpetrated and condoned by the state in, for example, detention, incarceration, and police harassment, as well as in forms of violence associated with colonization, militarism, poverty, transphobia, and homophobia. These are examples of what scholars call structural violence. We make the point that these forms of violence stand alone as well as shape interpersonal experiences of violence in everyday lives.

And finally we want to emphasize again that even though we recognize the need to destabilize the normative categories of gender and resist binary aspects of opposing women to men as if these categories were “natural” ones, it is especially in this focus on violence that the material realities of identifying, and being identified, as a “woman” have real consequences. Living in certain bodies in the context of systemic and structured institutional power relationships means that women do exist as a knowable social group who are abused on the basis of misogynous attitudes and practices. This is true for both cisgender women and transwomen, although of course their experiences vary in terms of the consequences of gender conformity versus gender nonconformity as individuals are targeted specifically because of the latter. We emphasize these points because this chapter, like many others, incorporates statistics that assume and compare the categories “women” and “men.”

In most societies, interpersonal gender violence (IPV) usually occurs when masculine entitlements produce power that manifests itself in harm and injury toward others. Overwhelmingly this gender power imbalance involves the violence of people who identify as men against others. Those who identify as women are especially vulnerable in intimate relationships. Most violence against them occurs in their own homes, where they are 10 times more likely to be victimized by an intimate partner. IPV is therefore among the most common forms of gender violence, is generally described as abuse within the context of an intimate partner relationship, and, while legal definitions vary by state, can include physical, sexual, and psychological abuse, as well as economic coercion. IPV affects millions of individuals, regardless of sexual and gender identity, race, ethnicity, national origin, age, religion, marital status, education, and social class. Because of the seriousness of this crime, the effects on victims and their families, and variations in the criminal justice system response, survivors of IPV tend to require a range of sustained resources, including access to emergency shelter, housing assistance, legal assistance, protection orders, safety planning, support groups, financial assistance, and other forms of support.

The range of IPV includes acts of intimidation and harassment (stalking; voyeurism; bullying and online/chat room, street, school, and workplace harassment; road rage; and obscene phone calls); forcing someone to watch or participate in pornography, prostitution, and other sex work; emotional/psychological, physical, and sexual abuse (including rape and attempted rape); and any other unwanted coercive act that harms and violates another person. The term “contact sexual violence” is often used to describe criminal acts that include rape, being made to penetrate a perpetrator, sexual coercion, sexual assault, and other unwanted sexual contact. Rates of IPV in the United States are quite alarming, although compared to figures from the early 1990s, rates of contact sexual violence have decreased somewhat, with the exception of stalking and online bullying. Overall, it is estimated that incidences of IPV cost the state and insurance companies, as well as communities, families, and individuals, billions of dollars every year, including lost wages and decreased productivity as well as trauma and distress. Survivors of abuse are disproportionately represented among the homeless and suicide victims.

THAT'S MY STORY AND I'M STICKING TO IT
TATSUYA ISHIDA

And he respected her wish and pestered her no more.

“No,” she said.

One Shade of Grey
A Feminist Fantasy

The End.



Not surprisingly, physical and sexual violence, and especially IPV, are so very underreported that accurate statistics are difficult to collect, and the often tragic consequences are significant. The 1994 Violence Against Women Act (VAWA, passed as Title IV of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act) provides some legal protection and rape shield laws, which prevent a victim's sexual history from being used by defense attorneys, and other various state reform laws have helped survivors. Mandatory arrest procedures and the creation of temporary restraining orders have also supported survivors, despite this carceral approach that relies on the police and courts and which is often shaped by racism, homophobia, and transphobia. As the reading by Homa Khaleeli, “#SayHerName,” emphasizes, reliance on law enforcement is difficult in many communities because people of color, and especially African Americans, are subject to ethnic profiling by law enforcement

GENERED VIOLENCE

Sam Shelton

On the surface, the term ‘gendered violence’ seems pretty straightforward, but it is actually a loaded concept. To fully grasp what this concept is pointing to, we have to break it down into its two parts: “gendered” and “violence.” Let's start with violence. What comes to mind when you think about violence? Many people associate violence with the use of physical force against another person's body, but what makes something violent is more than just the means of inflicting harm. Violence is a method of social control that can take many different forms and exist in many different contexts. The threat of violence can prevent people from diverging too far from social norms, and the use of violence can force people back into boxes. Violence can be physical, but it can also be emotional, spiritual, economic, social, and/or anything else that takes autonomy away from the victim/survivor. The only defining characteristic of violence is that it is coercive—it places pressures on people to look and act in “normal” (or normative) ways.

To say violence is gendered is to recognize that the social construction of gender makes certain forms of social control possible. Gender constructs are grounded in systems of power, which means that the gender categories we are seen to occupy make us more or less vulnerable to different kinds of violence. Since violence is about containment and control, it tends to come from people in positions of privilege. Men, for example, are disproportionately the perpetrators of sexual and domestic violence. People on the opposite end of the spectrum, those who are disadvantaged by systems of power, more often have violence enacted against them by people who feel entitled to their bodies and lives. Transgender people experience astonishingly high

rates of interpersonal violence when in public, ranging from harassment and derision to assault and even murder. Perpetrators often attempt to justify violence by saying they were provoked by the appearance or behavior of the victim/survivor. This is victim-blaming.

The concept of gender violence helps us understand the relationships between constructions of gender and the workings of power, but it also poses the danger of essentialism. All too often, when people refer to gender violence, they fail to think about the ways that gender intersects with other sites of difference (e.g., race, class, and ability). When we consider only gender, we run the risk of erasing the experiences of people for whom gender violence is simultaneously racialized, or classed, or disabling. There is no “general” account of gender violence because we are never just gendered people. For example, women of color might experience gender violence in a very different way than white women. Racialized gender violence often depends on the stereotypes associated with particular racial groups. Asian women might be exoticized. Arab or Muslim women might experience gender violence that targets their cultural or religious beliefs. In any case, it is important to recognize the ways that gender violence looks different based on which gendered people we are talking about (Crenshaw 1991; Fuller 2004).

To learn more about gendered violence, visit INCITE! Women, Gender Non-Conforming, and Trans People of Color Against Violence at www.incite-national.org.

References

- Crenshaw, K. (1991). “Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color.” *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–1299.
- Fuller, A. (2004). “What Difference Does Difference Make? Women, Race-Ethnicity, Social Class, and Social Change.” *Race, Class, and Gender*, 11(4), 8–29.

and increased deaths as a result of police shootings. This reading focuses on the #SayHerName campaign that was created to raise awareness about the number of women and girls that are killed by law enforcement officers. Khaleeli's goal is to raise awareness of these issues and the ways state violence impacts women.

Violence against indigenous girls, women, and other marginalized people is a problem worldwide. The wars of the twentieth century and the new conflicts of the twenty-first, the increase in globalization, and the scope of global commerce and communications have all facilitated an increase in gender violence. It is broadly estimated that approximately one in three girls and women worldwide is beaten, coerced into sex, and otherwise abused. This violence involves economic exploitation and sexual abuse, as well as gender-based violence in situations of armed violence, insecurity, and communal conflicts. Such gendered violence must be understood in the context of ongoing discrimination against indigenous peoples as well as their marginalization in terms of violation of individual and collective rights, poverty, and displacement.

These problems occur despite United Nations Resolution 1325 on women and peace and security, adopted in 2000, which presents measures to protect women and girls from gender-based violence, particularly rape and other forms of sexual abuse, in situations of armed conflict. Still, some countries condone or legalize these crimes, and others accept such violence against women as necessary consequences of war and/or civil unrest and ethnic cleansing. Certainly increased militarism and military posturing among countries in the global north have important consequences for the safety of women and children in target societies, usually in the global south, facilitating prostitution and international sex trafficking in girls and women. The reading by Nadje Al-Ali, "Sexual Violence in Iraq: Challenges for Transnational Feminist Politics," addresses sexual violence by ISIS against women in Iraq, particularly Yazidi women, against the historical background of broader sexual and gender-based violence. It emphasizes the need to recognize imperialism and the forces of neoliberalism and globalization as well as local expressions of patriarchy and religious interpretations and practices. Al-Ali questions what a transnational feminist solidarity might look like in this context.

Gender violence is such a persistent problem worldwide that it is increasingly understood in many quarters as a human rights issue. In 2010 the International Violence Against Women Act (I-VAWA) was introduced into Congress and has still not yet passed, although as of this writing it has again been introduced into Congress. It would allocate more than a billion dollars over five years to make the prevention of gender-based violence a "strategic foreign-policy imperative." One key aspect of attempts to address gender violence worldwide includes a focus on international trafficking. In the reading "Gender Aspects of Human Trafficking," Emilie Linder discusses this "grave violation of human rights" and examines the role of poverty and gender inequality in understanding this phenomenon. Linder emphasizes the need to recognize changing patterns of migration as a result of global neoliberal economic policies, wars, and conflict in order to help understand why high numbers of women and girls become vulnerable to trafficking-related violence. It is important to emphasize that sex trafficking does not occur only in places like Southeast Asia, but also in communities within the United States. Indeed, according to the Department of Justice thousands of people are trafficked into the United States every year and

THE IMPACT OF WAR ON WOMEN AND CHILDREN IN SYRIA

Nancy Staton Barbour

The war in Syria began with what has become known as the "Arab Spring"—a wave of protests and anti-government uprisings in North Africa and the Middle East in 2010 and 2011. The overthrow of governments in Tunisia and Egypt, and the rise of similar movements in Oman, Algeria, Jordan, and Yemen, inspired Syrian protesters to demand the resignation of President Bashar al-Assad. The Assad regime responded violently, with security forces opening fire on pro-democracy demonstrators and subjecting protesters to arrest and torture. The government's forceful suppression of dissent only increased the numbers of protesters calling for the removal of Assad. Rebels took up arms to challenge the government's security forces, and a civil war ensued. In the midst of the Syrian conflict, and in the aftermath of the war and subsequent uprisings in neighboring Iraq, a group of jihadist fighters came together to form the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS).

Since 2011, more than 5.6 million Syrians have fled the country to escape clashes between pro-government and opposition forces, bombings of cities and hospitals, chemical attacks, and ISIS kidnappings and killings. More than 6.6 million remain internally displaced within Syria. According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the war in Syria has created "the biggest humanitarian and refugee crisis of our time" (2018).

