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FOREWARD

Susan Rae Peterson

This collection was put together not only because of the significant gap in knowledge on the subject of rape, but also because of the remarkable personal and intellectual insights offered by my students in a paper on the morality of rape.

The topic of rape is surrounded by both a conspiracy of silence and a great deal of mythological (i.e., false) ideas concerning it. Without much prompting from me or classroom material, these students, both men and women alike, were able to suddenly "see" what had been there all along, and then were able to write eloquently about their insights. Thus, although many students made the same or similar insights, their examples always differ with respect to the student's own personal experiences as well as various ethnic backgrounds represented by the unique student body at the College at Old Westbury.

Briefly, the College at Old Westbury is a part of the State University of New York which has a mission: to educate the traditionally by-passed. Such traditionally by-passed students include all those who were not expected to, and therefore did not, go directly from high school into college. Such students may be poor or underprivileged in many respects, but such students may also be rich and underprivileged, as is the case with middle class women who were expected to marry and raise a family after high school. Many such women are now interested in furthering their intellectual and social interests. Also, there are middle-aged men who are either near retirement or who feel there is more to life than their respective careers.

Thus, the college's students are representative of the country at large, rather than a select group of young, middle class 18-22 year old males. This made group discussions of rape all the more interesting and fruitful. It is hoped that these papers will convey our interests and insights to the women's studies reader. All the papers reached an astounding degree of success for the first paper of the semester in such a difficult and new field. That is why I thought I would put them together for the benefit of the academic community as a whole.

The value of this collection is due entirely to the students who wrote the various selections. All I did was to try to provide the language of ethics as taught in traditional philosophy courses to enable the student to articulate his or her thoughts better. In particular, it took some doing to get students to use moral words such as 'good', 'bad', 'right' and 'wrong' freely. Once that was done, their problems disappeared.
In Appendix A I include a copy of the syllabus used for the course. Appendix B includes the syllabus used in the same course the following year, using materials from the recent appearance of FEMINISM AND PHILOSOPHY, edited by Vetterling-Braggin and published by Littlefield-Adams. Appendix C includes some of the personal facts concerning my qualifications for teaching such a course, including a brochure hand-out on presentation offerings.

Most Women's Studies courses are interdisciplinary, as is the entire College at Old Westbury. Thus there is ample room for including movies, novels, poetry, etc., in such a course.

My own organization of the course divided itself into four areas: ethics, philosophy of law, criminology and feminist theory. Since there is no available compendium on all of these things, several readings were required and even more recommended. Most students didn't find these burdensome. A lot of time is possible to spend on Amir's PATTERNS IN FORCIBLE RAPE (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967).

Concerning ethics, many papers have been written trying to focus upon precisely what it is that is wrong, morally speaking, with rape. Some have considered it a violation of treating a person as a means rather than as an end. Some consider it a matter of lack of communication between sex partners. Some have seen it as a matter of curtailing the rights of women to be free. It turns out to be very difficult upon examination to precisely pinpoint the moral problem with rape, especially since behavior which contributes to and comprises actions involved in rape are none of them by themselves considered to be wrong socially.

Throughout the course, in order to enliven the discussion and alleviate any temptation to condescend as college students to the "average unenlightened" person on the street, I argued that there was in fact nothing wrong with rape. Obviously this was not my personal belief, but I wanted to be persuaded that rape is wrong and why it is so. These papers were the students' first attempt to persuade me.

Concerning philosophy of law, we studied different theories of crime causation and "victimology" as well as the actual laws. Rationale for the laws was studied as well as the problem of whether laws reflect moral concerns of society or not. With rape, it became very clear that a law can exist which clearly and forcefully (by a heavy sanction) condemn an action which is not only socially acceptable but common and perhaps even encouraged. One is reminded here of laws prohibiting alcohol.

Concerning criminology, thus far Amir dominates the field, and so a lot of time was spent detecting methodological difficulties in his study. Moreover, we detected sexism and "classism" as well. Poring through the statistical data proved more difficult than anything else, since some of it was very misleading not to say entirely mistaken.
Feminist theory was not yet collected in a convenient volume as I consider FEMINISM AND PHILOSOPHY to be, so we relied upon various sources and lectures which tried to summarize the various positions.

I hope this compendium encourages lively debates and a new interest in a very old crime which nonetheless continues unabated and with alarming public apathy.

It is possible to order these pamphlets directly from Susan Peterson at the State University of New York at Old Westbury, Westbury, New York, 11568, (516) 876-3110 for $1.00 apiece.

The individual group leader or teacher can use these materials as he or she sees fit. The only structuring I did was to force the student to see rape as a crime against women by men. Thus it is a sex crime insofar as it is not a class crime; i.e., women of all classes get raped and men of all classes rape. However, it is a crime of violence more than it is a crime of passion. The term "sex crime" is ambiguous on this point.

Ideologically, only certain views were offered to the student. First, rape by definition cannot be perpetrated upon men. Secondly, although sodomy may be as morally repugnant as rape, in fact it is more rare than rape and it is in fact also so repugnant that convictions in sodomy cases are much higher than in rape cases.

Moreover, vaginas have at least one feature anuses don't have which significantly alters the seriousness of the crime of rape for women: vaginas are connected to reproductive organs. Thus, a woman cannot rape a man back.

However, the question arose: Is there a crime which is exactly the moral converse of rape? In other words, could it be the case that a woman or women could attack a man and force him to have heterosexual intercourse with her? Some said yes, and some said no. The question seemed to turn on whether or not an erection was a sign of consent. Out of seven men, four said it was and three said it was not.

This resolved into the question of language. We have a word for rape, and it is a rather old one at that. However, on the other hand we have no word for this female "rape" of men. The student was offered the bargain of coming up with a term for this in exchange for an essay. But no one could. This is an ominous sign for the future in my opinion. Perhaps your group will be more successful. If so, I wish you would share your knowledge with my group. It would be greatly appreciated.
INTRODUCTION

Victoria Lesser

In the fall semester of 1977, Professor Susan Peterson taught a course entitled "The Politics of Rape." This was part of the curriculum offered by the Comparative History, Ideas, and Cultures Program at the College at Old Westbury.

This was a senior level course which attracted 40 quite diversified students, 33 women and 7 men.

The goal of the course was to analyze the problem of rape in terms of practical and theoretical explanations of it. In the end, the students were expected to offer a concrete proposal concerning the solution of the problem, together with an appropriate theoretical explanation justifying the proposal and favored by the student.

The objective of the course was to understand the sociology of rape, to study criminological investigations of rape, discuss and choose amongst various political philosophies which explain rape. The course was interdisciplinary, and included criminology, political philosophy, philosophy of art, moral theory and feminism. Men were encouraged to enroll. The focal question was: What causes rape?

The books used were:

Susan Brownmiller, Against Our Will
Susan Griffin, "Rape: The All-American Crime"
Molly Haskell, From Reverence to Rape: The Treatment of Women in the Movies"
Menachem Amir, Patterns in Forcible Rape
Susan Peterson, "Coercion and Rape: The State as a Male Protection Racket"

The nature of the student's project was to provide the interested public in the response of a group of students to the reality of rape. The morality of sexism is the crux of the issue as we saw it, and we hope the gist of our collective ideas is clear to the reader. Basically, we agreed that sexism includes different ideas concerning the morality of women and men, ideas which are inconsistent with each other and which result in harm being done to women by men.

We carefully distinguished between rape and sodomy; rape is legally defined as the forcible penetration of a vagina by a penis of a man who is not the woman's husband. By that definition, men cannot be raped. The moral repugnance of sodomy was generally agreed upon, but then again women can be both raped and sodomized (this is not statistically uncommon).
CHAPTER ONE

RAPE AS OPPRESSION:

Sexual Terrorism as Keeping Women In Their Place
Rape is crippling women economically, psychologically and socially. Also rape is degrading the general moral level of society. The most interesting thing about learning about rape is the number of myths and misinterpretations surrounding it.

Rape is defined as the act of carnal knowledge of a woman without her consent. It is the most vicious crime committed by man against woman. It is an act culminating the hatred felt towards women by patriarchal society, even though some men in fact never rape.

The urgency of this issue must be recognized, for as long as rape continues women will continue to be denied their freedom of a life they equally deserve.

I don't think rape has been taken seriously enough. The term rape is been used metaphorically too often which I think has caused people to forget what rape really means. It is because of this lack of knowledge that has enabled rape to flourish. It is this unnatural act of man against woman that causes the great injustice toward women.

Since the beginning of recordable history, men have used their strength and the vulnerability of women to force women into subservient roles, as somewhat less than a person.

Since the crime is hideous and common, are we left only to lock any door that stands between us and man? I hope not, yet our space keeps getting smaller and smaller, as long as rape keeps getting larger and larger.

The question doesn't change. Why rape? The answers are too few, the hurt too great. It is necessary for all people to understand where rape has gotten us and where it might lead. For it we are to continue as a society, hoping to achieve that which humans are capable of, we must recognize the facts surrounding rape.

We must understand the "place" that has been determined for women by men, and enforced by the culture through the threat of rape. We must change our place to one which is freer, one which allows us strength and determination.

This compendium is comprised of papers written by students. They are not going to deal with the hard core facts concerning the brutality of the crime. You will not read about rape cases, police procedures after a reported rape, or courtroom scenes. Rather, these papers are the thoughts of students who studied society generally, in terms of what is a "good" woman, what is a "bad" woman, and what is a "good" or "bad" man. The title of the assignment was "The Morality of Rape."
Some students used the media to show cause for their beliefs, others just dealt with the topic in general, using as a guide the impact the class had on their lives.

But all the papers similarly deal with "What is wrong with rape?" I have broken this collection down into different topics for the convenience of the reader. Although each paper might somehow touch on the same strands of thought, themes vary enough so that these categories are meaningful.

Although I am sure there are other methods of categorization which would achieve better results, I felt this particular means sufficient to enable the reader to follow the intentions of the students.
A Woman's Place

Iris Greenberg

Rape is terrorism that limits the freedom of women and is used to keep them in their place. Society decrees that all women - no matter what her mental, emotional and physical abilities are - should be confined to a certain life style, and be content to stay there without complaining.

The place I'm referring to is the home, and the life style is that of homemaker. This encompasses a great many chores, but the primary one is keeping the house humming comfortably for the male. Life revolves around his schedule. Shopping done, cleaning done, cooking done, children shining and quiet, all must be ready for the breadwinner. He leaves the care of the day behind him and comes home to his little woman. He after all, has had to face the real problems of life on the outside, and deserves to be waited on and served when he leaves his male oriented world. He don't want anything to upset him when he wants to relax. Who in the world would do all that had to be done, if not his woman? Under the institutionalism of sexism, she is his property, and as such must take care of his needs above everything else.

Everything in our society tells us this is so. Television has had many situation shows about family life in America. "Life With Father" and "Father Knows Best" are two of the most popular programs in which the male has a successful life outside the home, while the woman is beset with decisions such as drapery fabrics, the best place to meet her friends for lunch, and bridge parties. I think that Desi Arnez and Lucille Ball are a perfect example in which a woman is kept in her place. Lucy kept trying to break out of the role of housewife and get into show business. Desi would hear of no such thing for his wife. At the end of each show Lucy would be confined back home scheming for another way to escape.

The movies are notorious in the way they handle the problem of a woman's place. Molly Haskell in "From Reverence to Rape" give us many examples of this. Katherine Hepburn, Rosaline Russell and Joan Crawford were usually portrayed as ambitious women who were after a career, but found true happiness only when they succumbed to their men, and gave up their independence. Women were shown to be themselves when making love, while men were pictured as creators, achievers and conquerors. Ambitious women had to be mocked in films. They were shown as aggressive caricatures who tried to be one of the boys while making it in a man's world. Their suits and hats were fashioned after masculine styles. They were hard drinking, tough speaking gals who melted and realized their true place after surrendering to the male. There was no way to forget where they actually belonged. Even if ambition to get ahead did overcome them, this was only temporary and they ultimately came home to roost.
"The Blue Angel" showed quite a different situation, and yet Marlene Dietrich too had a place to be kept in. When the professor married her, he was the one to be punished. He defied the rules of society, and took her from her place as a bad woman to the respectable position of wife. This lapse of good sense was so horrible, that he lost his job, lost his self-respect, and eventually went crazy and killed himself.

Molly Haskell also pointed out that women should be malleable and are considered as art objects. I don't think any picture points that out as well as "Beauty Knows No Pain". The young girls who yearned to be Rangerettes were molded in every way to be an object. The thinking, feeling parts of these girls were stripped down, it would seem, to nothing. They were made into beautiful, automated dolls that marched, danced and smiled, smiled, smiled. They were a picture of discipline and obeyed orders on command. What wonderful ornamental wives they would become one day. Sad to say, I found it to be a completely dehumanizing experience. Yet these girls desperately wanted to become one of those objects. They had been taught that it was desirable to be a beautiful obedient thing.

The boundaries are very well defined, and if a woman aspires to something more than the subscribed roles, she is subject to harm. If she steps out of line she is just asking for all sorts of trouble and rape is a means of social control to keep her where she belongs.
Rape: What is Wrong With It?

Barbara Untener

What is wrong with rape? Discounting the physical damage that can be caused by the act, and ignoring the psychological trauma that is usually caused by such a ruthless act, the most important thing wrong with rape is that it restricts a woman from her freedom.

The other damages are temporary and only the result of such an act. The restriction of a woman's freedom is a lifelong, everlasting oppression.

From the day we are born into this world we are indoctrinated. We are told not to leave the block that we live on because we do not know what kind of a "man" lurks around the corner. We are told not to accept candy from anyone. We are told never to talk to strangers. We are told not to kiss a boy on the first date; nor to let him fondle our body; otherwise he will think that we are easy and then pursue a sexual relationship which could eventually lead into a forcible act. We are told not to wear clothes that will entice men; because after all they are men and they get "excited" easily. We are told never to go into a bar or a cocktail lounge alone; because we are then only asking for trouble. Only "Tramps" go into bars alone. We are told not to wear "too much makeup", otherwise we look "cheap".

We are told never to live alone; because then we become easy prey. And, if possible, don't live in a big city because that is where you are more apt to be raped. We are told not to walk the streets too late at night. We are told not to do this, and we are told not to do that.

Does all this sound repetitive? Well, it is. A woman's life is a series of "don't do this" and "don't do that".

Are the above reasons the real cause of rape? According to statistics they are not! Some of the above circumstances might have been prevalent at the time of the rape, but they are not the reasons that the act was committed. To be a victim of rape is one of the most degrading and humiliating experiences for a woman. Therefore, most rape cases are not even reported.

Since we are in a male dominated society, which is debilitating and oppressive to women, we will always be vulnerable to rape.

This male-oriented society that we are a part of not only controls the minds of women, but also their vaginas.

"Men not only control the money and the business in this country, but also make the decisions for the future of women."
We are governed by a male government. We have a Supreme Court that hands down decisions which affect women's lives and this Supreme Court consists of men.