The bombing and shelling of homes and buildings that provide social services is a key factor forcing displacement in Syria (Handicap International, 2017). For many displaced Syrian women and children, the lack of security is a constant issue. Women who have lost male family members and are unable to remain safely in their homes face increased economic hardship and vulnerability to crime. The destruction of medical facilities greatly reduces access to reproductive and other health services. In addition, the burden of caring for family members injured in attacks falls disproportionately on women.

Whether internally displaced or living as refugees outside of Syria, women and girls face a higher risk of sexual assault. A UNHCR survey of Syrian women refugees in Lebanon, Turkey, and Jordan found that 60 percent lived in fear of sexual violence. The refugees faced pervasive threats of assault and harassment from strangers in public places, including police officers, service providers, and cab drivers, as well as individuals known to them, like employers, landlords, and neighbors (Leitner Center, 2018). The desire to protect their daughters from the risk of sexual assault has led to higher rates of child marriages among Syrian refugees.

A 2018 report found that Syrian women refugees continued to face numerous threats, including "labor exploitation, discriminatory housing practices, lack of access to sexual and reproductive health services, sexual assault and harassment, child marriage, barriers to education, domestic violence, human trafficking, discrimination and violence based on their sexuality or gender identity, and lack of access to justice" (Leitner Center, 2018, p. 2). The report urged the inclusion of specific rights for female refugees in the Global Compact on Refugees, a document developed by the UNHCR in response to the global refugee crisis and presented to the UN General Assembly in November 2018.

References

- Handicap International. (2017). "Everywhere the Bombing Followed Us": Forced Displacement and the Use of Explosive Weapons in Populated Areas. Perspectives of Explosive Weapons in Populated Areas. Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.org/en-us/events/conferences/5a86aa607/forced-displacement-use-explosive-weapons-populated-areas-perspectives.html?query=syrian%20women>
- Leitner Center for International Law and Justice. (2018). "Gendered-Approach Inputs to UNHCR for the Global Compact on Refugees (2018): Lessons from Abuses Faced by Syrian Female Refugees in Lebanon, Turkey, and Jordan." UNHCR. Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.org/5a3bb9b77.pdf>
- UNHCR. (2018). "Syria Emergency." Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.org/en-us/syria-emergency.html>

approximately 70 percent end up working in the sex industry. These problems exist despite the fact that there are U.S. laws against human trafficking at the federal level such as the U.S. Trafficking Victims Protection Act (2000) and at state levels. It is important to recognize the need for law enforcement training and survivor services alongside legislation in addressing this national problem. It also is important to recognize the distinction between human trafficking and sex trafficking in terms of differences between coerced sex trafficking and women who freely cross national borders to engage in sex work. Feminists of the

SEX TRAFFICKING OF GIRLS IN NIGERIA

Folah Oludayo

In human trafficking people are forced, tricked, or threatened into situations in which they are exploited sexually or financially or through forced labor (Jorgen, 2006). Trafficking can be understood as a modern form of slavery. The trafficking of girls for the purpose of prostitution and other forms of exploitative labor is a widespread phenomenon in Nigeria, which has made this country a source, transit, and destination country for trafficked women and girls (Cullen-DuPont, 2009). Many hundreds of young Nigerian girls are sent to Europe and Asia every year, where they are put to work in brothels and strip clubs or sent out to prostitute themselves in the streets. Internal trafficking also occurs within Nigeria's borders (Ifedigbo, 2013).

In 2009 the United Nations Office for Drugs and Crimes estimated that between 3,000 and 6,000 girls are trafficked each year from West Africa. Women and children account for 80 percent of cases of human trafficking. The National Agency for the Prohibition of Trafficking in Persons (NAPTIP) and United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) also report that 46 percent of repatriated victims of external trafficking in Nigeria are children, with a female-to-male ratio of seven to three (UNICEF, 2007). Children who are trafficked to other countries are engaged mainly in prostitution (46 percent), domestic labor (21 percent), forced labor (15 percent), and entertainment (8 percent). Among children who are trafficked within Nigeria, 32 percent are forced into labor, 31 percent into domestic labor, and 30 percent into prostitution.

According to a 2006 report issued by UNESCO, moving young girls from Nigeria to Europe for the purpose of sexual exploitation is one of the most persistent trafficking flows, as it is very well organized and difficult to detect. These victims often have to endure physical and psychological abuse and are under continuous threat of physical harm or deportation.

The *mama ke*, often the sponsor financing the journey, orders the girls and sometimes recruit them, leads the organizations, and monitors the process closely. The victims usually live and work under her control. Baby factories, often in the guise of orphanages, acquire and sell children. Boko Haram continues to kidnap girls for domestic servitude and sexual slavery. Trafficking not only affects girls' physical, emotional, and psychological well-being, but also adversely affects families, the economy, and wider national and transnational communities.

The Nigerian government is taking some, though still inadequate, steps to end trafficking. By creating and enforcing stronger laws, the government can slow trafficking in Nigeria (U.S. Department of State, 2017). More significantly, however, the social, political, and economic conditions that give rise to trafficking must be challenged and changed.

Learning Activity

1. Use online resources at www.unicef.org, unesco.org, and un.org/en to learn more about child trafficking around the world. What contributes to children's vulnerability to trafficking? How are various nations and organizations combating child trafficking?
2. Visit UNICEFUSA's resources for ending child trafficking at <https://www.unicefusa.org/mission/protect/trafficking/end/resources>. What concrete steps can you take to contribute to the movement to end child trafficking?
3. Plan an activity on your campus to raise awareness of child trafficking and advocate to end child trafficking.

References

- "Child Trafficking in Nigeria Social Work Essay." (2015). UK Essays. <https://www.ukessays.com/essays/social-work/child-trafficking-in-nigeria-social-work-essay.php?vref=1>.
- Deshpande N. A., & Nour, N. M. (2013). "Sex Trafficking of Women and Girls." *Reviews in Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 6(1), 22–27.
- Cullen-DuPont, K. (2009). *Global Issues: Human Trafficking*. New York: Facts on File.
- Ibriogba, L. (2014). "Tackling Menace of Human Trafficking." *The Nation*. <http://thenationonline.ng.net/tackling-menace-of-human-trafficking/>.
- Ifedigbo, S. N. (2013). "Child Trafficking in Nigeria." <https://nzesylva.wordpress.com/tag/child-trafficking-in-nigeria/>.
- Shelley, L. (2010). *Human Trafficking: A Global Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- UNESCO (2006). *Human Trafficking in Nigeria: Root Causes and Recommendations. Policy Paper Poverty Series* 14.2 (E). <http://nigerianlawguru.com/articles/human%20rights%20law/HUMAN%20TRAFFICKING%20IN%20NIGERIA%20-%20ROOT%20CAUSES%20&%20RECOMMENDATIONS.pdf>
- UNICEF Nigeria. (2007). *Information Sheet: Child Trafficking*. https://www.unicef.org/wcaro/WCARO_Nigeria_Factsheets_ChildTrafficking.pdf.
- U.S. Department of State. (2017). "Trafficking in Persons Report." <https://www.state.gov/tip/rls/tiprpt/countries/2017/271255.htm>.

global north have been guilty of sensationalizing the issue in their desire to "save" women from such sex work, often in ways that ignore the complexity of women's decisions and experiences in this work, and especially the differences between migrating sex workers and those who are coerced into such practices. Of course it is problematic to automatically assume "free choice" in these decisions, because "choices" are often made from limited options and reflect structural realities such as poverty and violence.

Gendered violence is specifically linked to processes of globalization, as already discussed, because these processes often heighten problems associated with gender inequities in relationships, families, and communities at the same time that they often increase women's poverty and therefore their vulnerability. Violence against women in Juarez, Mexico, for example, where countless women have disappeared and been raped and killed, can be explained in part by forces of globalization cheapening women's labor power and therefore their bodies in the context of the forces of prostitution, organized crime, police corruption, and drug trafficking. In addition, globalizing forces have encouraged the status of women to be used as a marker of the level of "civilization" of a society, just as cultural interventions have been justified in part in the name of improving the status of women (as was most recently shown with the U.S. attacks on Afghanistan as "liberating" women from the Taliban, discussed in the reading by Andrea Smith, "Beyond the Politics of Inclusion"). These developments often create complexity for feminist activism as women and men in these countries seeking to address nationalist, patriarchal problems can be interpreted as "traitors"; similarly, they cause problems for feminists in the global north whose activism can be interpreted as ethnocentric meddling or support for the militarist strategies of their own societies.

It is important in all these discussions to understand the tendency to "exoticize" global gendered violence as something that happens elsewhere and to avoid reading such problems as dowry-related violence or acid throwing (when acid is thrown at the face or person to maim or kill) as examples of crimes caused by customs and culture. These crimes are no more exotic or culturally based than atrocities perpetuated against women in the global north on a daily basis. For example, "Nirbhaya," the 23-year-old who died after being gang raped with unspeakable brutality on a bus in New Delhi, India, in late 2012, became an icon of resistance and galvanized protests and calls for change in India. Although her tragic death highlighted the problem of chronic gender violence in India and its relationship to cultural misogyny, it is important for those in the global north to understand that cultural misogyny is present in all of our communities.

Violence is an inherent consequence of militarism in conflict zones; it is also present in the everyday lives of soldiers, who cope with a higher incidence of sexual assault than civilians. Prevalence figures gathered in 2016 show that rates of sexual assault decreased by half for active-duty women and by two-thirds for men over the past 10 years; however, a report released by the U.S. Defense Department in 2018 describes an increase of 10 percent in sexual assault cases compared to data from 2017 across all four military services. These numbers include soldiers who are sexually abused by fellow soldiers and community

members affiliated with their service and reported cases of soldiers abusing nonservice troops. Men's rates of reporting IPV were relatively constant, and women's increased by about 13 percent. In part this reflects changes in reporting procedures: Currently about 1 in every 3 military members reports their sexual assault, up from about 1 in 14 in 2006.

It is important to emphasize that in all these situations where sexual, physical, and emotional abuse is recorded, violence is about the exercise of power and anyone can perpetrate it. But we do know that those who identify as men are most likely to suffer physical violence at the hands of other men, and boys are especially at risk during childhood and adolescence for suffering physical abuse by caretakers of all genders. They are especially at risk for sexual abuse by other boys and men. Given the norms about masculine invulnerability, it is often particularly difficult for these individuals to talk about their abuse and seek help. As a result, they are more likely to be in denial about such experiences, and some men who have been abused try to "master" the abuse by identifying with the source of their victimization and avoiding the weaknesses associated with being a "victim."

Trans individuals and those who are gender nonconforming are especially vulnerable to victimization by those with whom they have interpersonal relationships as well as by those who seek to harm them solely because of their identity. The latter is an example of a hate crime: a criminal offense motivated by prejudice, anger, and fear, and directed at someone (or a family, group, or whole community) because of their perceived identity. Hate crimes target victims because of their perceived membership in certain social groups and involve such criminal acts as damage to property or pets and offensive graffiti or letters (hate mail) as well as interpersonal violence such as physical and sexual assault, bullying, harassment, verbal abuse or insults, and murder. The U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) in its 2018 Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program data reported approximately 7,000 hate crime cases in 2017 (59 percent motivated by race or ethnicity, with crimes against African Americans, Jews, and Muslims most predominant; 16 percent by disability; 18 percent by sexual identity; and 29 percent by gender). It is not clear how gender identity also plays a part in hate crimes not designated as only related to "gender," nor, of course, how statistics might skyrocket if crimes of misogyny directed against women (both cisgender and trans) that were not recorded as hate crimes were actually included. UCR data notoriously underestimates the extent of the problem, and some scholars suggest that about a quarter of a million such hate crimes based on disability, age, sexual identity, religion, race, or ethnicity as well as gender occur every year.

It is also important to understand the ways gender violence might be experienced differently based on different social identities. For example, although people with disabilities experience the same types of crime as people without disabilities, they may experience unique forms of these crimes because they often must rely on caregivers, limited transportation options, and limited access to sign language interpreters and assistive devices, and they may be vulnerable because of potential isolation, among other issues. In terms of IPV, therefore, these individuals often face diminished reporting opportunities, and they may experience denial of care or assistance; destruction of communication devices, medical equipment, and/or medications; and other controlling and abusive behaviors that harm them emotionally, physically, and/or sexually.

You may recall from Chapter 2 the importance of recognizing intersecting systems of discrimination and privilege and these systems' roles in shaping human experience. Sexual, psychological, and physical violence by the state can take a variety of forms that include, as Homa Khaleeli's reading "#SayHerName" emphasizes, the ways women and girls are treated by police and the criminal justice system. Women held in pretrial or prison facilities are at risk for physical and sexual assault. The mass incarceration of people of color is linked to structural forms of discrimination and oppression. Poor women, women of color, LGBTQ individuals, and those who are gender nonconforming are at great risk, as are those who work in the sex industry, migrants, and undocumented workers, to name just a few. In addition, gender-based violence is associated with lack of health and reproductive justice, including denials of care, provider-controlled contraceptive technologies, and forced sterilization. As already discussed in other chapters, women of color often receive inadequate health care, which puts them at risk for, among other things, higher mortality rates associated with childbirth and diseases such as cancer and diabetes. Structural violence is of course related to interpersonal violence because it shapes the conditions of the latter, the specifics of the experience, and the sources of potential support and healing. Andrea Smith makes this point in the reading "Beyond the Politics of Inclusion."

Knowledge about interpersonal gender violence in the United States relies on several sources of data. First is the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) of the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics, which provides comprehensive information based on nationally representative samples of individuals and families interviewed in their homes about a broad range of crimes, including gender violence. As of this writing, the NCVS no longer asks 16- and 17-year-olds to voluntarily and confidentially disclose their sexual and gender identity, even though it provides crucial data on criminal victimization of LGBTQ people, who are subject to high rates of hate crimes that include gender-based violence. A National Research Council panel concluded that the NCVS was likely undercounting IPV as a result of the way the survey was designed and administered, and specifically the lack of privacy associated with interview protocol in respondents' homes.

Although the rate of intimate partner victimization declined over the last decade along with violent crime rates generally, currently an average of 24 people per minute are victims of physical and contact violence, including stalking, by an intimate partner in the United States. Over the course of a year this amounts to more than 12 million people. These findings emphasize that gender violence is an important and widespread public health problem. Eighty-one percent of women and 35 percent of men who experienced rape, physical violence, or stalking by an intimate partner reported at least one impact related to the experience, such as fear, concern for safety, injury, or absence of at least one day of work or school. Individuals who experienced rape or stalking by any perpetrator or physical violence by an intimate partner in their lifetime were more likely to report frequent headaches, chronic pain, difficulty sleeping, activity limitations, and poor physical and mental health than those who did not experience these forms of violence. In other words, nearly 3 in 10 women and 1 in 10 men in the United States has experienced contact sexual violence, physical violence, and/or stalking by an intimate partner and a related impact on everyday functioning.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT OF 1994

For decades, feminist activists had worked to gain recognition of the extent and severity of violence against women in the United States. On the whole, violence against women had not been fully recognized as a serious crime within the criminal justice system. Often reports of sexual assault were greeted with skepticism or victim-blaming.

Prior to feminist activism in the 1970s, women had to present evidence of resistance to sexual assault, rules of evidence allowed consideration of a victim's entire sexual history, and husbands were exempt from charges of raping their wives. Following the opening of the first rape crisis centers in 1972, grassroots advocacy managed not only to provide care and services to victims, but also to change these laws.

Generally, domestic violence was considered by law enforcement to be a "family matter," and so police, prosecutors, and judges were often reluctant to "interfere." The first domestic violence shelters opened in the mid-1970s, but not until the 1980s did this problem receive widespread attention. Thanks to activists, laws did change in the 1980s to codify domestic violence as criminal conduct, to provide increased penalties, to create civil protection orders, and to mandate training about domestic violence for law enforcement.

Following a Washington, DC, meeting of representatives from various groups advocating for victims of

sexual assault and domestic violence in the 1980s, activists turned their attention to ensuring the passage of federal legislation to protect women through interstate enforcement of protection orders, to provide funding for shelters and other programs for victims, and to provide prevention efforts. By demonstrating the need for these protections and programs, grassroots advocates and the National Organization for Women (NOW) Legal Defense Fund were able to develop bipartisan support in Congress and to pass the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) in 1994.

The four subtitles of the act describe the target areas of concern: Safe Streets, Safe Homes for Women, Civil Rights for Women and Equal Justice for Women in the Courts, and Protections of Battered Immigrant Women and Children. VAWA changed rules of evidence, police procedures, penalties, and court procedures. It also authorized funding for prevention, education, and training.

Since 1994, VAWA has been reauthorized and modified several times. In 2013, the reauthorization for the first time included protections for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender survivors and allowed tribal authorities to prosecute non-tribal members who commit crimes on tribal land. As of May 1, 2019, the bill reauthorizing the act has been passed in the House and awaits a vote in the Senate. To find out more about VAWA, visit the website of the U.S. Department of Justice's Violence Against Women Office at <https://www.justice.gov/ovw>.

Teen dating violence (TDV) is also an important problem in the United States, and one exacerbated by social media. Although it usually takes place in person, it can also include such behaviors as repeated texting or posting sexual pictures of a partner online without consent. When this dating violence occurs through text messaging, many teens often do not recognize controlling behaviors as abusive. This problem illustrates the ways communication technologies influence dating violence by redefining boundaries between dating partners. Teens are less likely than adults to report abusive behaviors out of fears of being ostracized by friends or of telling family members. Data from the Center for Disease Control's Youth Risk Behavior Survey and the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, however, show that TDV affects millions of teens in the United States each year. Almost 1 in 11 high school girls and 1 in 15 high school boys report having experienced physical dating violence in the last year. Sometimes physical abuse between adolescents involves mutual abuse, with both partners using violence against each other. However, it is clear that adolescents use force for different reasons and with different results. Researchers have found that girls suffer more from relationship violence, emotionally and physically. They are more likely than boys to have serious injuries and report being terrified. In contrast, male victims seldom fear violence by their girlfriends and often say the attacks did not hurt or that they found the violence amusing.

Data from the Center for Disease Control's Youth Risk Behavior Survey and the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey also report that sexual dating violence occurs in relatively high numbers in teen relationships. These data suggest almost 1 in 9 high school girls and 1 in 36 high school boys report having experienced physical dating violence in the last year. Overall about 1 in 4 women and 1 in 12 who are survivors of contact sexual violence first experienced these or other forms of violence before age 18. It is important to note that that both girls and boys are more likely to be sexually abused by other boys. It is also important to note that over half to three-quarters of all teens surveyed report knowing others in violent relationships in their school or communities. The consequences of teen violence are immense, with rape victims in particular more likely to contemplate, and actually attempt, suicide.

An important aspect of teen violence is bullying, when someone verbally and/or physically harasses another person perceived as weaker. Bullies seek power through aggression and intimidation, and direct their attacks at vulnerable targets. Boys are more likely to bully than girls and to bully other boys, although girls are almost as likely to bully as boys through social media, but, as discussed below, in different ways than boys. Despite the most recent School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, which reports that the rates of students reporting criminal victimization at school have decreased in the last decade (now about 4 percent of all K–12 students), bullying has increased, especially cyberbullying. The National Institute of Child Health reports that over 6 in 10 teenagers currently witness bullying in U.S. schools daily, and millions of children in grades 6 through 10 are bullied at least once a week. More than two-thirds of students report general bullying as an ongoing problem in their school, about 1 in 10 students drops out or changes schools because of repeated bullying, and more than 1 in 10 report school absences because of fear of bullying. Indeed, both the bully and the bullied are at greater risk of loneliness; lack of success in school; and involvement in drugs, alcohol, and tobacco. Almost half of all bullies have three or more police arrests by age 30. In addition, Asian American students are bullied in U.S. schools more than any other ethnic group, and particularly online in the form of cyberbullying. LGBTQ youth and those who are gender nonconforming are especially at high risk for bullying.