These men have already decided that the Federal Government will not pay for abortions for the women who cannot afford them. This is an act of "Vaginal control". These men pompously decide that women who cannot afford to pay for an abortion have the choice of either having the baby, aborting themselves or going to a "butcher" who will do it for them in a filthy hotel room, or they have the choice of going insane or committing suicide.

Men control women by being the impregnator and then oppressing women with the responsibility of children to raise.

Men are physically stronger than women which enables them to control our bodies forcibly. There is no way a woman could successfully thwart an attack by physical strength on her part. If a man has rape on his mind, he will undoubtedly be successful in his endeavor.

The police are overwhelmingly represented by men, and a woman who has been raped or has a problem with her husband, etc., must deal with this authority. It is degrading and embarrassing for a woman to have to go to such an authority and subjugate herself to humiliation upon being asked the facts and detail of her rape. She, in turn, becomes victimized again; this time by the police.

Generally the rapist goes free because the burden of proof is upon the victim and if the offender is found guilty, the jury hesitates to pronounce his guilt as such because of the harsh punishment. Thereby he generally gets away with the crime only to go out and commit it again.

I do want to mention one very important factor of control over women and that is economics. Men control the economics of this country; therefore, we must depend upon them for jobs and a salary to live independently. Without this we are always dependent upon men to support us. All the big corporations are controlled by men and that will never change.

I believe that all of the above are part and parcel of the restrictions placed upon women in this society. We are not free because the control and power is not within our hands. We are not free because we are physically weaker. We are not free because we are economically dependant.

Until we have full equality, until we are recognized by men as being equal to them we will never be free.
The ERA is not the answer to this equality. It is important; but men must be reconditioned. We are the nurturers, we raise the children, and, therefore, we must educate women who will eventually become mothers to educate their children to this ideology. It is generations away from us.

We will always have rape as long as we are oppressed. Rape is another form of that oppression. When we are socially, psychologically and economically equal, we will be totally free; and then maybe rape will be a rare occurrence.
The Cause and Effects of Rape

Patricia Christie

Rape is institutionalized within our patrilineal culture. Down through history, rape has been the tool of oppression of the conquer. Within today's society, rape is a symptom of woman's oppression and man's supremacy. The fear of rape makes women second class citizens, curtailing their personal freedom and leaving them no legal recourse against their oppressors - politically helpless.

Rape is wrong because the oppression of any group within a whole is wrong. It is the obligation of every member of a society to contribute to the well being of all the members in that society. This is the premise by which our legal system functions, giving federal, state, and local governments the power to deny an individual's rights for the good of the whole. Charles Darwin clearly stated that the only species which have survived were those who cooperated. Those who fought among themselves and victimized each other became extinct. Denial of the potential of half the society, namely females, has caused internal conflict and made male supremacy and rights more important than human survival and advancement.

By using the theories of Susan Brownmiller, Nancy Gager and Cathleen Schurr, Menachem Amir, and Susan Peterson, I intend to show how rape became institutionalized, how it functions to oppress women within our society, and possibly to propose some reforms of our legal and social systems which would curtail rape, thereby equalizing the rights of all individuals within society so that through the benefit of combined potential of all its members, maximum potential for survival can be reached.

Rape is the act of forcible intercourse perpetrated through mental coercion (threat) or physical violence. Rape is not a sexual crime but an assault on the body of the female. Many authors have stated that rapists often are unable to function sexually normally or have available sex partners already (wives, girlfriends). Rapists often resort to perverted sexual practices and torture: His aim is to dehumanize, degrade, humiliate, or even mutilate. This, because of our society's acceptance of male aggressiveness in sex
and toward women, he believes to be his right. No one
denies that rape is wrong. The discrepancy is in whether
the rape actually exists or whether it was justified.
A woman is supposed to be passive and dependent. If
she is not, the man is within his rights to violate her.
Women are in a unique position because they can be vic-
tims of rape, usually physically weaker than their as-
sailants, taught not to fight back, and unable to re-
taliate in kind on their attacker.

Rape is immoral because it causes physical and
emotional harm to another human being. Under the premise
that one individual's rights stop where another being's
rights begin. But within a society where survival of the
whole is most important, an individual's rights can be
usurped by the power structure. Within our society,
this is exactly what has happened. Since the power
structure is male (an analogy created by the necessity
for physical strength for protection and the biological
necessity of a woman's childbearing) and the rights of
males have become of paramount important. Rape is jus-
tified as a method of control, regardless of whether it
inflicts harm on women. Rape, therefore, has become a
functional right of males within a male dominated society.

Rape began its justification as a method of
control when warring tribes considered women part of
the bounty due the conquering army. Women and children
were considered the property of their husbands and fa-
thers. Rape, abduction, and forced prostitution have
remained effective means of control, humiliating, di-
viding and subduing conquered peoples. Even today, as
reports about the rape and plunder during the recent
undeclared Vietnam War show. Rape was effectively
used as a method of subjection of blacks during sla-
very in the U.S. The black female had no rights what-
soever, to privacy, chastity, even life. And the black
male was even stripped of his ability to protect his
wife or daughter from the sexual whims of the white
master. Among primitive societies, gang rape is
used as a punishment to deter independence or deviation
from the accepted female role.

In modern society, the threat of rape is
used to control the amount of personal freedom permitted to females. Women sell themselves into marriage for masculine protection. Rape seems to be a male symbol of power, proof of manhood.

Modern society has evolved a series of myths which contribute to the oppressing power of the threat of rape. The inconsistency of these myths does not prevent their belief. They are made to serve man's purpose, and by contributing to the female victim mentality, they effectively prevent women from bonding together to fight rape (oppression). The rape myths state basically:

1. All women want to be raped.
2. No woman can be raped against her will.
3. She was asking for it.
4. If you're going to be raped, you might as well relax and enjoy it.

The first myth testifies to the supreme rightness of male power. It is obviously in the males' interest to believe that all women secretly want to be raped. But it is just as nonsensical to say that all men secretly want to be beaten and forced against their will to commit sodomy. But, if one believes all women have this secret desire (and many famous psychiatrists such as Freud maintain this), then it stands to reason no woman can be raped against her will, for there is no such thing as forcible rape. This statement also implies that women are always physically strong enough to ward off an attacker, which is biologically untrue. The statement "She was asking for it" effectively shifts the blame from the rapist to the victim. She enticed him, seduced him. He is not responsible for controlling his own actions, a mere pawn in the hands of the unscrupulous female. How convenient for the male to be so weak willed.

The fourth myth, "women might as well enjoy it" is based on the unfortunate fact that the male will inevitably triumph, the woman has no rights or freedoms.

If a woman exercises the freedoms which are assumed to be the rights of males, namely, to walk in the park, to stop for a drink, she is "asking to be
raped" by putting herself in a vulnerable position. The rapist is justified. Rape is the only crime when it is the victim who must prove her innocence and thereby establish that the rapist was not justified. If a thief stole money from a shopkeeper's register, it would be upsurd for a jury to expect the shopkeeper to prove he didn't deserve to be robbed. But in rape cases, because of the sexual aspects of the event, the victim's motives and actions are of paramount concern. Rape is viewed, not as an assault on a woman's freedom or body, but a loss or theft of her chastity as owned by her husband or father. The woman is a possession. Her lack of consent, innocence, credibility and proof of resistance must be established. She could be claiming rape to save face and cover her own guilt for yielding to sex outside of marriage, or out of revenge and therefore victimize the poor man.

Notoriously, in the past, courts have required proof of resistance, struggle in the form of cuts, bruises, etc. and proof of non-compliance in the form of acting properly restricted. No court would convict a rapist if the woman was drunk or out alone at a bar. It is assumed she expected to be raped. Likewise, no jury would convict a boyfriend for raping his date after dinner at her place. It is assumed she expected to pay for her date with sexual favors. In fact, most police officers refuse to take complaints in these and similar cases because they are "unfounded," or unbelieved, impossible to prosecute. Women are told to calm down and accept what happened as a consequence of their behavior. If one is independent, one is fair game.

Rape is the most under-reported crime, due to fear and embarrassment, bias by the police and juries, and reactions of the husband and boyfriends of the victims. Rape victims are intimidated by their attackers, embarrassed by the sexual nature of the crime, unbelieved by the police and juries, and abandoned and treated as unclean by their families. Rape is the only crime where the victim is locked up and punished and the criminal is exonerated.

In Amir's study of reported rapes, the statistics showed that 15% of reported cases were
"unfounded" or not believed. Of the remaining 85%, only in 51% were offenders actually arrested, a low percent-
age when compared to other crimes. Of those arrested, 76% were prosecuted. Of these, 47% were acquitted. The actual conviction rate is as low as 3% in some surveys. 6

Amir's study also disproved the popular male theory that rape is an uncontrollable crime of passion. 71% of Amir's rapists had planned their rapes. Only 25% were unplanned, reportedly because of opportunity or impaired judgment by alcohol consumption, 43% were gang or pair rapes. 85% reported that they used weapons and force to achieve their goal. Only 15% said they were able to coerce their victims by intimidation, which shows their victims were far from willing. Amir draws a picture of a rapist as somewhere between a robber and a fighter. Rape is both the act of acquiring property and physical damage. 7

Amir also says that rape is a weekend activity occurring most often between 8 P.M. and 2 A.M. Therefore, he hypothesizes that women would be safe if they maintained a curfew. 8 But no woman is safe. Putting the emphasis on the woman's availability instead of expecting the rapist to exercise control is like saying a rapist commits no crime because a woman walked outside or a robber commits no crime because a store deals in money. This is absurd.

The emphasis should be on controlling the criminal, investigating his M.O., capturing and punishing him, preventing the crime, not on categorizing victims and their statistics, telling them to control their behavior. But can the woman actually protect herself by preventing her availability? Statistics show that 34 to 56% of rapes occur at home with the rapist breaking and entering, 11 to 22% occur in automobiles, and 11 to 26% on streets. 9 So where is the safe place? As in all crimes, the prevention lies with the criminal, not the victim. Too much time is spent on instructing the victim and not enough on punish-
ing the criminal.

Newspaper articles appealing to the sensationalism of "beauty ravished" distort the actual facts that all women from infants to senior citizens are potential
victims of rape. The appeal of the rapist to the victim is not sexual but to exert his power, to humiliate, to devastate, to violate; any weaker person will do, regardless of age or beauty.

The low rate of conviction in rape cases reinforces the rapist's right to rape, to commit violent acts against females and get away with it, contributing to the high rate rate. Although stiff sentences (life imprisonment, death sentences) attest to the moral outrage of the male community at rape, they also deter the jury from convicting rapists, again reinforcing his right to rape, leaving the victim helpless. Fear of conviction does not exist. Actually statistics show convictions to be racially motivated, with more severe sentences given to blacks. The media's role in painting a picture of the typical passive female, the heroic rapist and our subculture of violence helps to solidify the male image of machismo and sexual aggression. The female's social conditioning to passivity contributes to her inability to fight her oppression and therefore she accepts her subservient position. Even if she does report her rape, she is victimized by the police; subjected to a demeaning interrogation, leered at, humiliated, made the source of sexual enticement by her male protectors. The medical profession, also male oriented, is also guilty of gross neglect, harassment and humiliation. The court procedure, designed to protect the rights of the criminal, proceeds to discredit and embarrass the victim. With all this ahead of her, it is easily understood why few women report rapes and difficult to understand why anyone would assume a woman would claim rape untruly.

Before the crime of rape can be effectively controlled, a number of changes must be made within society. The police need to be trained to treat victims humanely and focus their investigation on the suspect instead of the victim. The hospitals need to provide prompt, standardized gynecological services for victims without hostility and with follow-ups to prevent pregnancy and venereal disease and psychological support for victims and their families. Laws need to be changed to provide reasonable penalties, allow a woman to fight back without penalty, to protect the rights of the victim as well as the
criminal and to assume the credibility of the victim and her right to bodily privacy regardless of her previous sexual conduct or independent lifestyle. Society needs to assume women have the same rights as men and view women as equal, mutual partners, not the property of males, vehicles of their sexual desires. Men must be held responsible for their own actions. Our society's norms should be rewritten so that they are consistent with our ideology of equality so that the rapist, now viewed as psychologically "normal" would become apparent as a truly sociopathic individual, power hungry instead of an exaggeration of the "normal" violent male role. Statistics show that up to 85% of rapists also commit other crimes, but psychologists still maintain their personality profiles are within "normal" range. Until some of these changes do take place, it is important for Rape Crisis Centers to foster female bonding and to provide the emotional support needed by women in a male dominated society and eventually to gain political power against the male power structure.

So, the threat of rape, created by a meticulous process of male cooperation, has succeeded in controlling the actions of females, allowing the establishment of a society based on male supremacy, once, but no longer, necessary to ensure survival and inheritance. Through a system of myths created to protect males, pertaining to sexuality and women, the justification of the rapist and the guilt of the victim has been established. This process has shifted the society's main emphasis from group survival to male survival and thereby denied its ability to reach its full economic, scientific, or even philosophical potential. Only in a society where all human beings are allowed to contribute their maximum can the highest potential be achieved. Therefore, aside from the moralistic concern for physical and emotional harm inflicted upon the oppressed section of any population, even the oppressors are experiencing only a temporary euphoria, destined to lead them to destruction. In these advanced times of atomic energy, population explosion and space exploration, it is imperative that the human race not be divided against itself by sex.
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Is a Liberated Woman a "Good" Woman?

Elaine Milone

In today's society of the 70's, the word liberation has become widely known and used. It has made its entrance into the vocabulary of most Americans either negatively or positively. If I had to venture a guess, I would estimate that most Americans have become aware of the term through the medium of the media. For liberation has effected most Americans personally would be hard to say. In order for one to experience the sense of the word one would undoubtedly have to have a sense of being oppressed first. Of course, one need not experience oppression in order to simply understand the scope of its meaning. In other words, liberation can be understood either through its experience or rationally. To say that a person is liberated is to say that the person has experienced and understood the bonds of oppression and sees the immorality that stands behind the position. Once a person's awareness of the bond and its immorality is either experienced or understood, the person has a higher degree of self-consciousness. One would think that this degree of self-consciousness would create a more intuned, morally alert individual actively seeking to liberate oppression and injustice, both personally and for others. However, I shall argue that due to the nature of the type of society American women live in, it is not possible for women to actively achieve liberation while remaining morally good. And to show the paradox inherent in this view: Women indeed have a moral obligation to fight against oppression and injustice.

Living, as women do, in a male-dominated patriarchal society, standards as well as identity for both males and females are derived via the male. The cultural norm under patriarchy of male identity consists in power, prestige, and privilege. However, even though women derive their knowledge of who they are through the males in society, power, prestige and privilege is not a cultural norm for women. Men are the arbiters of identity for both sexes; yet men do not allow women any power, prestige, privilege, and perogative. In fact, males hold the power, prestige, privilege, and perogative as over and against the gender class women. In other words, the males are the oppressors of women and women are now, by definition, powerless. It doesn't take much insight to recognize what suddenly emerges: male supremacy. Under patriarchy, then, masculinity in any form is a commitment to sexist injustice.