In terms of cyberbullying specifically, teenage boys and girls are equally likely to be targets, but there are differences in the specific types of harassment they encounter and girls appear to be more emotionally scarred as a result of the bullying. According to a Pew Research Center Internet and technology study, almost 60 percent of both girls and boys have experienced at least one of six abusive online behaviors, which include name-calling, spreading of false rumors, constant and repeated monitoring and policing, receiving explicit images they did not ask for, having explicit images of them shared without consent, and physical threats. While similar shares of boys and girls have encountered abuse such as name-calling or physical threats online, other forms of cyberbullying are more prevalent among girls. For example, 39 percent of girls say someone has spread false rumors about them online, compared with about 26 percent of boys who say this. Girls also are more likely than boys to report being the recipient of explicit images they did not ask for. When it comes to bullying online both girls and boys participate, but levels vary based

upon the kind of bullying. Boys tend to use more overt aggression and intimidation and are likely to bully alone; girls are more secretive, use more indirect forms of emotional abuse intended to ostracize and humiliate, and bully as a group. Indeed, cyberbullying is currently a serious social problem that may lead to tragic consequences, such as youths committing suicide after experiencing bullying and harassment.

The prevalence of youths committing suicide due to long-term bullying has resulted in the term “bullycide.” Again, this is especially pertinent for gender nonconforming and LGBTQ students who are at high risk of suicide after experiencing a variety of abusive behaviors. Alongside the high rates of ostracism and emotional humiliation, their isolation diminishes opportunities for seeking support. Lawmakers, school officials, and some companies that make and market online platforms are trying to address electronic harassment. For example, several states have enacted legislation prohibiting cyberbullying, schools have implemented policies and education, and social media companies are including anti-cyberbullying resources. In addition to these statistics on the bullying and victimization of children and youths is the tragic reality of school shootings, which have resulted in the killing and severe wounding of pupils and staff in schools across the United States.

GENDER AND SCHOOL SHOOTINGS

Nancy Staton Barbour

As Jill Filipovic points out in “It’s Always Men,” 98 percent of mass shootings in the United States have been perpetrated by males. School shootings are likewise overwhelmingly carried out by males, specifically young men under the age of 30. Research on school shooters has shown that these young men tend to commit violence against their peers out of frustration and anger stemming from their perceived failure to conform to socially constructed norms of masculinity (Farr, 2018; Langman, 2017). In a study of 31 school shooters—including the perpetrators of Jonesboro, Columbine, and Sandy Hook—Farr (2018) found that all of the shooters were troubled by challenges to their masculinity, for example, being bullied by male peers, having romantic difficulties with females, being called “homo” or “fag,” or feeling otherwise emasculated by classmates and teachers. Langman (2017) observed that a combination of social, psychological, and biological factors contribute to feelings of inadequacy and “damaged masculinity” among school shooters.

While male identity is the main characteristic linking the vast majority of school shooters, it is also important to recognize that most shooters also identify as white and heterosexual—a demographic that typically enjoys the greatest social privilege in the United States. Thus, school shooters often feel that others have denied them the status to which they are entitled (Farr, 2018). Early reports on the February 2018 shooting at Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, indicated

that the perpetrator was motivated not only by damaged masculinity, but also by white supremacist ideology. Another common factor among men who commit mass shootings is misogyny. A growing group of male supremacists connecting on shadowy Internet sites and claiming to be “involuntarily celibate”—or “incel”—have celebrated mass shooters as avengers of marginalized men. The incel community, also predominantly white heterosexual males, blames women for denying them sex, and some members actively advocate violence against women and sexually active men.

The Stoneman Douglas shooting became a pivotal moment in the national debate on gun violence. One month after the incident, a million U.S. students coordinated school walkouts in response to the tragedy, and survivors of the shooting organized a massive protest to demand political action on gun control. Students from Stoneman Douglas High School went to Washington, DC, and spoke about their experiences at one of the largest youth-led demonstrations in American history. The March for Our Lives demonstration on March 24, 2018, saw more than two million people gather in cities across the United States and around the world to call for an end to mass shootings.

References

- Farr, Kathryn. (2018). “Adolescent Rampage School Shootings: Responses to Failing Masculinity Performances by Already-Troubled Boys.” *Gender Issues*, 35(2), 73–97.
- Langman, Peter. (2017). “A Bio-Psycho-Social Model of School Shooters.” *Journal of Campus Behavioral Intervention*, 5, 27–34.

That these shooters are overwhelmingly white boys is sometimes overlooked by media and academics alike. A more thorough analysis of contemporary white masculinities, as well as the role of firearms and violent media in the cultural landscape, needs to be performed in order to better understand this phenomenon.

Another disturbing trend is the increase in stalking behavior that causes fear and emotional and psychological trauma. Stalking can be defined as the act of a person who, on more than one occasion, follows, pursues, or harasses another person, and, by actively engaging in a pattern of conduct, causes the victim to believe the stalker will cause physical harm or mental distress to the victim. Behaviors include making unwanted phone calls; sending unsolicited or unwanted letters, texts, or emails; following or spying on the victim; showing up at places without a legitimate reason; waiting at places for the victim; leaving unwanted items, presents, or flowers; and posting information or spreading rumors about the victim on the Internet, in a public place, or by word of mouth. Stalking is generally defined as a pattern of behavior that would cause a reasonable person to feel fear. Although a crime throughout the United States, stalking varies widely across the states in terms of statutory classification and associated penalties because it is understood as a “course of conduct crime.” This means that it consists of individual acts that could, in isolation, seem benign or non-criminal and be under-identified and underreported. Often linked to IPV, it can lead to significant trauma for those victimized.

Approximately 13 percent of women on college campuses report being stalked, and two-thirds of stalked women know their stalker. It is estimated that about 1 in 6 women and 1 in 20 men will experience stalking in their lifetimes. Eighty-five percent of women in the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey reported that they were stalked by a man. Among men who are stalked, 46 percent report being stalked by a woman and 43 percent by a man. Native American women and those who indicate more than one racial identity report the highest rates of being stalked, at one-third and one-quarter, respectively.

All 50 states in the United States now have stalking laws, although as already mentioned states vary in how they handle the crime; some states require that victims prove they felt fear (and 4 states require proof that they feared for their life). Half of states require that there be two or more different instances of stalking, and the other half require evidence of an “established pattern” of stalking behavior. About one-third of those stalked report the problem to the police, with 20 percent of these indicating that law enforcement responded by taking no action.

As already mentioned, accounts of gender violence are generally underreported and sometimes difficult to interpret. Different studies ask about victimization in different ways and get different results. Some studies ask about current abuse, and some survey past histories; some ask only about physical abuse, while others include questions about emotional or psychological abuse and sexual abuse in the context of consent. It is always important to consider whether consent for sexual intimacy can occur in a relationship where physical violence and emotional intimidation are present.

However, any discussion attempting to address the issue of violence against women—either in the United States or worldwide—must involve several key points. *First*, violence must be understood in the context of socially constructed notions of gender. If one group

of humans is raised to hide emotion, see sensitivity as a weakness, and view sexual potency as interwoven with interpersonal power, and others are raised to be passive, dependent, and support masculine entitlement, then interpersonal violence should be no

ANTI-LGBTQ VIOLENCE AROUND THE WORLD

Sayan Bhattacharya

A March 2017 article published in the *Guardian* asks the following question: “Where are the most difficult places in the world to be gay or transgender?” (Banning-Lover 2017). The article lists various countries—such as Iraq, Iran, Honduras, Uganda, Russia, and Egypt—that have had a long record of persecution and even murder of queer and transgender individuals. The fact sheet “Homophobic and Transphobic Violence” by United Nations Human Rights states that violence against LGBT people can range “from aggressive, sustained psychological bullying to physical assault, torture, kidnapping and targeted killings” (2017, 1). It notes that victims of homophobic and transphobic violence are sometimes not only murdered, but also brutalized through sexual torture, mutilation, and even burning.

Such violence can occur in public spaces, such as streets and parks; institutions, such as the workplace, hospitals, and schools; or the family home. Violence can also be carried out in prisons and by the police. It can be led by extremist groups too. For example, the *Guardian* article notes that the Islamic State has been concertedly attacking the LGBTQ population in the Middle East (Banning-Lover 2017). Amnesty International¹ (n.d.) reports that 76 countries in the world criminalize sexual activities between “same-sex” adults.

Still, we should not read these accounts of violence as representative of an entire culture. Different countries have specific histories and culture, and queer identities are mediated through these specificities. There are robust LGBTQ movements around the world that take into account these questions and accordingly design advocacy initiatives. However, often these local movements are rendered invisible in global analyses of anti-LGBTQ violence. For example, the *Guardian* article talks mostly about countries in the global south and how violent these countries are for LGBT people; while the incidents discussed are true, the analysis is incomplete because it does not take into account local movements of resistance in these countries. Moreover, it ends up giving the reader the impression that the global north has been able to create safe environments for LGBTQ people, which is far from the truth.

The Trump administration recently ordered the Bureau of Prisons to use “biological sex” to determine how transgender prisoners are assigned housing, thus rendering transgender folks more vulnerable to sexual abuse and other forms of discrimination. Yet the United States has often justified war with countries like Iraq and

Afghanistan and support for the Israeli occupation of Palestine by pointing out that LGBTQ people in these countries are unsafe under their respective governments (Puar 2007, 2017). Moreover, LGBTQ people of color and LGBTQ people with disabilities around the world are more at risk of hate violence compared to their white and able-bodied counterparts. Any analysis of hate crimes against LGBTQ people must also account for the ways race, class, and ability intersect with sexuality and gender.

Activity

Select two articles published in the United States that report anti-LGBTQ violence in a country outside of Europe and North America. Then compare that coverage with how the incidents were reported in the media of that country. Was there any difference in coverage? If yes, what were those differences? If no, why do you think there was no difference? Now imagine yourself in the journalist’s shoes. How would you report the same incident? Is there anything that you would do differently?