One can see how the oppressive attitude towards women is institutionalized in the traditional family, simply by observing this basic social unit of society. It is the male—the head of the house—who has the option of exercising his rule whenever he so chooses. After all, it is widely assumed and accepted that the male "wears the pants" in his family. He allows the woman to handle the day to day decisions of family life until such time as a conflict should arise. If the conflict can be mutually agreed upon and a decisive decision made, both have shared equally in the decision making. However, if a conflict of interest arises between the male and female figures of the household, it is ultimately the male who has the final word. Is it not just this very process of exercising his power that becomes as important an act as obtaining whatever it is his power can get for him? The key to the male ego in society is exactly the notion of power. Masculine power is for use over and against women.
Anyone familiar with Marxist philosophy knows that he argues the first class opposition coincides with the development of the antagonism between man and woman in monogamous marriage, and the first class oppression coincides with that of the female by the male. "Monogamous Marriage comes on the scene as the subjugation of the one sex by the other..." (Engels). I know that there might be some voices crying in opposition, but I truly believe if one would only look at their own individual positions, then the statement could become quite clear.

In our American society, it is definitely an empirical fact that household management has absolutely no place in the public sphere. The housewife is definitely excluded from all participation in social production. Her position in the home is equivalent to a slave. It might be painful to admit but male society does not leave any room for doubt: the woman is a possession of her husband. Patriarchy holds the average woman prisoner. She lives dependent on the status and economic power of men. The very social fabric of our male-dominated culture denies women equal access to political, economic, and legal power. She is culturally forced into a passive/submissive role in society. She in turn learns to accept and internalize her submissive role to the masculine strength and her passivity teaches her to regard herself as unable to act. She sees herself as impotent and in no way self-sufficient. She is now deprived of her status as a human being and is no longer able to be free because she is the object and not the subject of human behavior.

Unfortunately, this is the plight of women in society; this is no fabricated story. Women are the carnal chattel of men and they are denied absolute control of their own bodies and lives. If you don't believe me, just take a glance around. Who controls when you are needed in the labor force and when you are not? The male capitalist. Who decides if you should have legal custody of the children? The male judge. Who do you turn to for professional help? The male psychiatrist, the male clergy, the male gynecologists, the male professor. Who are you afraid of when you walk the streets? Yes, above all else, the rapist. Now tell me that you don't recognize it. Every woman in society has absolutely no control over her own life and body. Every law, custom, and habit has been proscribed and perpetuated by males. Is this not the utmost of injustice and oppression?

Every woman experiences all of the above to varying degrees, but not every woman understands and internalizes the experience. Perhaps that is why there are some women who adamantly refuse to believe they are oppressed? But what about the women whose consciousness have been raised and who recognize that women have lied and manipulated and pretended to be helpless and were guilty of conspiring in their own idealization—and their own oppression? What about the women who
refuse to accept "the ground rules of the game and participate in its penalties and rewards: The inhibition and self-denial, the duplicity, resistance, agony, and uncertainty, and even the ecstasy?" (Haskell) Indeed, is she not recognized today as the liberated woman? But how is she viewed in society? Is her behavior acceptable or considered an anomaly? If it is an anomaly, then it is unacceptable and deviant. And deviant in societal terms is bad, and bad, therefore, is wrong, and wrong is immoral.

It is commonly accepted today for a woman to pursue advanced education and a career. But what about the woman who chooses a career over having a family? Isn't marrying and bearing children a paramount destiny for a woman even today? If she negates her paramount destiny, isn't something just a little wrong with her? After all she really isn't a "real woman" unless she marries and bears children. And what about the woman who does compete and conceivably win in a man's world? Is she still not viewed as defying emotional gravity and going against the prevailing notions about the female sex? Is she still not viewed as least "womanly"? In order for a woman to insist on professional relationships she is defying cultural expectations and becomes unfeminine, and undesirable. She ignores the socially accepted thoughts. Therefore, her climb to success in a male-dominated culture is unnatural, unwomanly, unfeminine, undesirable and an anomaly. Hence, according to a male-dominated patriarchal society, she is deviant, bad, wrong, and immoral for not adhering to society's standards and expectations by not fitting into the mold of conventionality. She has failed the test of character.

Some test! In order to pass, a woman must deny her own feelings and learn not to act from them. She must learn to fear herself. She must learn to stifle every masculine quality inherent in her and cripple herself from her own self-expression. She must censor masculine traits within her own self, yet turn to males in society to derive her identity. What an impossible task to expect of anyone. It's like expecting a child not to imitate its parents.

As a last irony, women, in this same male-dominated society, learn their femininity only to become the perfect victim of sexual aggression. They must learn to control, smother, and stifle every means of self-determination for what? Only to be terrorized and raped? Is this not the end of all ends? Is this not abyss of humiliation and injustice? Are women enculturated into society only to have the ultimate act of domination some day reaped upon them? Rape.

Perhaps, liberated women are immoral by societal terms but they have a deep moral obligation to fight back. And I don't mean with guns and the art of karate. I mean with their morally alert consciousness. They have a moral duty not towards only other women but also to children and men. It is highly important as Haskell suggests for women to explore the 'inner space' of their conditioning, to discover
long-suppressed anger, contending with the conflicting demands of their lives as working women mothers/professionals, and finding relief and moral support in a shared experience. There is much need for camaraderie and mutual support among women. There is much need for all women who are liberated to help all others to see "the lie" and the inherent contradictions perpetuated by it. And this takes a strong moral commitment in face of the adversary. The male ego with his notion of power and allegiance to masculinity must be made to experience and understand just how morally wrong and unjust his position is. His consciousness must be raised. Unless we all recognize the immorality of societies' "lie", I'm afraid we will all strangle ourselves to death with the knots of contradictions. It's a painful way to die and we are all doing it to ourselves. The modern age has no one to blame but man himself.

To understand and experience liberation is every person's moral duty and obligation. Liberation is not just for deviant and unconventional people. Liberation is a step toward a more morally alert society where self-determination is equally accessible and where the possibility of the penultimate act of humiliation and injustice, rape, can no longer be justified.
'It's your own fault for being built that way'
Lurking beneath her modest female exterior is a subconscious desire to be ravished." But, of course, in a society which represses female sexuality while at the same time encouraging men to enjoy what God put on this planet for him (women), it is understandable that men think that women are incapable of talking about and taking sexually what they really want, so they must do it for them.

The belief that rape is sexual and only accidentally do the women get bruised, consistently relies on society's definition of male and female sexuality and what a "good" or "bad" woman is in order to determine whether the rapist should be prosecuted or defended. Rape in our society is seen by everyone but the rapist as morally wrong and punishable by law. However, in determining whether or not a woman was raped, societal attitudes about women play a major role in determining whether or not she was actually raped. If the woman is defined as a morally "bad" woman, the rapist will not be judged as a rapist at all, because it was not actually rape. She was just "getting what she asked for."

How then is a woman defined as a "good" woman and when is she being a "bad" one? Women in our society are "good" if they are dependent on those who can protect them, e.g., either father or husband. A "good" woman is also gentle, emotionally weak, sexually introverted and, most importantly, passive. Are these, then, the same definitions for a "good" man? ... On the contrary! Any of the above characteristics in a man defines him as being "bad" since he is behaving like a woman. A "good" man is one who is independent, emotionally strong, aggressive and, if he is a true man of men, sexually insatiable. As in the case with men, women who do not accept their ascribed role but instead, adopt any of these male characteristics, is automatically referred to as a "bad" woman. There is one very important difference, however, that is, a "bad" man at the most may be ostracized by society whereas a "bad" woman may be raped. "Good" women are given the protection of the "good" man; the "bad" woman deserves what the good and bad men may want to give her for they are not only the ones who determine whether or not she is a "bad" woman but should they so determine, they are also the ones who will give her the just punishment.

Our society, through the concept of chivalry,
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vows to protect its good women who are most often referred to as a "lady." Susan Griffin writes, "Indeed, chivalry is an age-old protection racket which depends for its existence on rape." Chivalry will protect the "lady" but who determines who is a "lady"? Movies and other forms of the media have always offered the public society's definition of a lady or molded its own interpretation and defined it for society. In the movie "The Blue Angel" with Marlene Dietrich, we see a woman who is independent, career-oriented, extroverted, comfortable and sexually unrestricted. Lest anyone begin to see these as positive traits in a woman, however, Marlene marries the leading man to prove that she is not a cheap woman but is a "lady". The audience, of course, realizes that he has made a rather large mistake since once a "bad" woman, always a "bad" woman. The moral of the movie is that because she is not a "real" lady and he not a "real" man, she destroys him. Movies of that era (the 1940's and 50's) perpetuated the image of the "lady" as protected and offer warnings as to your fate if you are not a "lady". These films were of an era where women dominated the screen. The importance of the movies through these three decades and to a large degree even today, shaped how women would see themselves. The image and values projected are no mistake but are the values and images -- not to mention sexual fantasies such as Farrah-Fawcett -- which the men making them hold dear.

The Women's Movement has attempted to educate the public to the fact that rape is a violent, not sexual crime. Likewise, they have offered statistics which show the rapist is more likely to be a friend of a woman's family/husband/lover or, at least a next door neighbor rather than a total stranger. Still we are all products of our society which, unfortunately, happens to be both racist and sexist. Therefore, while it would be virtually impossible to find anyone - male or female - who would dare say the rapist is not a criminal, when a rapist is tried by a jury of his peers, his peers make their value judgment of his guilt or innocence based on the facts presented (which until recently could include whether the rape victim had ever willingly engaged in sexual activity with a member of the opposite sex) but these facts are sifted through the values of good and evil which society has
taught are correct. One of the most often-voiced doubts of the validity of a rape charge by both males and females is that the woman was originally agreeable to the sexual act but later charges "rape" because she is found in the arms of another man or gets scared. There is little question that this may actually have happened on some few occasions but the argument for women becomes a "Catch-22" since it is again the male dominated image of women as conniving, prick-teasing, and manipulating that is constantly projected to us through T.V. and film which too often even women come to accept.

One can begin to comprehend then the difficulty in getting public opinion to see rape as an act of violence and to understand only through changes in how society views women can rape be stopped. Society sees rape and violence as wrong and institutes laws and movements to deal with such acts. However, this same society (which is male dominated) projects sexual aggressiveness in men and passivity and deceitfulness in women as "the norm." It is understandable then, that in the process of dispensing justice it too often deals with the rapist as if he were the victim.
Women & Morality or Women vs. Ladies

Sheila Mason

In this paper I want to show how females suffer a double bias in this culture. I purposely used the term "females" because of the implications surrounding the terms "women" and "ladies".

This is an obvious double standard applied to "females" that is not applied to males in our society. In this society ladies are praised whereas women are just barely accepted and only accepted under certain circumstances. By this I mean that there are certain qualities in females that are expected of them and certain qualities that are shunned. These standards are (of course) set by males and are passed on generation after generation. Even in these so-called times of "equality", there is still a certain "gender injustice" that never fails to be used against us.

It has been said that "You can't judge a book by its cover." This evidently doesn't hold true for females. Females more so than men are pre-judged by their looks, their style of clothing, their gestures, and the way they walk, before, during and after they are allowed (and many times they are just that, allowed) to speak. These prejudices are not only evident in personal instances, they even uphold in a court of law, e.g. isn't it true that in a case of rape (female vs. male) the victim's credibility, more so than the suspect's is based on her appearance and past experience. If she shows up in court in heels too high or a blouse cut too low, she is believed to be at fault for the crime, if it is even determined that there was a crime committed at all. If the victim doesn't look "right" her word is more than likely doubted, and she is believed to have encouraged or either did nothing to prevent the act.

The rights of females are not fairly protected. God forbid if she was wearing the "wrong type" of clothing when the act was committed or even if she was in the "wrong" place and at the wrong time. The wrong place meaning practically anywhere unescorted, especially after dark, be it leaving or entering her home or someone else's, school or job, grocery store or church; leaving a movie, a bar or discotheque to being simply out of the question. Females obviously do not have the freedom to wear what they wish in public (or at home with the shades up). Their own choice
of timing (after dark) or the choice to go places unescorted or escorted. If the crime is committed by your escort, your chances of winning the case are slim. If anyone is caught in any of these circumstances, she is usually prima facie wrong.

The above are considered as incidents that happen to "women" - not "ladies" which brings us to defining women vs. ladies. Women go places alone, and at night. Women usually don't get married. Women pursue careers. Women wear provocative clothing. Women are also competitive and assertive (at the wrong things). Women drink (beer, not wine and/or cocktails). They even indulge in drugs (pot, pills, etc.) If you haven't already guessed, there is a common adjective that goes along with the label of women: Loose.

Ladies are the types shown in "Beauty Knows No Plain". These ladies were assertive and competitive only in what a male in our culture would deem as being "healthy for a lady". Ladies get married and have families. When married ladies work it is only to help her husband and family. It is not in pursuance of a career, unless she happens to be a nurse, school teacher or a secretary. These are careers considered as acceptable for ladies. Ladies wear "nice" or either modest clothing. Ladies are always feminine and do not go places unescorted. A ladies word can be taken. A woman's word may be doubted. Ladies are malleable and obedient in particular to their husbands. Another thought that goes hand in hand with these theories is that women provoke rape. Women prevent it.

Females are thought of as inferior to males in many cases. When a man is successful the credit is usually given to his intelligence. A woman is usually accredited for her looks. A man is thought of as working his way to the top. A female is thought of as sleeping her way to the top, especially in fields of modeling, acting or entertainment, anything that is associated with glamour. A man's eligibility is increased when he does well educationally but more importance is placed on his financial success. If he is also good-looking this is all a woman can hope for. With females good looks and "femininity" come first. Education and financial success are secondary. In our culture men are not under nearly as much pressure
as women. They don’t have to prove as much as women to be labelled as "good morally. Nor is it of as much importance to be labelled "good" at all. Let's face it, the males in our society find it humorous and are even given a certain degree of respect for being known as a "casanova" or a ladies man. The female equivalent to this is to be known as a trap. Even in our times of women's lib the so-called "new sexual freedom" men still use many moral labels when it comes to females. Men are disgusted with Women’s Liberation unless it's being used to their advantage (only sexually). But when it comes to equal pay for the same tasks, they begin to think of Women's Libbers as "wierdos" or even homosexuals. Regardless of how times have changed women are still treated with a degree of inferiority, even when it comes to her right of denial of her own body. Even the roles she chooses to play in life are judged by male standards of morality before anything else.
Good Girls vs. Bad Girls

Wanda Smith

In our society, male sexuality and violence are inseparable. Men are raised to be the aggressors while women are brought up by double standards. Based on popular morality, women have to be provocative in order to exist in a male dominated world. On the other hand, their provocation can also be detrimental in that it sets women up to be raped. Our society puts all women in a "catch-22" category, for to be a "real" woman you must be sexually appealing. Just as male eroticism is connected to power, so is female sexuality. Women are judged as being either good women or bad women. The standards by which they are judged are male standards.