Further Reading

Amnest International. (n.d.) “Gender, Sexuality, and Identity.” <https://www.amnestyusa.org/issues/gender-sexuality-identity/>

Banning-Lover, R. (2017, March 1). “Where Are the Most Difficult Places in the World to Be Gay or Transgender?” *Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development-professionals-network/2017/mar/01/where-are-the-most-difficult-places-in-the-world-to-be-gay-or-transgender-lgbt>

Marzullo, M. A., & Libman, A. J. (2009, May). “Research Overview: Hate Crimes and Violence Against Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender People.” Human Rights Campaign Foundation. https://assets2.hrc.org/files/assets/resources/Hatecrimesandviolenceagainstlgbtpeople_2009.pdf?_ga=2.21618581.1200148078.1526426404-1353441099.1526234789

Puar, J. (2007). *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

—. (2017). *The Right to Maim: Debility, Capacity, Disability*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

United Nations Human Rights. (2017). “Fact Sheet: Homophobic and Transphobic Violence.” <https://www.unhcr.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/Homophobic-and-Transphobic-Violence.pdf>

¹ “Gender, Sexuality, and Identity,” Amnesty International at <https://www.amnestyusa.org/issues/gender-sexuality-identity/>

surprise. As Debra Anne Davis explains in the reading “Betrayed by the Angel,” women are raised in ways that may encourage victimization. *Second*, violence is a power issue and a consequence of masculine dominance in society. Such dominance also extends to control of political systems that address crime and create policy. Indeed, entitlements associated with masculinity produce a range that some scholars term the rape spectrum. This means that all sexist behaviors are arranged along a continuum—from unexamined feelings of superiority, for example, on one end to rape on the other. In this sense, all these behaviors, even though they vary tremendously in degree, are connected at some level.

In addition, scholars emphasize that these behaviors are often connected to “backlash” or resistance to gains made by women and other marginalized peoples. Though many support these gains and are working on ways to address interpersonal power and violence, hoping to enjoy more egalitarian relationships, some have not responded well to these gains. They have responded with anger and feelings of powerlessness and insecurity. Interpersonal violence occurs as people attempt to reestablish power they believe they have lost as a direct result of others’ gains. As already discussed, hate crimes based on identity are significant problems in contemporary society as people marked as “different” or marginal are targeted as victims of violence. Finally, online gender-based harassment targeted at people who speak out in favor of social justice is also increasingly being understood as a form of backlash as well as a rampant social problem as the public virtual space gets constructed as a masculine sphere where misogyny is rife. In particular, those writing about feminism and misogynous violence are often silenced and controlled, sometimes through brutal online threats of violence.

Third, gendered sexual violence is also related to the ways violence is eroticized. Although pornography is the best example of this problem in its role in eroticizing power differences, women’s magazines and advertising are often rife with these themes. Before turning our focus to specifically address issues associated with rape and sexual assault, physical abuse, and incest, we end this section with a discussion of pornography as an aspect of gender violence. Because many forms of pornography are legal, some people object to thinking about pornography in the context of gender violence and claim instead that it is a legitimate type of entertainment. Many people, scholars and laypeople, feminists and non-feminists alike, resist considering pornography in the context of gender-based violence. Indeed, there are sex-radical feminists who strongly endorse pornography and argue that it is empowering to women, especially when women are in control of certain aspects of the sex industry. Others respond that just because a person has consented (knowing also that “consent” does not always imply free choice), this does not alter the degrading character of the behavior. These debates are alive and well in feminist studies and sometimes bring about some interesting coalitions among those who normally do not work together, such as feminists and conservative religious groups.

Most feminist scholars and activists recognize the potentially positive aspects of some pornography that is created in more egalitarian contexts, but some emphasize it is still important to recognize that pornography eroticizes unequal power relations between people and often involves representations of coercive sex. Men as a social group are the major (although not only, of course) consumers of pornography, and women’s bodies tend to be the

ones on display for their pleasure. Critics suggest pornography thus represents a particular aspect of gender relations that reflects entitlements and power as well as sexual objectification, especially of marginalized people. They believe that people's rights to consume such materials are no longer rights when they violate the rights of others. In addition, some make the case that even if there is feminist disagreement over whether pornography entails objectification, and whether such objectification can ever serve social justice, pornography is still used as a tool of misogyny and domination in violent crime; otherwise some pornography would not be illegal.

Just as there are degrees of objectification and normalization of violence in pop culture forms, so too in pornography there is a continuum: from the soft porn of *Playboy* to *Hustler* and a host of hard-core Internet sites, along to illegal forms of representation such as child pornography and snuff films. Snuff films are illegal because women are actually murdered in the making of these films. Of course the Internet is one of the largest sites for pornography. In addition to online pornography, there is the problem of Internet prostitution, in which technology is utilized for live cam pornography as well as global trafficking and the sexual exploitation of women and children.

In conclusion, many people condone pornography because they believe it represents free speech, or because they feel that the women have chosen to be part of it. Some people make a distinction between hardcore and soft porn and feel that the former is harmful and the latter relatively harmless. Some see pornography as a mark of sexual freedom and characterize those who oppose it as prudish. Certainly sexual freedom requires sexual justice and pornography can be understood as a violation of this justice rather than an expression of it. In this way, pornography is opposed as a violation of rights even while others celebrate it.

SEXUAL ASSAULT AND RAPE

It is important to understand sexual abuse in terms of the normalization of violence in society. We live in societies where violence is used to solve problems every day, media are saturated with violence, militarism is a national policy, and rape is used as a weapon of war. Again, it is important to analyze the role of contemporary masculinity in these phenomena and consider the ways violent masculinity is normalized. What do you think would be the societal response if women and girls victimized men, boys, and other girls to the extent that men and boys routinely victimize girls, women, and each other?

Consider the following story told to us. A white, 30-something professional, whose pronouns are she/her/hers, had been having a drink with colleagues early one evening after work. A well-dressed man struck up a conversation with her, and they chatted a while. When she was leaving with her colleagues, the man asked if he could call her sometime, and she gave him her business card that provided only work information. He called her at work within the next week and asked her to have dinner with him, and, seeing no reason not to, she agreed to meet him at a popular restaurant after work. (She was careful to explain to us that on both occasions, she was dressed in her professional work

clothes, and she met with him early in the evening in a public space. There was nothing provocative, she emphasized, about her clothes or her demeanor.) At some point during the meal, she started feeling uncomfortable. The man was flirtatious but also very pushy; he tried to choose and order her food and told her that if she wanted to date him, he had certain requirements about how his girlfriends dressed and acted. She panicked and felt a strong need to get away from him, so at some point she quietly excused herself, saying she needed to visit the rest room. She then exited quickly and did not return to the table. Unfortunately, this was not the end of the story. The man found out where her home was and started to stalk her, angry that she had humiliated him by rejecting his advances. One evening he forced his way into her apartment and beat her badly. Although she took out a restraining order on him, he managed to gain entrance into her apartment building again and beat her senseless one more time in the hallway outside her apartment.

This story is a tragic illustration of misogyny and masculine entitlement. The man felt he had the right to define the reality of women in his life and expected them to be subordinate. He believed it was his entitlement. He was so full of rage that when a woman snubbed him, he had to subdue her. In addition, the woman's telling of the story is illustrative of societal norms that blame women for their own victimization. When tearfully sharing her story, she had felt the shame and humiliation that comes with such an experience; she wanted it to be known that she had not been "asking for it." He had given no indication that he was anything but upstanding, she was dressed appropriately, she took no risks other than accepting a date, she gave him only her work numbers, and she agreed to meet him in a public place. What more could she have done except be wary of all men she might meet? This story sets the stage for our understanding of sexual assault.

Sexual assault can be defined as any sexual contact without consent that involves the use of force. Definitions of sexual contact violence also include forcing someone to engage in sexual contact, including the case where perpetrators make their victims penetrate them. Individuals may be sexually assaulted without being raped. Rape is a form of sexual contact violence, but sexual assault and abuse do not necessarily imply rape. More specifically, rape is the penetration of any bodily orifice by a penis or object without consent. Someone who is asleep, passed out, or incapacitated by alcohol or drugs cannot give consent. Silence, or lack of continued resistance, does not mean consent. You may recall the reading in Chapter 6 by Charlene Muehlenhard and colleagues, "The Complexities of Sexual Consent Among College Students," which makes these points. Although rape can be broadly defined as sex without consent, it is understood as a crime of aggression because the focus is on hurting and dominating. The sexual abuse of children is often termed molestation, which may or may not involve rape. When children are molested or raped by family members, it is termed incest. Although the rates of rape are very high, sexual assault rates generally (which include but are not limited to rape) are even higher.

Women are often victims of altruistic sex (where motivation for consent involves feeling sorry for the other person or feeling guilty about resisting sexual advances) and compliant sex (where the consequences of not doing it are worse than doing it). Neither of these forms of sexual intimacy involve complete consent. Consent is a freely made choice

that is clearly communicated. Consensual sex is negotiated through communication in which individuals express their feelings and desires and are able to listen to and respect others' feelings and desires. Rape can happen to anyone—babies who are months old to women in their 90s, and people of all races, ethnicities, and socioeconomic statuses. Both women and men are raped, but, as already discussed, overwhelmingly it is a problem of men raping women and other men. Rape occurs relatively frequently in prisons; dominant men rape men they perceive as inferior. Often, dominant inmates refer to the victims as "women." In this way, rape is about power, domination, and humiliation and must be understood in this context.

As already mentioned, most reported sexual assaults are against girls and women, with the likelihood of one in three or four women experiencing sexual assault in their lifetime. In addition, approximately half of all women raped are under the age of 18 years, and about one-fifth are younger than 12 years old. Offenders were armed with a gun, knife, or other weapon in about 11 percent of rape or sexual assault victimizations, according to the National Crime Victimization Survey. The percentage of reported rape or sexual assault victimizations that resulted in an arrest either at the scene or during a follow-up investigation decreased from almost half in the late 1990s to less than a third in 2018. Overall, among both reported and unreported sexual assaults and rapes, approximately 1 in 10 results in an arrest. It is important to note again that NCVS surveys underreport IPV and include a higher relative proportion of stranger rapes, which are more likely to be reported and prosecuted.

Data from the Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) study suggests that almost a fifth of women are sexually assaulted during their enrollment in college, with the first few months of their college experience being the time of greatest vulnerability. When nonconsensual sexual contact rather than assault is considered, these estimates increase to about a quarter of all women undergraduates, with most incidents occurring on campus, and a majority associated with Greek life. The Association of American Universities (AAU) published a report on college sexual assault and misconduct that surveyed 150,000 students across the United States. Mirroring the takeaway message of the reading by Chelsea Spencer, Allen Mallory,



LEARNING ACTIVITY

HOW SAFE IS YOUR CAMPUS?

Investigate the safety and security of your campus by asking these questions:

- How many acts of violence were reported on your campus last year?
- Does your campus have a security escort service?
- What resources does your campus provide to ensure safety?
- What training and educational opportunities about safety does your college provide?
- What specialized training about violence is offered to fraternities and sports teams on your campus?
- How does your school encourage the reporting of violence?
- What support services does your school offer to victims of violence?
- What is your school administration's official protocol for dealing with complaints of violence?
- How does your school's code of conduct address violence?
- Are there dark areas of your campus that need additional lighting?
- Are emergency phones available around your campus?

Michelle Toews, Sandra Stith, and Leila Wood, "Why Sexual Assault Survivors Do Not Report to Universities," the report emphasized that the most common reason why survivors did not report sexual assault was because they worried that the victimization was not serious enough and they were embarrassed about its occurrence. In the AAU study, two-thirds of college rape survivors reported the incident to a friend, family member, or roommate, and less than 10 percent to school officials or police.

Over the last couple of decades the numbers of sexual offenses on college campuses have tripled, in part because of increased reporting procedures. Back in 1990 Congress passed the Campus Security Act ("Clery Act"), which mandated that colleges and universities participating in federal student aid programs complete and distribute security reports on campus practices and crime statistics. This was amended in 1992 to include the Campus Sexual Assault Victim's Bill of Rights to provide policies and statistics and to ensure basic rights to survivors of sexual assault. This act was amended again in 1998 to provide for more extensive security-related provisions, and, since then, the U.S. Department of Justice has given substantial grants to colleges and universities to address sexual and physical assault, harassment, and stalking on campus. It is estimated that women at a university with 10,000 women students could experience about 350 rapes a year with serious policy implications for college administrators. Still, however, a significant number of colleges and universities across the nation report zero known instances of rape on campus.

Rapes on college campuses (especially gang rapes) may be committed by fraternity members, and may be part of male bonding rituals. This does not mean, of course, that all fraternities are dangerous places for women, only that the conditions for the abuse of women can occur in these male-only living spaces, especially when alcohol is present. About 70 to 80 percent of campus rapes generally involve alcohol or other drugs (with alcohol most-pervasive among all drugs). The most common "date rape" or predatory drugs are Rohypnol (commonly known as "roofies"), ketamine (commonly known as "special k"), and GHB (gamma hydroxybutyrate). These drugs are odorless when dissolved and are indiscernible when put in beverages. They metabolize quickly and make a person

incapable of resisting sexual advances. Memory impairment is associated with these drugs, and a survivor may not be aware of such an attack until 8 to 12 hours after it has occurred. In addition, there may be little evidence to support the claim that drugs were used to facilitate the attack because of the speed at which these predatory drugs metabolize. It is imperative to be vigilant at social occasions where such attacks might happen; do not leave a drink unattended, get your own drinks from an unopened container, and watch out for your friends. A buddy system that includes a designated driver is essential!

One specific form of intimate partner violence is marital rape. In the United States the legal definition of marital rape varies across the states, but it is generally defined as any unwanted intercourse or penetration (vaginal, anal, or oral) obtained by force or threat of force, or when a spouse is unable to consent. Historically, rape was understood as a property crime against men because women were considered the property of husbands and fathers. As a result, it was considered impossible to violate something that was legally considered your property, and rape laws defined rape as forced intercourse with a woman who was not your wife. As of 1993, marital rape became illegal in all 50 U.S. states, but there are still a handful of states where marital rape continues to be handled in a substantially different way than rape outside of marriage, such as being charged under a different section of criminal code, restricted to a shorter reporting period, or held to a different standard of coercion and force. In addition, some states have lesser sentences for husbands than other rapists, and statutory rape laws often do not go into effect if a spouse is younger than the age of consent for that state.

Although marital rape is a form of violence both prevalent and illegal, it is often regarded as a much lesser crime than rape by a stranger, for example, or not really seen as a crime, as in "it's just having sex with your spouse when you don't want to." However, as research on marital rape suggests, it always involves emotional abuse and sometimes severe physical violence, threats of violence, and the use of weapons, usually by husbands against wives. Compared to batterers or those who only physically assault partners, individuals who batter and rape are particularly dangerous and more likely to severely injure and potentially murder a partner. Marital rape is also more likely to be ongoing and repeated because of physical access to victims, and is more likely to include anal and oral rape as well as vaginal.

A national study reported that 10 percent of all sexual assault cases involve a husband or ex-husband, and the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence suggests that taking into account the underreporting that occurs because women are less likely to label such actions as rape, 10 to 14 percent of married women in the United States have been raped by their husbands. Researchers generally categorize marital rape into three types: force-only rape, when a husband uses only enough force to enact the rape; battering rape, in which rape occurs in the context of an ongoing physically abusive relationship; and sadistic/obsessive rape, in which a husband uses torture or perverse acts to humiliate and harm his wife. Pornography is often involved in the latter case. Women are at particularly high risk for being raped when they are living with domineering partners who view them as "property"; when they are pregnant, ill physically or mentally, or recovering from surgery; and when they are separated or divorced.

As will be discussed in Chapter 11, political institutions in the United States have historically supported men's access to women as sexual property, and the history of racism

and the lynching of black men for fabricated rapes of white women have influenced how our society and the courts deal with the interaction of race and sexual violence. Although most rapes are intraracial (they occur within racial groups), women of color are especially vulnerable as victims of sexual violence because of their marginalized status. They also have less credibility in the courtroom when rape cases go to trial. Men of color accused of rape are more likely to get media attention, be convicted, and receive longer sentences. While these differences result from the racism of a society that sees African American men in particular as more violent or dangerous, they also are related to class differences whereby men of color are generally less able to acquire superior legal counsel. As Andrea Smith explains in the reading "Beyond the Politics of Inclusion," gender violence functions as a tool of racism and colonialism for women of color. She emphasizes the need to make the needs of marginalized women central in the anti-violence movement and implores writers and activists to understand the intersectionality of racism and sexism in social movements for ending violence and supporting racial justice.

Very often, women realize that a past sexual encounter was actually a rape, and, as a result, they begin to think about the experience differently. They may have left the encounter hurt, confused, or angry but unable to articulate what happened. Survivors need to talk about what occurred and get support. It is never too late to get support from people who care. Feeling ashamed, dirty, or stupid is a typical reaction. It is not their/your/our fault.

Social myths about rape that encourage these feelings include the following:

- *Rape happens less frequently in our society than women believe. Feminists in particular blow this out of proportion by focusing on women's victimization, and women make up rape charges as a way to get attention.* This is false; rape happens at an alarming rate and is underreported. Rape is considered a crime against the state, and rape survivors are witnesses to the crime. As a result, the credibility of the "witness" is challenged in rape cases, and women are often retraumatized as a result of rape trials. This is among the many reasons why rape is underreported, and, as a proportion of total rapes committed, charges are rarely pressed and assailants rarely convicted. The FBI reports that the rate of false reporting for rape and sexual assault is the same as for other violent crimes: less than 3 percent. Although feminists care about the victimization of women, we focus on surviving, becoming empowered, and making changes to stop rapes from happening.
- *Women are at least partly responsible for their victimization in terms of their appearance and behavior (encouraging women to feel guilty when they are raped).* This is false; rape is the only violent crime in which the victim is not *de facto* perceived as innocent. Consider the suggestion that people who have been robbed were asking to have their wallets stolen.
- *Perpetrators are not totally responsible for their actions. Especially if a woman comes on to a man sexually, it is impossible for him to stop.* This is false; people are not driven by uncontrollable biological urges, and it is insulting to assume that this is how they behave. Likewise, it is wrong to assume that anyone has to "finish what they started." Everyone has the right to stop sexual behaviors at any time. Note how this myth is related to the previous one that blames the victim.

These myths not only support masculine privilege concerning sexuality and access and therefore support some men's tendency to sexually abuse women, but are also important

INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE

Liddy Detar

Intimate partner violence hurts all who are involved and does so in forms that are physical, psychological, economic, emotional, and continuous. Violence is enforced in our legal, social, and institutional systems, as well as in our cultural constructions of gender, sex, and sexuality. These social identities intersect with race, ethnicity, class, ability, and nationality to shape our relationships to systems of power and to create certain bodies as vulnerable to violence. Traditional models for anti-violence work have drawn on a reductive "violence against women" framework and have turned to state forms of protection as solutions.

Queer feminist approaches have more recently centered the anti-violence movement around articulating conditions and identities that have historically been rendered invisible or relegated to the margins. Advocates and activists imagine anti-violence frameworks that recognize all bodies as vulnerable to violence, thus intervening in the criminalization of certain bodies and identities. This approach allows us to reimagine who is considered "worthy" of access to support and healing spaces. It also challenges ableist and other normative paradigms that define the terms of survivorship and who and which bodies are capable of healing. Drawing on queer and feminist lenses, the anti-violence movement can imagine new forms for resources, broader access, and different kinds of "safety" to address the needs of many historically isolated communities.

TRY THIS: Research your hometown; if you have moved around a lot, choose a place that has an important role in your life. Do an Internet search to explore the following:

1. Look up local newspapers or other media sources; check police logs and other emergency and call-response organizations. What sorts of crimes are reported? Pay attention to any crimes reporting sexual assault and/or involving the sex industry. How are they represented?
2. Look up resources in your town for victims of sexual and domestic violence. Perhaps you will find shelters or churches harboring children and their parents or guardians; perhaps you will find immigration advocacy groups or animal shelters that take in pets while their owners seek help. Look up churches, homeless shelters, and community centers for services they provide for survivors of intimate partner violence. If your town has limited resources, consider a search that asks how far someone must go to get help. Would they be able to walk or bike to a shelter? Would they need a car or public transportation?
3. Review the websites of resources and consider the following: What services are offered? Which bodies might feel welcome and find safety and access? Which bodies would not? What is the meaning of these findings?

IMAGINE: Drawing on a feminist intersectional perspective, create a list of needs for resources and access in your selected community and share it with a local shelter, town representative, or activist group involved in anti-violence work and in a position to implement change. Or volunteer at a shelter or anti-violence organization and participate in creating the change yourself.

Reference

Patterson, J. (2016). *Queering Sexual Violence: Radical Voices from Within the Anti-Violence Movement*. Riverdale, NY: Riverdale Avenue Books.

means for controlling women's lives. Recall again the discussion of sexual terrorism in Chapter 2. Such terrorism limits everyday activities and keeps people in line by the threat of potential sexual assault. Early research on rapists in the early 1980s revealed that although there are few psychological differences between men who have raped and those who have not, the former group were more likely to believe in the rape myths, were more misogynous and tolerant of the interpersonal domination of women generally, showed higher levels of sexual arousal around depictions of rape, and were more prone to use violence.