In this paper I intend to show how popular morality is guilty of imposing contradictory standards on women, thereby ridiculing them publicly and making them more vulnerable to rape.

From birth, women are expected to appeal to men. The "good" girls (and most successful at the game) usually are the ones that attract men but don't "give it up". This is a double standard in itself. Women are encouraged to be sexually appealing without being sexually permissive. Men use this inconsistency to justify the act of rape. They will claim that the women said "no"- but meant "yes". They attribute this to the fact that women are not moral agents and are not responsible for their actions. My question is, that if women are not responsible for their actions, why are they entrusted with the important job of raising children? And if men really feel this way, why do they then take advantage of this disadvantage?

Popular morality does not object to rape, the law does. Their outlook on rape is that women are sex objects and rape is sex. They say that some women deserve to be raped. This could not be true because women are not considered responsible, they must be responsible moral agents in order to deserve rape.

On their provocation women are accused of working their wiles on men. This sexual power or magnetism is also used as an excuse for rape. Men
have stated, "I don't know what came over me..." If women possess all this power and magnetism why aren't they in top governmental jobs, while the men do the drudging work? This is just one example of the male schizophrenic attitude prevailing in our society. Men tend to want to protect you on one hand, and rape you and assault you on the other. This attitude persists in the minds of the most "normal" male. Dworkin demonstrates this in her book Woman Hating, which graphically illustrates a chart of a woman:

"ears-pierced, face-made up, body-powdered and perfumed, nipples-roughed, hands-ringed and braceleted, etc."

This may seem to be an extreme example, but it happens to be a true set of values that are bestowed upon women by men. The strange thing is that women allow this to go on. Whether it's with cosmetics or birth control pills, women's bodies are and have been exploited by males.

After viewing things in this light, the question of what's a good or bad woman does not seem valid. Maybe the question should be: Why does our society allow men to oppress women with such neanderthal methods. Because rape is not an urgent crime in our society, men don't get raped. Until something is done to them personally, the problem of rape does not seem pressing. Men even consider rape "normal" behavior. As long as this attitude prevails, there will be no "good women" or "bad women" just women in trouble.
Women are Morally Inferior

Jean Fraser

Though men in general believe women in general to be morally inferior, every man has elevated one woman above the rest by virtue of association with himself. He has reserved a special place in his mind for this one woman. Early in life, as soon as she learns to understand signals, a woman hears a series of contradictory instructions and conflicting descriptions of the way she is to look and behave. She must be sexy and a virgin at once. Appreciative, yet challenging, strong yet weak. She must be vulnerable, yet able to protect herself. Smart enough to get a man, but not smart enough to threaten him, or at least conceal her intelligence. Desired by all, but interested only in one and so on down the line. This is the good/bad woman syndrome which is part of our diseased culture. The personality split is projected outward onto women as a class. Those who resemble the mother are "good", those unlike the mother are sexual and therefore "bad". Prostitutes pay with their lives for this dichotomy, others suffer to different degrees.

This same dichotomy applies to men in our culture. Men must be aggressive but never passive, strong, verile, unemotional, rational, hard, etc. A man who shows emotions is considered unmasculine and weak. A "good" man does not cry nor show affection towards children, especially male children. Contradictorily enough, men who want women to be clinging vines in fair weather, expect them in times of stress to become sturdy oaks and to carry on in situations that they have abandoned. Women must pretend to be cowards in order that men may appear more courageous by contrast. I believe that women on the whole are more courageous than men, both morally and physically. Men behave bravely when in public view or when their future is at stake, or when the odds are stacked greatly in favor of their ultimate survival. Women are instinctively courageous, because courage involves a forgetfulness of one's self, of compassion and a high evaluation of another's life, all of which are feminine attitudes.

News broadcasts rarely miss an opportunity to humble and belittle women, from female jockeys to
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visiting officials. Women in commercials are invariably either sex objects themselves or are engaged in sexworshipping some condescending male. In television, dramas and movies, the woman is always subservient to the man. She never or very rarely appears as an equal partner or breadwinner. She tends to be demoted. She may be portrayed as stupid, selfish, fiendish, scatter-brained, unreliable, ignorant and other demoting terms. In the movie "The Blue Angel", Marlene Dietrich was portrayed as a woman who was selfish, fiendish, unreliable and ridiculous, clearly with no morals. If a woman portrays a strong character, one that is aggressive, assertive, domineering, strong-minded, direct or blunt, she will be considered a Bitch. Since she is aggressive she is therefore unfeminine. She is a subject, not an object. When doing things that are considered naturally masculine, a woman could be accused of being domineering. In the movie "Network", Faye Dunaway portrayed the Bitch image. She was strong, aggressive, independent and clearly enjoyed sex as much as any man. (She was not a genital male, but was powerful and therefore unfeminine). Women are also taught that to be feminine means to be soft and pretty and sexy, and that this should be their man goal in life, even though by male standards this constitutes immorality. This goal was evident in the movie "Beauty Knows No Pain". Our society has defined humanity as male, and female as something other than male. In this way, females could be human only by living vicariously through a male.

Then we come to the fact that women are the ones who raise children, all children, males and females. If women are morally inferior, how then does she raise such moral males? Why is such an important job (one that has no cash value however) relegated to such a criminal element as a woman? It would seem to me that such a job should be relegated to the superior sex - the male. However, it should be noted here that males learn from each other at an early age that they must bond together. Because that is how they learn from each other the power they are entitled to in a patriarchal culture. It is a small wonder that the average woman accepts this image of herself, and concludes there must be some truth in it, and therefore,
she must deserve her place on the bottom rung of the ladder. These ideologies of men function not only to keep women in their subordinate role by presenting it as one that is unalterable, but also that it represents an ideal to which they should strive. It appears that some women because of their beliefs fostered by male society, are willing to endorse the dubious superiority of men. As Montagu says, all women do not know the truth about man's inferiority to them. This endorsement of male supremacy is a striving for self respect and self justification.

It is almost unbearable after so many years of subjection to men, to face the fact that we have been enslaved by our inferiors, that the mater is lesser than the slave. Throughout the years women have comforted themselves with the church-generated belief that she was indeed inferior and that God had created her from Adam's rib to be his slave. Therefore, her condition of servitude had been preordained, and was right and just. It is indeed difficult for women to believe and realize that all these years they have been forced to worship false gods.
A Good Woman is Hard to Find

Mia Kelley

The song says, "A good woman is hard to find."
And I'm not really surprised. The criteria for defining
a "good woman" is inconsistent and cloudy.

However, if the situation exists that only a
"bad woman" will get raped, then perhaps if we come up
with a concrete definition of a "good woman," we can
protect ourselves from this crime.

Immediately I find that there are already in-
consistencies arising from the fact that the criteria
are different for women in different roles. For the
sake of clarity, I have divided the sex into three basic
categories: The wife-mother, the mistress and the lady.

First, the following are the rules for a "good"
wife:

1. She is obedient, malleable.
2. An appealing, attractive mate.
3. Sexy and available.
4. Fertile.
5. Maternal, good mother
6. Monogamous
7. Domestic
8. Content

Next the mistress:

1. Obedient, not necessarily too malleable,
but cooperative.
2. Provocative, sexy and available.
3. Always attractive and waiting.
5. Content - appreciative.

And finally, the lady:

1. Proper on the outside but a tigress in bed.
2. Refined, obedient.
3. Subtly provocative.
4. Worldly, intelligent (not too), but yearning
for domestic bliss.
5. Monogamous
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Commonly, they should all be sexy (but not too), content and monogamous. Therefore, these could be the common denominators of trying to find a "good woman." However, it is not quite so simple.

An overtly sexual woman is a bad woman. She provokes responses she is not willing to take responsibility for. For if she is content and monogamous, she would only have a sexual encounter with one man, therefore she must put her sexuality away for a more appropriate time or she will be labelled a tease (very bad woman). So she must be sexy to her partner, but not give that appearance. It is handy to think of one's body as having a little switch that may be turned off when leaving the house.

Now the fertility of the wife which makes her a good woman can easily turn a mistress into a really bad woman. And the sexiness of the mistress could certainly be inappropriate for the wife-mother. Furthermore, the provocative mistress could easily be mistaken for the "loose woman" (bad) if she doesn't watch it and the domesticated wife could easily become the haus-frau, dish rag (real bad) if she isn't careful.

The proper lady (who underneath it all is the hot-blooded woman wanting to be overtaken) can easily be mistaken for the frigid-bitch (real bad) if she leans too far into her cool exterior.

Commonly, the good woman should be beautiful, and concerned with making herself as beautiful and appealing as she can. Beauty should know no pain. One must put up with the suffering in order to be beautiful in order to fulfill one's dream. This becomes a political ploy that tells women what they want, and shows that a way to get it.

The only consistency I find in the definition of a good woman is that the idea is set up to be inconsistent in itself. It serves a purpose. By non-definition and gross inconsistency, there can be no definition of a good woman.

Oddly (or not so), I do not find a corresponding dilemma in trying to define a good man:

1. He is assertive.
2. He has money.
3. He wants sex.
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4. He is strong - maybe physical, emotional or intellectual.

Item 3 is definitely missing from any definition of a good woman (historically). A good woman need only be obedient and willing. A woman who wants sex may be:

1. A nymphomaniac (bad).
2. Prostitute (bad).
3. Demanding wife (bad).

The woman who honestly desires sexual gratification runs the risk of very quickly becoming the bad woman. That becomes a convenient built-in excuse for rape (all women secretly want it, i.e., all women are basically bad).

The logic of sexist definitions of women is irrational, inconsistent and frustrating. It is perpetrated daily through movies, literature and advertising. Man's definition, analysis and perception of woman has been accepted for too long, by women as well as man.

Women must start to define themselves as free of sexual stereotypes as possible. We must determine ourselves our own wants and needs and thus eliminate a great deal of inconsistency.

The idea that a "good woman" exists is ridiculous and to assume or conclude that she cannot be raped is absurd. A good woman and a bad woman are one and the same and a rapist in search of a victim needs no provocation. He needs only a body.
Women and Morals

Marie Walsh

In our society women have been trained and conditioned to be provocative. Women's provocativeness is a way of life in our society and it is a typical reaction of women. Therefore, they should not be labeled bad because of their provocativeness.

Many people believe that women, by their looks, actions and ways of dressing provoke men into raping them and that they get their desert. Our society says that women are bad when they wear sexy loose fitting clothing and act promiscuously. Yet, I believe that society rewards women for being provocative. Thus, women have very little choice in the matter. According to Susan Griffin, the Federal Commission on Crimes of Violence claims that only 4% of reported rapes were caused by women's behavior. Therefore, we could say that it is a myth that women provoke rape since there is such a small percentage of crimes which are caused by it. However, when people must make a judgment in a case of rape the woman who wears sexy, loose fitting clothing would be considered an initiator in the rape.

What we do know is that women do have a much easier time in life if they are pretty, dress well and act sexy. They are the ones who become more popular, are given more materialistic gifts and in many instances lead a happier life, on the surface, than the "plain Jane". Therefore, it is understandable that many women would rather become provocative than dull. This is a social contradiction because women have learned that they like men and that they want them. Yet if they act in a way to influence the man to be interested in them, they supposedly are asking for trouble.

Beauty is a highly placed value in our society. If a woman is sexy and beautiful more men will find her appealing. They will be more attracted to her. If she is seeking a job, there is a greater chance that the more provocative woman will win out over the other applicants. Molly Haskell said that Harry Cohn did not want to give Jean Arthur and Judy Holliday jobs in movies because he did not like the way they looked. They were not pretty enough to go on the screen. They would turn audiences away. He was judging them on
their provocativeness, not their talent.

In the film Beauty Knows No Pain we saw that prettiness and sexiness were assets which were necessary to have in order to win a job. Although the candidates worked vigorously to learn their dances and they smiled so hard that I thought their faces would fall off, it was also necessary for them to be provocative in order for them to become Rangerettes.

Advertising uses provocation as a means to sell its products. Models are dressed very beautifully and alluringly so that the woman consumer will think that she will look like the model if she uses the products, and also reap many rewards by looking that way. Women are conditioned to think that being provocative is good and that it is a useful commodity. Many women will agree that they would rather be sexy and alluring than someone who is not. It is usually the provocative women who men find more appealing and with whom they would rather share their wealth.

In The Blue Angel, Lola Lola was a very beautiful and sexy woman. The professor fell in love with her from the very first moment that he saw her. She was considered a bad woman by the professor's colleagues. When he decided to marry her, he was fired from his job. This is an example of a provocative woman overwhelming a man so much that he actually lowered his social class to have her regardless of its consequences to him.

I believe that women do benefit more from being beautiful, acting sexy and dressing so that they are appealing to men. However, there are inconsistencies to this belief. These women will not be considered good in many instances. They are referred to as bad women but they are the women who gain more from society. It is wrong to be provocative but it is right because it is what men want. Since men have all the wealth, many women find it necessary to act in a way which is appealing to them or else they face being unattached and unhealthy.

If men did not control the wealth in society, women would not have to be provocative in order to win them over to share some of the wealth.

Therefore, although society says that women provoke rape, even though statistics say, no, I believe that society perpetuates women into being provocative by giving more rewards to the provocative women.
A Man Looks at Women's Fear of Rape

Kenneth J. Jackson

Webster says that rape is the "illicit carnal knowledge of a woman without her consent, effected by force, duress, intimidation, or deception as to the nature of the act." Rape is a crime against women and children (far more children are victims of rape than most of us realize). A crime which might be viewed as the ultimate expression of negative attitudes toward, and contempt for, women of all ages. The worst feature of rape is it denies women the right to freedom of bodily movement.

Although most of us think of rape as a clear-cut, unjustifiable sexual act forced on a woman against her will, many people especially men (but not only men), have misconceptions about what rape is and what it isn't. In their minds "rape is rape" when it happens in an alley, when it's committed by a stranger, or when there are bruises and signs of physical violence - but for them rape is not really rape when it happens in a bed, when it's committed by friend, lover or acquaintance, or when a woman appears not to be physically harmed. Many women know that these latter rapes are just as much "real rapes" as the former. But men and more women need to understand this also. Rape is an exaggerated acting out some of society's conventional ideas toward women. Women are supposed to belong to man, so they often are considered fair game or to be asking for it if they are not visibly protected by a man. Women are often viewed as passive sex objects, so what man think it should be violated. These attitudes must change before we can eliminate rape and have better treatment for rape victims, better law enforcement approach, approaches, better medical and psychiatric care and more humane courts.

Who gets raped, when, where, by whom and why? Rape can happen to any woman - rich, poor, young, old, of any racial or ethnic background. Even the good girl (long a destructive stereotype in our society) can be raped.

The woman is nineteen, a resident counselor in a girl's dorm at a coeducational university. It is about two o'clock in the afternoon and she is in an isolated part of one of the school buildings. Her attacker is a young married man who is a lecturer at the university.
The woman is twenty and has recently been hired for a new job. The boss asks her to come in on a holiday to help with the inventory. When she arrives, there is no one else there. Her boss, a man of thirty, rapes her.