PHYSICAL ABUSE

Domestic violence hotlines receive over 20,000 calls in a typical day. A 2018 fact sheet from the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV) reports an average of

20 people experiencing intimate partner physical violence every minute, with millions annually. The NCADV also reports 1 in 3 women and 1 in 4 men having experienced some form of physical violence by an intimate partner, with 1 in 7 women and 1 in 25 men reporting an injury. Not surprisingly, women have higher rates as perpetrators of physical violence compared to contact sexual violence, although the extent and severity of the violence tends to be less than that perpetrated by men. Of all survivors, women between the ages of 18 and 24 years incur the highest incidence of intimate partner physical violence. The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV) reports that women who are pregnant are especially at risk, and physical violence especially. Consequences include miscarriages, stillbirths, and a two- to fourfold greater likelihood of bearing a low-birth-weight baby.

Individuals of all races and classes are abused, although rates are five times higher among families below poverty levels and among unemployed male partners. These differences reflect economic vulnerabilities and lack of resources, the ways certain families have extensive contact with authorities like social services that increase opportunities for reporting, and structural violence by the state as already discussed. Sadly, the impact of family violence on children is severe. More than half of all women who are victims of IPV live in households with children younger than 12 years, and studies indicate that between 3 and 10 million children witness some form of domestic violence every year. Violent juvenile offenders are four times more likely than non-offenders to have grown up in homes where they saw and experienced violence. Children who have witnessed violence at home are also about five times more likely to commit or suffer violence when they become adults. Approximately half of men who abuse women partners also abuse the children in those homes. Of course, women abuse children too, and these rates are quite high. Indeed, some estimates show mothers are more likely to neglect and abuse children than fathers. However, because mothers have greater ongoing contact with children through caretaking activities, when numbers are controlled for the relative proportion of such caretaking activities, mothers are less likely to abuse and neglect children than fathers or stepfathers.

Women who are physically abused are also always emotionally abused because they experience emotional abuse by virtue of being physically terrorized. Mariah Lockwood writes poignantly about the emotional abuse of battered women in the poem "She Said." This reading illustrates the ways women internalize messages about femininity, love, marriage, and romance that can make them vulnerable to being dominated in interpersonal relationships. The poem also speaks of the importance of friendship and emotional support for battered women. Emotional abuse, however, does not always involve physical abuse. Abusers, for example, who constantly tell partners that they are worthless, stupid, or ugly can emotionally abuse without being physically abusive. Sometimes the scars of emotional abuse take longer to heal than physical abuse and help explain why people might stay with abusive partners.

Why do people so often stay in abusive relationships? The research on this question suggests that when individuals leave abusive relationships they return about five to seven times before actually leaving for good. There are several complex and interconnected

reasons why survivors stay. First, emotional abuse often involves feelings of shame, guilt, and low self-esteem. Like rape survivors generally, they often believe that the abuse is their fault. They may see themselves as worthless and have a difficult time believing that they deserve better. Low self-esteem encourages survivors to stay with or return to abusive partners. Second, some who are repeatedly abused become desensitized to the violence; they may see it as a relatively normal aspect of gender relationships and therefore something to tolerate.

A third reason people stay in abusive relationships is that abusers tend to physically isolate their partners from others. This often involves a pattern in which survivors may be prevented from visiting or talking to family and friends, left without transportation, and/or have no access to a telephone. Notice how, when individuals are abused, the shame associated with this situation can encourage them to isolate themselves. An outcome of this isolation is that they do not get the reality check they need about their situation. Isolation thus helps keep self-esteem low, prevents support, and minimizes options in terms of leaving the abusive situation.

IDEAS FOR ACTIVISM

- Volunteer at a local domestic violence shelter.
- Organize a food, clothing, and toiletries drive to benefit your local domestic violence shelter.
- Interrupt jokes about violence against women.
- Organize Domestic Violence Awareness Month (October) activities on your campus.

- Create and distribute materials about violence against women on your campus. Write a blog about gender-based violence.
- Organize a poetry slam to feature poems about gender-based violence.

CHECK UP ON YOUR RELATIONSHIP

DOES YOUR PARTNER

- Constantly put you down?
- Call you several times a night or show up to make sure you are where you said you would be?
- Embarrass or make fun of you in front of your friends or family? Make you feel like you are nothing without him/her?
- Intimidate or threaten you? "If you do that again, I'll . . ." Always say that it's your fault?
- Pressure you to have sex when you don't want to?
- Glare at you, give you the silent treatment, or grab, shove, kick, or hit you?

DO YOU

- Always do what your partner wants instead of what you want? Fear how your partner will act in public?

- Constantly make excuses to other people for your partner's behavior? Feel like you walk on eggshells to avoid your partner's anger?
- Believe if you just tried harder or submitted more that everything would be okay?
- Stay with your partner because you fear what your partner would do if you broke up?

These indicators suggest potential abuse in your relationship. If you've answered yes to any of these questions, talk to a counselor about your relationship.

Remember, when one person scares, hurts, or continually puts down the other person, it's abuse.

Source: Created by the President's Commission on the Status of Women, Oregon State University.

A fourth reason survivors stay is that they worry about what people will think, and this keeps them in abusive situations as a consequence of the shame they feel. Most women in abusive relationships worry about this to some extent, although middle-class women probably feel it the most. The myth that this is a lower-class problem and that it does not happen to "nice" families who appear to have everything going for them is part of the problem. And, indeed, the question about what people will think is a relevant one: Some churches tell abused women to submit to their husbands and hide the abuse, neighbors often look the other way, mothers worry about their children being stigmatized at school, and certainly there is embarrassment associated with admitting your partner hits you, especially for men.

ACTIVIST PROFILE

INCITE! WOMEN OF COLOR AGAINST VIOLENCE

In 2000 a group of radical feminists of color organized a conference, "The Color of Violence: Violence Against Women of Color," at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Initially, the gathering was to be small, focused on analyzing violence against women of color and strategizing ways to address violence against women of color. The response was overwhelming, and more than 2,000 women of color attended. Another 2,000 had to be turned away. At this conference, the focus turned to women of color who had survived violence and challenged mainstream conceptualizations of the anti-violence against women movement.

One result of this conference was the founding of INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence, a national grassroots activist organization of radical feminists of color working to end violence against women of color and their communities. Using direct action, critical dialogue, and grassroots organizing, INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence works with women of color to create projects that address issues of violence against women of color and their communities. INCITE! identifies violence against women of color "as a combination of violence directed at communities, such as police violence, war, and colonialism, and violence within communities, such as rape and domestic violence." Projects include "producing a women of color radio show, challenging the non-profitization of antiviolence and other social justice movements, organizing rallies on street harassment, training women of color on self-defense, organizing mothers on welfare, building and running a grassroots clinic."

INCITE! utilizes a framework of intersectional analysis to understand and work against violence against women of color who are located in the intersection of racism and sexism, as well as other forms of oppression.

INCITE! also offers a challenge to the approach of many anti-violence organizations that are dominated by white women by placing women of color at the center of their analysis and work. Here are INCITE!'s principles of unity that guide the organization:

We at INCITE!:

- Maintain a space by and for women of color.
- Center our political analysis and community action in the struggle for liberation.
- Support sovereignty for indigenous people as central to the struggle for liberation.
- Oppose all forms of violence which oppress women of color and our communities.
- Recognize the state as the central organizer of violence which oppresses women of color and our communities.
- Recognize these expressions of violence against women of color as including colonialism, police brutality, immigration policies, reproductive control, etc.
- Link liberation struggles which oppose racism, sexism, classism, heterosexism, ableism, ageism, and all other forms of oppression.
- Support coalition building between women of color.
- Recognize and honor differences across cultures.
- Encourage creative models of community organizing and action.
- Promote shared leadership and decision-making.
- Recognize and resist the power of co-optation of our movements.
- Support these principles not only in our actions, but in the practices within our own organizations.
- Support the creation of organizational processes which encourage these principles and which effectively address oppressive individual and institutional practices within our own organizations.

A fifth reason survivors stay is that they cannot afford to leave. Women, who are more likely to be economically marginalized, fear for the financial welfare of themselves and their children should they leave an abusive situation. They often have less education and care of dependent children. They understand that the kind of paid work they could get would not be enough to support the family.

Reason six is that some survivors believe that children need a father and that even a bad father might be better than no father. Although this belief is erroneous in our view, it does keep women in abusive situations "for the sake of the children." Interestingly, the primary reason women do permanently leave an abusive relationship is also the children: When they see their children being hurt, this is the moment when they are most likely to leave for good.

Another reason survivors stay is that there is often nowhere to go. Although the increase in the numbers of crisis lines and emergency housing shelters is staggering given their absence only a few decades ago, some survivors still have a difficult time imagining an alternative to the abusive situation. This is especially true of those who live in rural areas and who are isolated from friends and family.

Reason eight is that survivors may fear what might happen to abusive partners in the criminal system, especially if they are men of color. They may also believe their partner will change. Part of the cycle of violence noted by scholars in this area is the "honeymoon phase" after the violent episode: First comes the buildup of tension when violence is brewing, second is the violent episode, and third is the honeymoon phase when abusers tend to be especially remorseful—even horrified that they could have done such a thing—and ask for forgiveness. Given that the profile of many batterers is charm and manipulation, such behavior during this phase can be especially persuasive. Survivors are not making it up when they think their partner will change.

Finally, people stay because they believe their partner might kill them—or hurt or kill the children—should they leave. Again, a batterer's past violence is often enough to establish this as no idle threat. Abusers do kill in these situations and often after partners have fled and brought restraining orders against them.