The woman is sixteen, a high school student. She has a date with a college student she knows fairly well. He drives her to an isolated area and rapes her.

The woman is twenty-nine separated for her husband to come over to see the kids and rapes his ex-wife.

Rape doesn't usually happen in a dark alley late at night. According to statistics from the Washington, D.C. Rape Crisis Center, 50% of all rapes are committed in the home (over half of these cases involving forcible entry into the house). But it can occur almost anywhere, on the street, on highways, in subways, on campus, in public buildings. Although dim lighting and isolated places may increase the danger, rape has happened mid-day with people around sometimes even watching the crime. This is just one indication of how the rape problem extends far beyond rapists - there are many who themselves would never commit a rape, but who continue to condone or accept others rape crimes. They often blame the victims, and they see no need for significant changes in law enforcement procedures, the hospitals or the courts.

In addition, most men realize at some level that the existence of rape tends to keep women in their place (dependent on men for protection). According to the FBI, there were 51,000 reported rapes in 1973. One study shows, 85,000 rapes and attempted rapes in just the first six months of 1973. (Study by U.S. Department of Justice) Officials estimate that only 10-25 percent of rapes are reported, so the actual number of women raped in 1973 might well be over half a million. In addition, there has been an alarming increase in the rate of rape. Clearly rape has become twelve (12) major social issue as well as a personally traumatic experience. But one important thing to remember, although they can help, the police, the courts, or men will not finally stop rape. Women will stop rape by
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careful education women will be the ones to stop rape!

Usually a woman gets little or no support after she is raped. If she goes to the police, they may be unsympathetic or insulting. When she seeks medical treatment, especially in a city hospital, it will often be insensitive or inadequate. The laws and courts may only further humiliate a rape victim by implying that it was somehow all her fault to begin with. In some places the picture is not so bleak, especially since the creation of many rape crisis centers, but we still have a long way to go. In addition to better treatment of rape victims, we want a society in which we can live our lives without fear or threat of attack.

Police

Many police still believe that women want or ask for rape. They often are insensitive to the rape victim. Some detectives view rape charge as a woman's revenge. If she thinks she's pregnant, she'll go for a rape charge. The prostitute's check bounce so she claims she has been raped. When a woman doesn't resist, but instead succumbs to being raped in order to avoid being beaten as well, she may be assumed to have consented. In one case we know about, a detective took the woman aside to proposition her himself. Fortunately some police departments are creating rape units staffed by specially trained police (other women) toward rape victims. These units sometimes work in connection with a local rape crisis center or women's rape group to ensure the best possible treatment for every rape victim.

The Hospitals

The hospital experience, especially the pelvic exam (a "second rape") for many women can be upsetting to the rape victim as the crime itself. Very often a woman is seen and examined by an intern or resident who has had little training in the gentle art of being humane to rape victims. Sometimes the numbers of cuts and bruises on a woman's body is the doctor's personal criterion for judging if the woman has been raped. Again it's important to say that things are changing
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in a few places. Many rape groups and individual women have pressured hospitals to create twenty-four hour rape units and to provide better, more sensitive medical care to rape victims, going to the hospital with someone along who can give them valuable support. We need more high-quality medical care and more sympathetic doctors.

The Courts

It is important to try to prosecute a rapist, both to protect women who may be attacked in the future and to let our community know the frequency of rape. But prosecuting is difficult and often humiliating. Sometimes a woman may wish to prosecute, but the district attorney decides that she does not have a "good case". Since the state (not the victim) officially brings the charges, the district attorney can choose not to prosecute despite the victim's wish to do so.

A woman who wants to prosecute for rape can usually expect little help from the courts. Often in rape trials the defense tries to show or suggest that a woman as a "defendant" has a "bad reputation" to put the character on trial rather than the offense of the defendant. She will often be assumed to be lying. She will have to face the rapist again and she will have to relive the rape.

In court, many lawyers tried to prove that no woman could be raped by her husband. Even a woman who is separated from her husband can't always prosecute if he forces her to have sex. Fortunately, new amendment to state rape laws are finally being passed in at least a dozen states. One kind of amendment eliminates the previous requirement of medical evidence (bruises or semen) to corroborate the rape victim's testimony. Another prohibits the introduction into court of evidence concerning a rape victim herself. Another is "staircases" sexual offenses so that the rapists will be sentenced according to the severity of their crime (many of us are reluctant to prosecute if the rapist may be sentenced harshly). Such changes in our laws not only will encourage more women to prosecute when they are raped, but also will help to change general attitudes toward rape.
Morality of Sex

Joann Thornton

From the moment we are born we are treated differently from little boys. Adults handled us differently as infants. Our toys were different: dolls instead of erector sets. Our clothes were different: dresses to be kept clean instead of sloppy pants, and skirts that restricted our movements and have no pockets. Over the years the distinctions between female and male become inequalities and are repeated to us in so many ways that we too come to believe them. We're emotional; they're intellectual. We're dainty; they're clumsy. We're domestic; they're athletic. We can make babies and relationships; they can make ideas and objects. We're going to get married and be mothers; they're going to work and be mailmen, or doctors, or administrators.

Through the physical cycle of menstruation (a signal that we were becoming real women), getting our first period was an exciting event as well as 'the curse', many of us could not celebrate this transition because we had not learned to accept our body processes as normal and desirable.

We grow up in a society that is sexually confused and repressive for women. Magazines and TV are constantly telling us how to make ourselves attractive and sexy, yet at the same time we learn that 'good girls' don't have intercourse until marriage. Boys are rewarded for developing the accepted masculine characteristics; girls are trained to be feminine. A 'good' woman, according to society is: weak, sympathetic, warm, softspoken, childlike, loyal, cheerful, clinging vines, dependent, gullible, and inferior. In other words, she is basically an unfeeling being. Women 'don't' fight, curse, get drunk, or lose their tempers as men do, and never commit violence against others. If women fool around they are considered promiscuous or bad. If a man fools around he's a playboy and considered to be a 'real man'. A good woman must protect her reputation at all cost, by learning to refrain from inner sexual urges. A 'bad' woman is aggressive, dominant, loud, dresses skimpy, frequents bars, and is assertive. Men view women as mere 'cunts'. Men are 'good' because they are men, their behavior may be labeled as deviant if they commit murder, but they are never bad. The 'macho' male
is aggressive, physically strong, sexually virile, dominant, exercises power over others, active, possessive, supports his family financially, upward mobile, athletic, independent, and competitive.

From both standpoints the list is endless. Through the powers of men, women have been made objects instead of individuals. This has reflected a large cultural problem: that power is unequally distributed in our society. Men, having the power, are considered superior and we, having less power, are considered inferior. Society clearly states, that women who flaunt their physical attributes deserve what they get...HARM.

WHEN ADAM LOST HIS RIB HE GAINED A MATE, BUT IT HAS BEEN A BONE OF CONTENTION EVER SINCE.

The explanations for sexism are multi-facet. As women we discover at an early age that there is only one 'norm' for beauty...a commercial norm, a Hollywood norm. TV sells us products as we agonize over breasts, hair, legs, and skin that will never ever measure up. We lose respect for our uniqueness, our own smells and shapes and ways of doing things. We look to men to reassure us that we are, despite all this, OKAY. We learn to judge ourselves in relation to others, and images from the media. The constant comparing leads to a competitiveness that separates us from each other. In movies there are very few sexual assaults on men, but many upon women. We have totally sanctioned male dominance accepting the beliefs of our fathers, husbands, physicians, employers, clergymen, and political leaders as well as our male hairdressers. Any gift that we receive from a man: car, fur coat, diamonds, or just a simple dinner date implies that we owe sex.

MYTH: Women who are raped are asking for it. FACT: Rape is a brutal, degrading, violent crime. Most rapes are planned and the victim is usually threatened with death or bodily harm if she resists. Why would a woman go out of her way to be humiliated, beaten or possibly killed? The problem with this myth is the way it takes the criminal blame away from the rapist and shifts the responsibility for the crime to the victim. Does a woman's dress or mannerisms give any man the right to rape her? Because you carry money in your pocket, does it mean that you're
asking to be robbed? Perhaps this myth arose because rape is the only violent crime in which women are never the perpetrators, but always the victims.

Our first lesson in sex education was to fear strangers; strangers who always seemed to be men. At some point in a woman's life, the things her mother warned her about come true. We were never taught how to react to fear. Women were supposed to be unresisting, passive beings who, when in danger, summon the nearest male. It was normal for a woman to be afraid but highly unnatural for her to do anything about it. This spoon-fed passivity turned women into mental and physical cripples, living proof of the power of negative thinking. "I can't, I shouldn't and I won't."

Sex is equated with intercourse as a final end, and love is confused with the same thing. Love, for far too many men in our time, consists of sleeping with a seductive woman, one who is properly endowed with the right distribution of curves and conveniences, and one upon whom a permanent lien has been acquired through the institution of marriage. Marriages contracted upon such a basis are not likely to be any more enduring than the curves which exercised the initial attraction, for the curves will eventually become fat and sag, while character alone endures. Is it any wonder, then, that with the neglect of character and the emphasis on sex, so many marriages end in divorce?

The social status of women, and hence their self-esteem is measured primarily in terms of how successful they are in their relationships as 'good' mothers, lovers, and wives. Unlike men, who learn that their major goal is success in work, women are taught that their ultimate goal is love and marriage. Women thus have more invested in a love relationship than men, and more to lose if it fails. The "old maid" or the "divorcee" is still an inferior status to be pitied, while the "swinging bachelor" is rather envied. The woman who has a career has her share of added problems, for she has had to support her husband's career over hers wherever there was a conflict, because she knows male egos are tied up with success and "making it" in this competitive society. Women's egos, on the other
hand are primed for failure. Successful women, especially successful women with unsuccessful husbands, are considered not "true" women, but rather as "castrating bitches," "ball-busters," and "masculine women."

Often people think when a woman is wearing a miniskirt, a bikini, or hot pants, she is teasing or encouraging a man, she is loose and, therefore, is a prostitute. It's not how a woman dresses, it's what the man perceives she means by her outfit. Some men, when they see a braless coed, feel there's a message here and the message is "take me." The message may actually be "I like to stay in fashion," or "I think I look nice in this outfit," or even "Eat your heart out, Buster." But that doesn't matter, because some men would see a "Take me" message even if you were wearing a tent. We shouldn't blame women for the weaknesses of men. Without our ideology, women are not held to have the right to freedom of bodily movement at all. Moving about freely is rather a male privilege, which only immoral women seek to exercise. A 'good' woman must remain 'ladylike' at all times, and how does a man deal with a woman like this? He fucks her good.....

If a woman works at a job, she is criticized for competing in a man's world and neglecting her home and children. If she stays at home, she is blasted as a parasite who fritters away her time at bridge and gossip, spoils her children and betrays her husband. Women learn eventually that most of their troubles are caused by men. Therefore, we are damned if we do and damned if we don't.

I conclude that society controls not the men, but the 'bad' woman. If you are a 'good' woman you can avoid being raped. The principle of equal treatment tells us that sexism is wrong. I believe that every woman has the absolute right not to be raped. "Good" or "bad" are value judgments. Therefore, men do not have the right to sit in judgment of women. A strong reason why rape is continuous is because of the social control of women. "Keeping women in their places." People basically resist change. What we must change are the power relationships between the sexes, so that people's qualities can be judged on their merits
rather than in terms of power.

Being a 'good' or 'bad' woman is based on the sexual attitudes of men. And whenever there's sex, there are moral attitudes and judgments of every variety. People become concerned with what ought to have happened, rather than with what did happen. They react as if the double standard were on the statute books, not as though it was only a tradition of a still adolescent society that refuses to practice what it preaches: that everyone is created equal.

Sexual stereotyping is wrong, because it limits personal freedom to develop any personality and interests one chooses. This is a serious moral objection to sex-role assignment. To justify stereotyping, one would at least have to show not only that it serves some social purpose (such as producing happiness, efficiency, or stability), but also that this good result is more valuable than the freedom lost.

I propose that as men begin to understand women's true value, and rid themselves of the myths which have been traditionally foisted upon them, they will come to view their relationship to women as a partnership conferring mutual benefits, as well as benefits upon all who come within the orbit of their influence. The freeing of women and increasing respect for them will mean the freeing of, and increasing respect for men. Men need not fear that women will turn into men or that men will turn into women, there are certain biological arrangements in each of the sexes which will effectually prevent such development. Schools could be a most powerful influence in readjusting the sexes to each other in the light of our newer knowledge and of the great benefits which will accrue from the application of our knowledge.

A democracy is as strong as its weakest links, and among the weakest links is the position of women. Discontent is the mother of progress. Necessity is the mother of invention. And since discontent is almost a necessary condition of the life of the educated woman of our day, progress and invention in the area of women's place in the world are almost inevitable. The change will come gradually but inevitably.
CHAPTER THREE

WOMEN IN THE MEDIA: THE SOCIAL SANCTIONS OF RAPE
Women as (Slightly) Living Dolls

Rosanne Muchnick

In this paper I am going to show that virtues such as beauty, passivity, submissiveness, motherhood, (dependency, nurturing, loving), virginity and heterosexuality are typical of the good woman, whereas aggressiveness, ambition, responsibleness, strength and power are typical of the good man. The bad woman is honest, daring, independent, assertive, aggressive, promiscuous and sexy, whereas a bad man is lazy, passive and weak. The reasons for writing this paper is to show the moral values attached to and formulative of roles of men and women in society.

The topic is about the expectations put on men and women by society. Powerful media give us role models reinforcing the dichotomy between good and bad women and men. All in the Family presents Edith Bunker as the typical empty headed but loving mother and wife, whose sole existence is for her family. She stays at home, knows her place and is a typical "good woman". On the other hand, Looking for Mr. Goodbar shows what happens when one tries to break out of the mold - death. If she had stayed home and "behaved" this wouldn't have happened. It's her fault! Marilyn Monroe, Racquel Welch, Jean Harlow and Melina Mercouri all portray "bad women". Cinderella perpetuates the American Dream of Prince Charming, strong, aggressive and handsome searching for the girl of his dreams. Cinderella's sisters and stepmother show us the rivalry between women, the competitiveness that prevents them from being close to other women. In Beauty Has No Pain, paramount is the message that preening yourself for the audience, men, is worth any pain. James Bond, being a good man, always lives in the end as does John Wayne, Clint Eastwood, Burt Reynolds and all the men on the white horses. As a child I remember you could always tell the good guys from the bad guys by the color of their horses.

The problem with all this is that it's unfair. Sexism is wrong. To have men defining women's roles is also wrong. From birth, the split begins. Boy babies - blue blankets, trucks. Girl babies - pink
blankets, dolls. Boys are encouraged to be aggressive and engage in sports; girls are taught to sew, cook, clean and take care of babies. In the *Odyssey*, the man goes off to war and Penelope knits patiently waiting for his return. Also wrong are all the myths connected with women. For example, that a good woman cannot be raped. Any woman can be raped, young, old, fat, thin, good or bad. None are exempt or can avoid it. Likewise, none are free from harm.

1. Let's first begin with the good woman and passivity. A passive woman can be very dull and boring. But to whom? To a good man? Suppose a couple is married and the woman is passive and boring. The man turns to another woman for excitement, stimulating conversation and/or sex. However, who does or did he marry? Not the bad woman, but the passive, boring, good woman. One could argue passive women are mindless, like wind up dolls, totally depend on their men. What a burden! One could say yes, that's probably true. However, if she were to take charge of her life, maybe return to school in preparation for a career, this is so threatening to the status quo that by the time she finished school, the man would be gone. She can't win for losing. But on the other hand, if she does educate and prepare herself and the man leaves, she isn't devastated. She has not got a potential future. Yes but she is not a good woman anymore. She's no longer passive. Perhaps divorced, she now automatically becomes the bad woman. The moral of the story is: She shouldn't have made waves. Why couldn't she have been satisfied with what she had? Why wasn't that enough for her? If she were a good woman, none of this would have happened. It's her fault. She got what she deserves. On the other hand, maybe that's just what she wanted. So what if she's put into the victim slot, now she can make a life for herself. But one could argue, who wants that kind of a woman as a wife? Not a good man, that's for sure.

As to submissiveness, one could argue that good women are sexually submissive to men and that's the way it should be. They are men's sex objects, only receptacles to service their spouses. Well, what about the sexual desires of women who really enjoy making love and especially get off on being
the aggressor? That's enough to make a good man important! But what's wrong with a woman expressing her feelings and urges? According to society, only bad women are sexually stirred. I see no biological difference between a bad woman and a good woman. If it's wrong for a good woman to respond to sex, let alone to initiate it, then she should be put together differently to take this into account. Then only bad women could be sexually oriented.

Marriage, motherhood, nurturing and loving are all related. Society would have us believe that marriage and motherhood is woman's fulfillment - the total essence and reason for existing. But what about the pain of childbirth and the responsibility for a minimum of eighteen years to rear the children. That's a job from which you can't resign, get fired from, take a sabbatical or avoid. Society would argue that women are not fulfilled until they have children, that it's a natural instinct to be a mother. Why? The fact that women are capable of childbirth doesn't lead to the assumption they will love children. But a good woman is supposed to. Who says? Society and who is society? Men. How does a man know what it feels like to have a baby? If men could experience childbirth, perhaps they wouldn't be so quick to praise motherhood.

Heterosexuality of women is taken for granted and supposedly taught to us from birth. However, I would contend that every newborn girl's first experience is a homosexual one at her mother's breast. Some might say it isn't a sexual experience, the child is too young. I do not know of a more sensual, sexual experience than this. Even in the Bible, homosexuality is rampant, yet society tells us it's wrong. Now I am not saying women should be homosexuals, but they should be given a choice. Why are girls encouraged to date boys and discouraged from even befriending girls? Society would have us believe that girls are catty, can't be trusted and too competitive. I would argue it seems more logical to trust one of your own kind than an outsider, man.

Beauty is high on the list of virtues of good women. One could argue that beauty is a girl's best asset and without it she takes a back seat in society. This sounds plausible, but beauty can become a powerful weapon, giving her power and control. Take for example a
beautiful sexually attractive woman who draws men like flies. She can have her pick, use them, manipulate them, all to her advantage. Now society says, she’s a bad woman. At what point do we draw the line to differentiate beauty in good and bad women? A man is attracted to a beautiful nicely made-up woman. He marries her. She stops wearing make-up inasmuch as she's now a homemaker. Her husband appreciates her natural look and even compliments her on it. Yet, he is attracted to chic, made-up women and eventually he sees someone on the side. But his "little woman" is safely tucked away at home without make-up to doubly make sure that no one finds her attractive. On the other hand, he will never marry the other woman, only the good woman.

Society says that men only marry virgins. Why? So man can reinforce his dominance and aggression. If women aren't virgins, they must be nymphomanics and nymphomaniacs are bad women. Let's take a married couple. He's aggressive, she's passive and a virgin. She does only what he tells her to do. He, of course, is not a virgin, but a man of experience. Their relationship lacks excitement, stimulation, imagination and creativity. Eventually he is going to find an experienced woman. No good man would ever engage in oral or anal sex with a good woman, but with a bad woman, anything goes. As is obvious, the same argument applies here that men don't marry bad women.

2) This leads me into the bad woman and her virtues which are opposite the good woman and pretty close to the good man. Let's use the same example as above of the "other woman" in a sexual relationship. The bad woman has sexual freedom and allows her body to experience itself to the fullest. Society would argue this is wrong. Sex out of wedlock is wrong and to enjoy it is even a bigger sin. I would contend that it's a waste not to use your body to its capacity. If it feels good, do it! But society makes us suffer for feeling good, because you end up alone. No one marries a bad woman. On holidays and weekends, the bad woman is lonely and alone as her man is with his family, not her.

The virtues of honesty, assertiveness and aggression I will lump together as one. An outspoken
woman is a threat to the status quo of men. It puts them on an equal par with men, which men reject inasmuch as they have to be top dog. Let's take a situation where a job is available for a lawyer. Both applicants are equally qualified, one a woman, one a man. Needless to say, the man gets it. The competition is too intimidating for a man and society protects him by keeping women down. That a woman can do the job better is totally irrelevant. After all, she'll meet the right man and there goes the career. Or she'll get pregnant and that's the end of her success. This is plausible but what about the career woman? Does she really exist or is it just a fantasy until Mr. Right comes along? Society would argue Mr. Right will come and put her in a little house with a picket fence and she'll live happily ever after.

Promiscuity and sexiness are two virtues that attract men to bad women. They're for fun, between the sheets enjoyment. If a man can have this freedom, why can't a woman? I would argue a woman is entitled to the same rights and freedom as a man. The only difference between them is biological. It shouldn't be held against a woman that she has breasts and a vagina. It's certainly not held against a man that he has a penis. One argument could be that men can't get pregnant. However, there are plenty of birth control devices so as to make women impregnable. What if she did get pregnant? Abortion is readily available nowadays.

3) As to men, men are born good. There isn't the dichotomy of good and bad men as there is for women. The passivity of the good woman reinforces the aggressiveness in the good man. A passive man is like a lump of clay and who likes that? Even passive women want to be dominated by aggressive men. One could say, however, that a passive man is less violent.

Strength and power I will handle together here. No one likes a 70 lb. male weakling, not even another 70 lb. weakling. The example of the muscle men at the beach who flex their muscles and parade their bodies off, who wants them? I can't imagine anyone who would - more brawn than brains. Also in ten or twenty years, they'll be worse flab than anyone.
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Powerful men are respected in society. Power is a status symbol, prestige for men and allows them commodities they want, such as the bodies of women. But then who wants to hang around with a penniless nobody, going nowhere? Not men. If I'm going anywhere, I'd opt for first class all the way. To those who would say money isn't everything, I would agree. However, it certainly helps to have it.

4) As far as bad men go, society doesn't say much. But I would think laziness, passivity and weakness would fit.

The inconsistencies are between what society dictates and what really exists. Life isn't once upon a time and happily ever after. Marriage isn't the institution it's cracked up to be. Everything is nicely packaged and categorized. But all is not black and white. There are vast shades of gray.

It's very depressing to see that society has won! Women are given more rules of conduct than I would care to acknowledge. My own values tend to be those of the bad woman (good man) but intertwined therein sometimes subtle, sometimes overt is sexist conditioning. To my view, women and men could break out of the molds and become people, not sexists. The criteria for my values are equal treatment, justice, freedom and the rights of human beings to exist. An objection to equal treatment might be that biological differences make us unequal, to which I reply equal treatment doesn't mean we must be identical. Freedom, on the other hand, might make the institution of marriage extinct. Who cares, what's so great about it? If there are no marriages and no children, eventually there will be no people on earth.

I wish I could propose the reader to believe I was right and society was wrong. But it's very frustrating to find that society wins. I think most people would agree with me. A change is definitely desirable, necessary and I'd like to believe likely. These are the years of our discontent and the only way to go is onward and upward. Perhaps we could start with newborn children and stop differentiating and training them for their roles; institute neutral sex education in the
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elementary schools as well as the media. Make the public aware. It's a huge job almost like rewriting history.

Briefly, I think I've shown how society dictates the roles we play and how we function in life. I see I am now in the process of going from being a "good woman" to a "bad woman", by society's standards. I'm anxious to see if these attitudes are reinforced or rejected in my own life by me and those I relate to.
Women in Patriarchy

Tyrone Ford

What's a good woman, a bad woman? This is a question that is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to answer. However, America's patriarchal society answers it quite easily, but not satisfactorily.

Good women in accordance with patriarchy are beautiful, married, have families, are fragile, need to be protected, are passive and submissive, aren't out late at nights by themselves, or seen in the company of more than one man, aren't hard to satisfy in bed, but most of all, they have a man and therefore (as shown in Stoltenburg's article "Toward Gender Justice") have identity.

Bad women on the other hand, in the eyes of patriarchy, are basically the antithesis of a good woman.

In essence good women "deserve" what patriarchy deems to be all they need; money, "love", a home, a family, identity, happiness and a man. All life has to offer. Bad women, however, don't deserve this. They don't respect or live up to the expectations of patriarchy. They're the opposite of what patriarchy advocates of women. Therefore, such a thing as rape would be the just desert of a bad woman.

What's a good man, a bad man? Well according to patriarchy, a good man is a lover, an oppressor of women, strong, powerful, prestigious, a breadwinner, aggressive and ambitious, and one of the guys.

A bad man would be any male who opposed patriarchy in any way. Homosexuality is considered a great threat to patriarchy, since men lying sexually in bed with other men, as the Stoltenburg article states, one of the men is lying as a woman. Homosexuality is a threat to male identity and so is any other sign of male or female rebellion against patriarchy whether it be homosexual or heterosexual.

A good man or a bad man, a good woman or a
bad woman, as I said earlier, is difficult if not impossible to determine. Is a good person still good if he or she does a few bad things or vice versa? Patriarchy quite clearly gives its definition of good and bad males and females, but it's patriarchy's view, a view unshared by many.
Docile Virgins and Loose Bitches

Pam Woulfe

In American society, which is male dominated and oriented, males and females who have not yet had their consciousness raised believe that "good women" don't get raped and "bad women" get raped. What I wish to do in this paper is to give legitimate explanations and evidence along with some statistical data to disprove the above mentioned fallacy and show that all women are susceptible to being raped as well as oppressed, discriminated, and dominated by males in this society.

What is a "good woman"? A good woman according to the values and morals of our sexist society is a female who is feminine, dependent, passive, non-assertive, altruistic, neither physically competent nor interested in becoming so (the male will always be there if she needs protecting) intuitive, but not rational, emotionally open, and impulsive rather than self-disciplined. She is also mild, docile and submissive. In terms of sexuality, the female is to be pure and virgin. A "good woman", therefore, is one who has been conditioned to conform to the mold that has been set forth for her by our sexist society.

On the other hand, a "bad woman" would be classified as having traits which would include being aggressive, independent, active, self-reliant, assertive, ambitious and self-centered. Sexually speaking, she is classified as being "fast", "hot to trot", "tramp", "slut", "whore", "Bitch", "cunt", "bimbo", "puts out", "easy lay", "loose", would spread her legs for anything and a "nymphomaniac". In other words, a "bad woman" has no morals, values or scruples. A "bad woman" is considered to have deviated from the norm and non-conformed to the mold society has set forth for her.

A "good man" is defined in this society as being masculine, active, strong, powerful, domineering, ambitious, independent, aggressive, demanding, interested in physical activities, rational, emotionally controlled and self-disciplined. In terms of a good man's sexuality, he is unlimited in his sexual actions and desires - he is infallible.

A "bad man" is considered to be a "cheater," "a crook," and runs around with the wrong type of people.
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He may, on the other hand, be said to possess feminine traits where he would be categorized as being a "poor excuse for a man", a sissy, faggot, queer or gay.

In referring back to society's morals and values, one finds that the description attributed to a "bad woman" and those attributed to a "good man" are extremely similar. One could even go so far as to say they were the same. Women who carry the traits of being independent, self-reliant, intellectual, ambitious, etc. pose a threat to males. This society has always provided jobs and opportunities for all males throughout every generation. The male has always been labelled the "bread winner."

Females who have had their consciousness raised no longer accept the old traditions of being placed into certain categories, that of wife and mother. More so than ever before women are attempting to break the barriers of the male dominated professions and earn their way independently in this society, rather than on the coat-tails of their man or husband. Love is no longer the state of mind desired by women. The state of mind coming into existence now is for the self and self-satisfaction. Obviously, we can see why this is posing a threat to the male. The more females push towards that goal (for the self) the more males will tend to reciprocate and push the female back into her traditional role. One way of doing this would be by affixing derogatory labels on the women. By labeling or stereotyping a person in this society, one may be ostracized by friends or the community. Therefore, they no longer pose as a threat. What it all comes down to is that the male feels he is being jeopardized by the female in her having equal qualifications or even better qualifications for the same pro-

A male's ego plays an important part in the role of sexuality. I believe that it is questionable whether a male wants to satisfy a woman's sexual needs but it seems that his basic motive is for his own personal satisfaction. If a woman makes a comment to the effect of the male's performance in bed or size, his ego has been deflated! He therefore feels rage, indifference and wants to strike back but cannot sexually so he strikes out in another way. This way is by labelling the women as cold bitches or frigid. Again we see a part of reciprocation on the male's part against the female. He again is putting the blame on the female and not himself. All women
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are scapegoats for men.

Violence against women is endemic in America. It takes many forms - sexual, physical, verbal, and, underlying all, psychological. Of the multiple assaults by men on women, none are more feared, none more vicious or traumatic, than the crimes of rape and sexual brutality. 1

Rape is the number one crime against American women today, and it is increasing at a shocking rate.

Historically, the literal definition of rape is specific; it's a crime, usually a felony, in which the criminal (male) compels a victim (female) to submit to penile-vaginal sexual intercourse against her will, with or without the use of force, fear, or fraud.

Rape victims are every woman - and all too often, every child. The tragic fact of man's inhumanity to woman touches every female, whether or not she is directly attacked herself. In hundreds of ways, large and small, the persistent threat of rape insidiously molds a woman's life and continually assaults her emotions. Women hesitate to go out at night without an escort; they fear living alone, working late in lonely offices, hitchhiking (without or with companions), traveling into strange places, doing new and different kinds of jobs, and working in fields and areas traditionally dominated by men. The fear of sexual attack has served to deny personal freedom to women and at the same time to increase their dependence upon men. 2

Despite the popular fantasy of rape as the crime of a sex-crazed maniac, perpetrated upon a flimsily clad, seductive female stranger, many victims are at least casually acquainted with the offender. Women have been raped by men they loved and trusted - by their finances or by men whom they dated (either casually or not so casually). They have been raped by co-workers, bosses, clients, office acquaintances, and men with whom they have only a nodding acquaintance - maintenance men, delivery men, janitors and guards.