INCEST

This topic is especially poignant, as the reading by Grace Caroline Bridges, "Lisa's Ritual, Age 10," demonstrates. Incest is the sexual abuse (molestation, inappropriate touching, rape, being forced to watch or perform sexual acts on others) of children by a family member or someone with a kinship role in a child's life. There is now an evolving definition of incest that takes into account betrayals of trust and power imbalances, expanding the definition to include sexual abuse by anyone who has power or authority over the child. Perpetrators might include babysitters, schoolteachers, Boy Scout leaders, priests/ministers, and family friends, as well as immediate and extended family members. It is estimated that in about 90 percent of cases in which a child is raped, the perpetrator is someone they know. Studies suggest that 1 in every 3 to 5 girls has experienced some kind of childhood sexual abuse by the time she is 16 years old. For boys, this number is 1 in 6 to 10, although this may be underestimated because boys are less likely to admit that they have been victimized. Again, like other forms of abuse, incest crosses all ethnic, class, and religious lines. Power is always involved in incest, and, because

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN: SELECTED HUMAN RIGHTS DOCUMENTS

International human rights documents encompass formal written documents, such as conventions, declarations, conference statements, guidelines, resolutions, and recommendations. Treaties are legally binding on states that have ratified or acceded to them, and their implementation is observed by monitoring bodies, such as the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW).

GLOBAL DOCUMENTS

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) has formed the basis for the development of international human rights conventions. Article 3 states that everyone has the right of life, liberty, and security of the person. According to article 5, no one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment. Therefore, any form of violence against a woman that is a threat to her life, liberty, or security of person or that can be interpreted as torture or cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment violates the principles of this declaration.

The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966), together with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex. Violence detrimentally affects women's health; therefore, it violates the right to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health (article 12). In addition, article 7 provides the right to the enjoyment of just and favorable conditions of work that ensure safe and healthy working conditions. This provision encompasses the prohibition of violence and harassment of women in the workplace.

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) prohibits all forms of violence. Article 6.1 protects the right to life. Article 7 prohibits torture and inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. Article 9 guarantees the right to liberty and security of person.

The Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (1984) provides protection for all persons, regardless of their sex, in a more detailed manner than the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. States should take effective measures to prevent acts of torture (article 2).

The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (1979) is the most extensive international instrument dealing with the rights of women. Although violence against women is not specifically addressed in the Convention, except in relation to trafficking and prostitution (article 6), many of the antidiscrimination clauses protect women from violence. States parties have agreed to a policy of eliminating discrimination against women, and to adopt legislative

and other measures prohibiting all discrimination against women (article 2). In 1992, CEDAW, which monitors the implementation of this convention, formally included gender-based violence under gender-based discrimination.

General Recommendation No. 19, adopted at the 11th session (June 1992), deals entirely with violence against women and the measures taken to eliminate such violence. As for health issues, it recommends that states should provide support services for all victims of gender-based violence, including refugees, specially trained health workers, and rehabilitation and counseling services.

The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1965) declares that states should undertake to prohibit and to eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms and to guarantee the enjoyment of the right to security of the person and protection by the state against violence or bodily harm, whether inflicted by government officials or by any individual group or institution (article 5).

The four 1949 Geneva Conventions and two Additional Protocols form the cornerstone of international humanitarian law. The Geneva Conventions require that all persons taking no active part in hostilities shall be treated humanely, without adverse distinction on any of the usual grounds, including sex (article 3). They offer protection to all civilians against sexual violence, forced prostitution, sexual abuse, and rape.

Regarding international armed conflict, Additional Protocol I to the 1949 Geneva Conventions creates obligations for parties to a conflict to treat humanely persons under their control. It requires that women shall be protected against rape, forced prostitution, and indecent assault. Additional Protocol II, applicable during internal conflicts, also prohibits rape, enforced prostitution, and indecent assault.

The Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) declares that states should take appropriate legislative, administrative, social, and educational measures to protect the child from physical or mental violence, abuse, maltreatment, or exploitation (article 19). States shall act accordingly to prevent the exploitative use of children in prostitution or other unlawful sexual practices, and the exploitative use of children in pornographic performances and materials (article 34).

The International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (adopted by the U.N. General Assembly in 1990 and put into force in 2003) asserts the right of migrant workers and their family members to liberty and security of person as proclaimed in other international instruments. They shall be entitled to effective protection by the state against violence, physical injury, threats, and intimidation, whether by public officials or by private individuals, groups, or institutions (article 16).

children are the least powerful group in society, the effects on them can be devastating. Approximately a third of all juvenile victims of sexual abuse are younger than six. Children who are abused often have low self-esteem and may find it difficult to trust.

Incest can be both direct and indirect. Direct forms include vaginal, oral, and rectal penetration; sexual rubbing; excessive, inappropriate hugging; body and mouth kissing; bouncing a child on a lap against an erection; and sexual bathing. Direct incest also includes forcing children to watch or perform these acts on others. Indirect incest includes sexualizing statements or joking, speaking to the child as a surrogate spouse, inappropriate references to a child's body, or staring at the child's body. Examples also include intentionally invading children's privacy in the bathroom or acting inappropriately jealous when adolescents start dating. These indirect forms of incest involve sexualizing children and violating their boundaries.

Often siblings indulge in relatively normal uncoerced sexual play with each other that disappears over time. When this involves a child who is several years older or one who uses threats or intimidation, the behavior can be characterized as incestuous. Indicators that a child has been sexually abused include excessive crying, anxiety, night fears and sleep disturbances, depression and withdrawal, clinging behaviors, and physical problems like urinary tract infections and trauma to the mouth and/or perineal area. Adolescent symptoms often include eating disorders, psychosomatic complaints, suicidal thoughts, and depression. Survivors of childhood sexual violence may get involved in self-destructive behaviors such as alcohol and drug abuse or cutting their bodies as they turn their anger inward, or they may express their anger through acting out or promiscuous behavior. In particular, girls internalize their worthlessness and their role as sexual objects used by others; boys often have more anger because they were dominated, an anger that is sometimes projected onto their future sexual partners as well as onto themselves. Although it takes time, we can heal from sexual violation.

In this way, acts of violence and the threat of violence have profound and lasting effects on all lives. We tend to refer to those who have survived violence as "survivors" rather than "victims" to emphasize that it is possible to go on with our lives after such experiences, difficult though that might be. Understanding and preventing gender violence has become a worldwide effort, bringing people together to make everyone safer.

THE BLOG

HARVEY WEINSTEIN'S NOT THE PROBLEM

Susan M. Shaw (2017)

Harvey Weinstein's not the problem. He's a symptom.

Of course, we act as if he's the problem, as if the problem is one of individual bad actors who do horrific things to women.

As if Harvey Weinstein and Bill Cosby and Roger Ailes and Bill O'Reilly and Donald Trump are simply individual men committing individual bad deeds toward individual women who happen to be at the wrong place at the wrong time.

As if they are aberrations. As if most men never do these things. As if there is no pattern, no discernable imprint of misogyny, no deep and pervasive system of sexism that means these things are not rare occasions but are ubiquitous parts of the intimate and daily fabric of women's lives.

Choosing to believe sexual harassment and sexual assault are individual problems rather than the systemic and violent enforcement of sexism and misogyny (with their interlocking companions of racism, heterosexism, classism, ableism, and ageism) is certainly easier. Men as a class don't have to be implicated, and so we can pretend

that if we address the bad behavior of individual men—let's fire Roger Ailes or prosecute Bill Cosby—we've done our due diligence and taken care of the problem.

But we haven't even begun to address the real problem, which is the deep-seated misogyny and structural sexism embedded in our social institutions, ideologies, language, and relationships.

Take Harvey Weinstein. How many women had to come forward before most people believed any of them? A number of his Hollywood buddies jumped right to his defense when the first accusations were made public, but they quickly backed away from that support as the testimonies and accusations cascaded.

Woody Allen warned us not to get carried away in naming Hollywood's sexual harassment and sexual assault problem lest this become a witch hunt. How ironic given that historically witch hunts have often involved sexually repressed men murdering women who refused to fall under their control!

And why did women feel a need to participate in a #MeToo campaign to demonstrate how big the problem is? Why haven't men believed us so far when we've said sexual harassment and sexual assault are a problem? We've had the data. We've published the numbers.

But we know women are not believed. By custom and by law in this country, women have been afforded much less credibility than men. According to Lynn Hecht Schaffran, director of the National Judicial Education Program to Promote Equality for Women and Men in the Court, "Sociological and legal research documents that women have less credibility in courts across the board than men."

The problem is not individual men like Harvey Weinstein. Men like him exist and get away with their barbarities because, despite the gains of feminist movements against sexism, we have not fundamentally transformed the interlocking systems of oppression that differentially disadvantage diverse women, transgender people, and gender nonbinary people and penalize them for not being cisgender men.

Think about how difficult the legal system makes prosecuting a rape, for example. Coincidence? Or

evidence of a system created by men to maintain male dominance, particularly men's rights over women's bodies? Think of all the barriers to women's reproductive justice. The barriers to women's health care. The barriers to equal pay. Recent research has found that women of color face an astounding amount of harassment in space science. Not long ago, Boston University launched an investigation into a prominent Antarctic scientist accused of sexually harassing graduate students. Mother Jones published the story of an aspiring academic harassed by a star professor. *The Atlantic* ran a story of how women are harassed out of science.

These are not individual incidents of individual bad actors, any more than are the despicable actions of Harvey Weinstein or Bill Cosby.

These point to the larger systemic problem that will not be fixed by a few investigations, firings, or even prison sentences.

While women, transwomen, gender nonbinary people, and even a few men have taken to social media to tell their stories of sexual harassment and sexual assault, few men have spoken up beyond the cursory and expected condemnation of bad behavior. Some of Weinstein's former friends have called him out, but calling one man out for sexual harassment and sexual assault won't change the system that enables and preserves that behavior as a way to maintain male dominance.

What's needed is a gender revolution that tears apart the fabric of patriarchy itself. And that's not the responsibility of women, transgender folk, and gender nonbinary folk. That's the responsibility of men. The problem is systemic, and the response must be systemic. And it must come from men being accountable for the contours of patriarchal power and the violence that props it up.

Muriel Rukeyser wrote, "What would happen if one woman told the truth about her life? The world would split open."

Women have told the truth. Is it possible the world is now splitting?

63. BEYOND THE POLITICS OF INCLUSION

ANDREA SMITH (2004)

What was disturbing to so many U.S. citizens about the September 11, 2001, attacks on the World Trade Center is that these attacks disrupted their sense of safety at "home." Terrorism is something that

happens in other countries; our "home," the U.S.A., is supposed to be a place of safety. Similarly, mainstream U.S. society believes that violence against women only occurs "out there" and is perpetrated