Contrary to popular opinion, which tends to think of rape victims as young and nubile victims range from the very young to the very old. Police records
show that children have been sexually assaulted in their cribs, grandmothers, and great-grandmothers in their seventies, eighties and nineties have been raped. Rapists attack the rich as well as the poor; they attack all races and all nationalities.

Rape usually occurs indoors, often in the homes and bedrooms of the victims. At other times women have been sexually attacked and assaulted in cars, or in public places such as office buildings, women's restrooms, libraries, parking garages and public parks. Many have been assaulted in front of their young children, their husbands, and their grown sons and daughters. Daughters have been raped before their mothers. Wealthy women have been attacked in their elegant mansions, other women have been dragged out of cars and raped while their dates were forced to watch.

The image of the lone, mad, rare and violent stalker of women as the typical rapist of women is fallacious for a number of reasons. To begin with, rape is a much more frequent act than official police records indicate.

A study of victimization of all kinds, rape included, was conducted by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in the late sixties. A sample of 10,000 households across the country was drawn up; their members were questioned about whether they had been the victim of a number of crimes during the previous year. About 31,000 rapes were recorded in the F.B.I.'s Uniform Crime Report for 1968. The President's Commission victimization study revealed that, by extrapolating from the data it gathered, roughly four times as many women reported having been raped to an interviewer than reported it to the police. This would indicate well over 100,000 rapes each year for the late 1960's. In 1975, 56,000 rapes were included in the F.B.I.'s statistics. If the same ratio of four to one unreported to reported rapes holds up, this suggests that close to a quarter of a million rapes occurred in the U.S. in the middle 1970's.

The rise in officially reported rapes from 17,000 in 1960 to 56,000 in 1975 may or may not represent a rise in the actual incidence of rape. The rise may be mostly due to a greater willingness of women to
report rape than was true in the past. Which is another way of saying: there is a growing refusal on the part of women to be passive victims of male aggression. Many more women are willing to subject themselves to the humiliation that reporting rape to the police entails. Perhaps women's definition as to what is rape has changed. They may be less likely to accept masculine sexual aggression as routine and "natural". The greater the pride and self-confidence that exists among women, the greater the likelihood that male sexual aggression against them will be both mentally and officially recorded as rape. The lower this sentiment is, the more hidden from view rape will be, the greater the likelihood that women will walk away from masculine sexual aggression and think: "Was I raped? I'm not sure. Maybe I did provoke it," and the less likely they will report it to the police.

Just as rape is almost unknown in many societies of the world, it is encouraged by some of our most honored systems. Men learn that women are creatures apart, that they are inferior, that they have a definite place, are exploitable, and, if they step out of line deserve to be punished. Rape is without a doubt learned behavior - it does not come naturally. And moreover, it is learned both directly and indirectly - both from the values and the way that women are treated (and extrapolated from there) and directly within a group context. Other men often encourage the practice of rape. One of the most surprising statistics to be revealed about rape is the prevalence of violence in group rapes. In Amir's study of rape cases known to the police, 57% were a single man raping a single woman, 16% involved two rapists attacking one victim; and 27% involved more than two offenders raping a single victim. Put another way, of all offenders, 29% raped a woman alone; 16% were involved in "pair" rapes, and 55% were participants in a group rape.5

Rape, then, is characteristically not a solitary act, but an expression of attitudes that groups of men have toward women, toward relations between the sexes, and towards human relations in general. In a sense, there are subcultures of rapists. The greater the number of men involved in the attack, the greater the planning: 58% of the single rapes were planned, 83% of the pair rapes were planned, and 90% of the gang rapes were planned.
Planning is an indication of the togetherness and comradeship that men share in directing their attack against women!

FOOTNOTES


2. Ibid, p. 4.

3. Ibid, p. 5.


Bad Women Have More Fun!!

Joan H. Hanrahan

Values, not facts, are for controlling purposes. The measurability of goodness and badness make them facts in and of themselves. In the mere existence of good and bad, and our choice to believe the existence as an absolute we accept their order and the sense that goodness and badness have in our lives. (These views guide how we do all things) Men's and women's virtues are based upon a vested interest on the part of men to uphold their image of superiority.

Values are defined in complete contrast for men and women. These attitudes are defined by society, more specifically male society.

Most interesting to me is the category Bad Women (which I suppose is what I aspire to, not because of 'badness' but because of the characteristics). Bad women totally enjoy their lives. They are active in pursuit of what they want. Women who are determined are bad. They think of themselves primarily. Bad women are concerned with conditions effecting them directly, personally. Women who are not concerned with titles given them, are bad. They don't aspire to all that is 'good'. Reputation is of little interest. Women that hang-out are bad, of little worth. Women are bad when they enjoy and actively pursue sex. When they aren't interested in traditional relationships, husband and family, women are bad. Bad women are emotionally and often physically strong. Bad women are not concerned with security because they are secure in who and what they are.

Good women are far less complicated. They are very basic in nature. Helpless. Good women want to live up to all that is goodness. They have no ambition past home and family. The true mothers, thinking about everyone before themselves. Good women are totally dependent always on a male figure, a father, husband or son, or combination of these. The virgins - inexperienced in sex. Good women are not very smart or creative. These women value men's opinions above all else. They enjoy being described by and in terms established by men. Good women are emotionally weak - seeking always love. Good women are possessed by men and their views.
It would only be necessary to describe one of these four types, and the others would be explained.

But the job is an interesting one.

Bad men are not responsible. They take little pride in their maleness. Bad men are weak and timid. They are emotional, letting their feelings be known. They are not interested in control, manipulation or conquest. Bad men are content, non-ambitious. They are non-achievers, non-creators. Bad men are passive. They have little concern in physical appearance.

Good men strive to be all a "man" should. Masculine, Macho. They are concerned with style, image. Great pride is taken in all a "man" does. Career is primary. Women and family take a back seat to personal gratification. Good men are physically and mentally strong. They are in control of themselves and others. Their lives are motivated by success seen in accumulation of women and money. Handsome, well-groomed, well dressed. Good men are brave, assertive. They know nearly everything and can deal with all situations provided there is someone to show off for.

Society presents us with our characters that this drama, life, has cast us in. At every opportunity these roles are culturally inflicted. The media is the primary transmitter of all information - most obviously dictates sex roles.

Movies seem to be changing, but have not. There is a nation of a new-man and a new-woman. These characters are a coalition of male and female positive and negative values. Women still respond greatly to men who are the busiest and most successful, the most attractive and desirable. As Molly Haskell suggests in The Great Hollywood Con, the men who appear to be supportive "without abusing themselves on the altar
of feminism" are the men that still fascinate us in a film and the real world. Men who are men.

The idea of the "woman's film" is a myth. These films only give approval to the new woman, the independent, traditionally bad woman. Approval is still bestowed by good smart men to women.

Television also perpetuates these crucial criteria in a strange, deceptive way. As in film, women are permitted a level of independence with men, checking then along the way. Charlie's Angels, one of TV's most successful detective series demonstrates this clearly.

This show involves three, sometimes four women who work for Charlie. As is stated in the opening, "Once upon a time..." Fairytales, as Dworkin suggests invade us in the most subtle ways. They so clearly illustrate behavior for men and women. In fairy tales goodness and badness are as simple as activity and passivity. The opening continues "but I took them away from all that. Now they work for me. My name is Charlie."

These women are Charlie's property. He's rescued them from their past and now they owe him their lives. He is their savior.

Charlie is master and mystery. He has no identity - no physical characteristics attached to him. He is successful - Charlie's got lots of money and three, sometimes four attractive ladies working for him.

These women's lives are directed by Charlie through a strange BOSLEY who might be paralleled to a jailer or keeper. He informs them of activity they are permitted to indulge in. BOSLEY has another, less powerful side. He is awkward in most situations and has to be rescued by the "angels".

We are constantly given contrasting messages of good and bad. Yet it becomes evident that men are making all the choices. Men are permitted access to both sides of the goodness-badness realm much more conveniently than women. It is a man's option, his priority to waver from super activity to mere activity. While men pass so freely, women are in constant waiting on man's desires.
These "angels" are not capable of any individual action. They continuously confide and confer with each other. Lacking the ability to take any action on their own. Conforming to the main goodness criterion, passivity.

The "angels" are very rarely confronted with personal relationships that would make them act out of character. When there is a romance, of sorts, the man involved is either a criminal or killed off, leaving the hand of these women intact.

The simplest definitions can clearly be related to positive behavior for women.

Good: Suitable; serviceable
Not spoiled; whole or sound
Pleasant; enjoyable
Virtuous, upright
Well behaved; obedient

Also the case with women and their negative qualities

Bad: Inferior; poor
Rotten; spoiled
Sorry; regretful

Bad man can be fit into the definition of bad much more easily than good men into the definition of good. It is interesting to me then that women continue to allow their value to be described by men and opposed always to what is proper for men. The most basic requirements of maleness and femaleness show this.

A woman's passivity is her most valuable asset, a man's his activity. When are weak; men are strong. Women are to be conquered; men are the conquerors. Men are the creators, the achievers, but lack reflection and love while women are thought to be in constant throes of emotion with little pursuit of knowledge or success.

Since men are permitted all the possibilities of goodness and badness so should women be involved in the same. We must agree to the need for change of values - we do. Then women must not be any longer judged
in male terms. Judged not on their lack of action, but the ability to generate and take action in their own benefit. Women and men must resist these images of themselves. Male superiority based simply on biological structure must cease.

We must all reckon the notion that there are truly no bad women (or good women, or bad men, or good men). The only bad people are the ones that give credence to these values.
Castrate the Rapist

Clovis Bryan

Rape, and our society's attitude toward rape, affects every woman. No woman whether or not she has ever felt threatened by an actual rape, can ignore the problem. Most of us would rather avoid thinking about it, but the underlying fear and loaded warnings of "be careful" have always influenced us.

A black man walking through certain white neighborhoods or a white man walking through certain black neighborhoods can understand the fear of unprovoked attack.

Rape is a crime against women. It is a deadly insult against you as a person. It is the illicit carnal knowledge of a woman without her consent, affected by force, intimidation or deception as to the nature of the act. Rape is the deprivation of sexual self-determination. It's all the hatred, contempt and oppression of women in a society concentrated in one act.

Men think of women as property. Therefore, they relate to them as object, my "thing". In their way of thinking, man will naturally always overpower a woman. It is as Susan Griffin pointed out in an enlightening article, "The All American Crime" and Brown-miller's biological theory, they are open to physical attack because they have a vagina.

The culture predetermine who we are and how we should behave. Fairy Tales are the primary formation of the culture.

The rape of the female is part of our universal heritage, a theme of poetic dimension as common to literature and art as war - though in rape, victors and victims never change identities. The conquerors are always men.

In this paper I want to discuss the morality of sex by comparison and contrast of the "good woman and bad woman, the good and bad man".

Take for example, both Sojourner Truth and
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Harriet Tubman may be considered "bad" because they stood as orototypal models. In my opinion I consider them courageous. They fought for what they believed in. While on the other hand, the anti-abolitioners will say they deserved to be punished because they are bad.

The Fairy Tales define for us the female character and delineates its existential possibilities. A good woman is passive, and the only good woman is a dead woman. When she is bad she lives, or when she lives she is bad. While the good man is strong and powerful. That he is powerful makes him succeed. There is the bad man, he is emotional and passive.

The morality of sex, the good woman is the victim. There is the bad woman. She must be destroyed. The good woman must be possessed. The bad woman must be killed, or punished.

If a bad woman needs to be punished, then why do men always seek her out? Because she is active, ambitious, independent and alive. There is the other man who is sympathetic, loving, yet he is bad in the eyes of society.

To me a good man is one who is understanding, kind, passionate, communicative, emotional and responsible. A bad man is one who goes out and kills for no reason.

A good woman is one who can dominate the male supremacy and fight for her own equality, and sexual freedom.

Today there is that savagery which is surfacing, especially in films, short stories and novels. The savagery depicted in such film atrocities as Straw Dogs and A Clockwork Orange.

Any solution to rape is complex and must involve a multi-faceted approach. Basic to all reforms is a change in attitudes towards the female half of the population and the ways in which men, ordinary citizens as well as papists intimidate and oppress women. In the eyes of society, men are always good no matter what they do, or do not do.

So the only solution is to castrate all
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rapists. Then others will think twice before they attempt anyone. I challenge society to do so. Rape must be remembered as a crime. It is not the just desert of any woman who dresses casually, goes out at night, or lives alone.

Rape is a crime which has thrived on the misconception and indifference of the morality of sex in our society, and the past silence of the victims. Women must wake up to the fact that there are no heroes in rape. Rape is only a symptom of the massive sickness call sexism, and the sickness itself must be cured.
Survival of the Fittest:
A Black Perspective on Rape
Larry Butler

In American society the concept of a good man, bad man, good woman, bad woman is just one of so many age old manifestations of a dominant class trying to impose its values and mores on everyone else. Unfortunately, this becomes even easier when those being dominated seek to identify with their oppressor. Even so, if one has to speak about good and bad women and men, like good and bad anything, one must look at the object to be dealt with within a particular framework.

Thus if one were to deal within the framework of street people, the concept of good and bad women and men would not be the same as that perceived by people in the upper echelons of society. And between these two polarities could exist many variations.

In any case, I shall attempt here to hold some middle ground in my analysis using as much as possible the ideal as seen by society or rather the ideal that has been thrust on society as my base of operations.

The way that I perceive society as seeing a good woman is a woman who is subserviant, ambitious, dependent (though I think this is changing) upright, loyal, chaste, good mannered, dutiful, respectful (knows her place) and so forth. Conversely, my outlook of society's view of a bad woman is one who is disloyal, unchaste, skimming on her responsibilities, ill-mannered, disrespectful of her men (stepping out of her bonds), loudmouthed, lacking ambition, loose and the like. On the other hand, a man to be a good man must like a good woman be respectful, dutiful, ambitious, upright and well mannered. Unlike a good woman, a good man must also be strong, protective and a good provider, and sustain a place of envy and respect in the world of men. Alongside the good man is the bad man who like the bad woman is ill-mannered, disrespectful and lacks ambition. However, unlike a bad woman he is weak, quiet or unassertive, unprotective, does not hold a place of respect and envy within the world of men, holds an unclear picture of his goals or if he has a clear one, he does little to bring about its realization.
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So, it seems a good man should be a pillar of strength and virtue and a good woman should adorn that pillar by virtue of being the antithesis, and at the same time compliment of a man; suggesting that one presupposes the other. Now, if the world was made up of only good men and bad women, then the strong virtuous pillar becomes merely an edifice of bare barren rock set off somewhere in a desert. Whereas, if one deals with the concept of a good woman and a bad man (in disunion), then one is left with decorative ornaments and complimentary asserts with nothing to decorate and nothing to compliment; a beautiful house without a foundation. So too it is with good men and bad women. A good man without his counterpart a good woman is in a state of suspended animation and vice versa. Thus it would seem the ideal would be a good man united with a good woman and vice versa. Unfortunately in the real world ideals rarely exist.

Scientifically, it would appear using the law of opposites that a good man paired with a bad man would be ideal but, let's examine this further and see if it's so outside of the world of science. Can a bad man and a good woman build a house that is beautiful as well as on solid ground? In my opinion, they cannot. In fact, I feel they would constantly be involved in a tug of war; for their motor forces would be repulsive rather than compelling. Therefore, the concept of a good woman bad man and vice versa in union is one that cannot surface and long survive in the real world. So that a good woman bad man, good man bad woman is an antithesis, while good women and men and bad women and men are juxtapositions. Therefore, the former can be no more than abstract reality while the latter must not only be prevalent in the real world, but also the one that would survive.

To conclude, it appears unfortunately that in American society the role of the female has always been that of adorner of her man and never the one being adorned. As Brownmiller states in her book "Against Our Will" historically and even in pre-historical times women have been objects of their men. Women today may have gotten to the point where they are able to obtain a certain status. Even so, it seems until very recently that that status has been objective, coming from outside herself; subject to the status of her man or the way in which she is viewed in the world of men.
Men, on the other hand, have always been a motive force subjected first and foremost to the approval of other men (the end process of male bonding). For if you are a man respected and approved of by other men, then it is a natural consequence that you will hold a position of relevance in the world of women. This then is the crux of a good man. A good man does not need to be judged so by women, but by other men and the same goes for a bad man.

An example of this can be seen in the film, "Once Is Not Enough" where Kirk Douglas tells his daughter that the man she is in love with is a bum. Even though she has judged him good, in the world of men he was nothing.

What about women? Is the disapproval of a woman by other women enough to make her a bad woman? I think not. For example, take the case of the businessman or politician who has his regular prostitute or mistress. He must see some good in her to like to be with her on a regular basis. But I'm sure unless a woman is herself in that business, she would possess a natural repulsiveness for a prostitute or mistress, stamiping her most definitely a bad woman. Whereas, even a most respected man may judge her good. So that how a woman feels on the matter really doesn't matter. On the other hand, if a man were to have a string of women or were to be a gigolo even though he might not be respected or judged good in the world of women, in the world of men he would probably be praised.

To conclude, it appears to me that if one deals within the framework of American society, a good man, bad man, good woman, bad woman are all concepts that in the final analysis are dependent on and subserviant to male mores and values. What a woman feels and thinks is given little credence. And when her opinions are allowed to be vented, if they prove threatening or opposing to male attitudes, we silence them. That is we simply resume our roles as lord and master and shove their silly ideas back under the rug where they belong. Therefore, in actuality no matter what one perceives to be a good or bad man or woman, the final judgment lies in the hands of a man.
Some Offers for a Solution

1) Men should attend consciousness raising classes.
2) Men should take women more seriously.
3) Men have to seek very hard to change their attitudes of superiority; at least in some respects.
4) Women should be less accepting of their roles.

The problem I have with offering proposals for a solution to the problem stems from the fact that I fail to see the severity of the problem. In fact I know many men who would say "What problem?" and women too. I know that when feminist movements first came out they were seen by black men and women as being a thing for white women. I think that many black people still hold this attitude. And even the few that may have been effected, I cannot see them as perceiving the problem in the same manner as their white counterparts unless they have become so enculturated with the other that they have lost sight of the self.

Grass roots people I feel are contending daily with so many problems that something like a feminist movement is of little concern when real problems (paying the rent, buying food, getting home without getting robbed, getting the oppressor off his back) are daily stomping them in the face. In this society (grass roots) a good man simply becomes that one who can survive and hold his ground and the same for a good woman. Morality goes out the window and survival walks in the door.
A sex role questionnaire was administered to actively functioning clinicians with one of three sets of instructions:

to describe 1) a mature, healthy, socially competent female,
2) a mature, healthy, socially competent male,
and 3) a mature, healthy, socially competent adult.

(The first twenty five descriptions of a healthy male and the last eleven of a healthy female correspond to the clinicians profile of a mature, healthy, socially competent adult.)

### FEMALE

- Non-aggressive
- Dependent
- Very emotional
- Easily influenced
- Very submissive
- Very passive
- Home oriented
- Very sneaky
- Does not know way of world
- Not at all adventurous
- Has difficulty making decisions
- Never acts as a leader
- Not at all self-confident
- Uncomfortable being aggressive
- Not at all ambitious
- Very illogical
- Does not hide emotions at all
- Very subjective
- Dislikes math and science
- Excitable in minor crisis
- Not at all competitive
- Not skilled in business
- Feelings easily hurt
- Cries very easily
- Conceited about appearance

### MALE

- Very aggressive
- Independent
- Not at all emotional
- Not at all easily influenced
- Very dominant
- Very active
- Worldly
- Very direct
- Knows way of world
- Very adventurous
- Makes decisions easily
- Almost always acts as leader
- Very self-confident
- Comfortable being aggressive
- Very ambitious
- Very logical
- Almost always hides emotions
- Very objective
- Likes math and science
- Not excitable in minor crisis
- Very competitive
- Very skilled in business
- Feelings not easily hurt
- Never cries
- Never conceited about appearance
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Very religious
Aware of others' feelings
Very talkative
Very tactful
Very gentle
Interested in own appearance
Neat in habits
Very quiet
Strong need for security
Likes art and literature
Expresses tender feelings

Not at all religious
Not at all aware of others
Not at all talkative
Very blunt
Very rough
Not interested in appearance
Sloppy in habits
Very loud
Little need for security
Dislikes art and literature
Does not express tenderness

This study outlines for us many of the virtues of womanhood and manhood but touches only indirectly upon aspects of sexual morality that are inherent in the natural role differentiation of men and women. In this paper, I will attempt to define and explore a morally good woman, good man, bad woman, and bad man in order to construct a more complete picture of the nature of men and women.

A good woman not only exemplifies the womanly graces and virtues pointed out in the questionnaire but is also, as the marriage contract reveals, faithful and obedient. As a very religious person, she strives always to deny her carnality and natural lustfulness and attend instead to the feelings of others. She places others before her and the glory of her womanhood is her self sacrificing ways. Although she repulses the little sexual drive she has in order to maintain chastity, she recognizes the needs of her man and offers herself to him out of love and a desire to satisfy those needs, despite the unpleasantness to her person. She beautifies and adorns herself in order to please him and to be a positive reflection of him to all. Her's is the ultimate and glorious sacrifice; to relinquish her own assertion of identity, to support the man she adores, to create a nurturant home environment to relax and refresh him, and to project his manhood by the contrast of her womanhood. Such a woman has earned and deserves the support, provisions, and protection of a good man.

A good man readily grants that protection and support while providing for his family. The primary virtues of a good man are: his directness and aggression which enable him to survive in the world and serve as an adequate provider, his ability to lead and chivalrously protect his submissive, passive partner who knows neither
the ways of the world nor how to make decisions easily, and his willingness to extent to her the privileges that his worldly status can afford in order to compensate her for her sacrifices. His directness and ability to lead also enables him to express his natural sexual needs and urgencies, freeing the woman from the burden of decision making and initiation. The good man's morality lies primarily in his ability to control those urgencies among good women other than his chosen partner. A good woman compliments a good man and the pair is thereby complete.

This brings us to the individual man or woman who refuse their natural roles. The woman who proposes, despite her general inability, to assert dominance, activity, decision making, and leadership in the world, is usually doomed to failure. And the woman who places herself first, refusing the womanly virtue of self-sacrifice, is indeed the most selfish of all creatures. None will protect or provide for the selfish unattached woman, especially if she is foolish enough to leave her carnality unchecked. Seen next to the righteous woman, no one will find cause to protect or care for the woman who refuses her position.

When we speak of a bad man, we cannot refer to those who fail to couple with and provide for an individual woman, as the abilities of men call many of them to work for great causes, to lead and assume the responsibilities of society. We refer rather to men who do not recognize the virtuous though vulnerable position of women as needing of protection; the man who fails to control his sexual urges and would violate a good woman. These are the men, though few who do not grant all good women the passing protection from harm that they have earned by their virtue.

Feminists argue that the good man and woman described here are unhealthy, incomplete partners of a duality that society has constructed. These are the individual women who are unwilling to accept their natural and virtuous roles as women in searching for a system that does not exist. They best beware lest they spent a lifetime alone, unprotected and not provided for. They strive to assert that the duality between men and women is socially not naturally determined, despite the universality of the condition. It may in fact be social but as all known cultures have developed
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in this way it must be a natural and inevitable development of society then.

The argument does not claim that women should not work as it may become another sacrifice they willingly make to fulfill their obligations to their family. A woman who claims the privilege of staying home while her children suffer from want is not a good woman, but neither is the woman who abandons her family when she returns from work. Individual women may choose to work to support themselves, living independent lives focusing on career but they choose at the same time a lonely, isolated, unprotected lifestyle. Men who focus on career in leading society sacrifice intimacy also but they have a lesser need for it and of course as men, they do not require the protection that women do.

Whether the roles described here are natural or social is irrelevant. They exist and have existed for centuries. Women and men couple in an exchange relationship. Women maintain their chastity, serve and nurture their partner in exchange for protection and economic provisions and privilege. The passive, submissive, emotional nature of women and the dominant, aggressive, direct nature of men equip both for their respective roles. Women in today's society are being exposed to an alternate role and lifestyle. I propose only that they be consciously aware of the consequences of that alternative and choose cautiously.

NOTES
Rape: A Personal Testament on Prejudice
Jocelyn Zadoff

Prior to writing this paper I asked my husband for his definition of a good woman. facetiously he replied, "It's in the bible." In this paper I shall attempt to show that the common biblical definition is still the generally accepted one; accepted in many ways by those of us who think of themselves as liberated. Although it seems safe to say that a good person is a moral person, I shall show that there is a wide disparity between a good, i.e., moral man and a good moral woman.

It is true that as a general rule women are physically weaker or unable to lift as much as men. Where individual tastes vary greatly the general view of a desirable woman is that of a beautiful passive creature just as that of a man being tall, dark and handsome, and aggressive. Good (aggressive) men desire good (passive) women. Because women are passive and weak, the world is not safe for them. They require the protection of a man, and men protect their good women just as they protect their other property. Our laws only reflect our morality.

The premise that women are weak is part of the "Big Lie." Movies reinforce this lie in their portrayal of women. Ambition in women is mocked and belittled. Ambition always takes second place to the love of a man. The man is always her superior and protector. The real woman lives longer and endures more pain than men. Women's physical inferiority in many ways is a myth. Not all women marry, and of those that do, one out of five ends up divorced. Many real women are, and have had to be, aggressive in order to take care of themselves and in some cases their children. And still the image of the good woman being passive persists. Divorced women are viewed by society as failures and seductresses. Other women see divorcees as attempting to steal their men. Men see divorcees as fair game for sexual advances in return for which they can offer protection. If women do not accept the superiority and protection of men, they are asking to be harmed. If they are under some man's protection and still manage to be harmed as in the case of rape, it is assumed that in some way they were asking for it. The myths about rape continue to perpetuate this image. In spite of overwhelming statistics, most people believe that good women cannot be raped. If they are, then they are obviously not good. It follows that where there is smoke there is fire.
I am a product of the society in which we all live. I have never been involved in "women's lib" but have only concerned myself with my own liberation as a woman. Until taking this course my ideas about rape were primarily those same myths, exposed in class, that the rest of society believes.

Years ago, when a member of my family was raped, my first reaction was anger that she had brought such disgrace on our family. My second reaction was that she had caused it. I can only believe that my reactions are typical of anyone brought up in a society where women are taught to hate themselves and to think of themselves as inferior. It is only with age and experience that I am able to evaluate people now without resorting to the stereotypical thinking that was indoctrinated into me in my youth.

In order to fully realize the put-down of women by society, that society has to be educated. It must be made to see what is reality and what is myth. Bad people engage in anti-social acts. Good people do not. There is no distinction between good men and good women in this case. It is strictly a matter of causing harm to another human being.

Because most of society has not had my education or experience, and until changes are made in the picture of women as portrayed in movies, television, advertisements, literature, etc., most people will continue to believe that there is a difference between a good woman and a good man. The good, passive, beautiful, fairytale woman will continue to be the ultimate sex object.
CHAPTER FOUR

What is Wrong with Rape?
Rape Results from Capitalist Ideology

Arthur C. Drayton, Jr.

Fully developed and freely expressed relationships are rare among men and women. Both are restricted by sexual norms which dictate how they should behave. For example, women are supposed to be helpless and dependent. Women are encouraged to think of themselves as warm, sensitive and always conscious of their supposedly feminine speech and behavior. Whereas, men are supposed to be at power and its control. That is to say, men are unemotional, strong, athletic, able to make firm decisions and financially stable. Men are not expected to be domestic, gentle and affectionate. Thus, stigmas are placed on both men and women who do not conform to society's stereotyping of "good women/men."

Women and men are socially accepted depending upon their portrayal of sex roles. The general attitude of society says a good woman should never enter the circumscribed character of man. Namely, management skills, mechanical aptitude, and the like are all reserved for male dominance. In other words, women should be non-competitive or solely restricted to menial work without final decisions (i.e. secretaries and nurses). Women are barred, at least good women are, from the usage of their language. It is the deviant woman who uses so-called male curse words such as "fuck". It is the good woman who uses soft colloquial words as "his thing" to describe "his dick", however if used they are considered disgusting and slutish. An easy going, soft-toned, passive, non-aggressive, and motherly-type woman is approved to be good. Furthermore, good women always try to look unordinarily enticing and glamorous for men.

Feminine charm, through the use of cosmetics and so-called sexy apparel, also typifies the stereotyping of "good women". Big breasts, wide hips, and long hair women are more than a woman who lacks these features. However, all women are not proportioned as such, thus all types of cosmetics and paraphernalia are used by women to look lady-like and appealing. Again, it is the plain-Janes who are an outcast and who are "less than a woman."
At same, men face similar sex roles as well as women. Men are surrounded, from birth, with the notion that they are the aggressor and dominant figure. From early childhood males are taught to suppress their emotions and not to be a "cry-baby," but to act like a man. Society categorizes a strong man as a courageous and competitive being. Maturing males are encouraged through school to be athletic and independently invulnerable. That is, not for the sake of recreation, but for preparing themselves into manhood in order to be the number one competitor. Thus, the male is molded into an insensitive, unemotional and self-achievement prone individual. After the adaptation, by males, psychological dominated role playing, hence society now honors their students as men.

Also, society reinforces the idea of male supremacy. Firstly, all major jobs are held by men (i.e. government - business). This in itself strengthens the concept of elitistical male nobility. It is the good men who prosper and become the breadwinners of the family. More importantly, it is "good men" who are expected to find gainful employment outside the home. Regardless how menial the work they have, the good man at least has the satisfaction support to his family. Moreover, society declares it morally normal and not in bad taste for good men to be hot tempered, impatient and speak loud. Good men also are categorized as hard working, independent, financially secure and not to mention popular with the women. On the other hand, weak men are regarded as passive, having subtle behaviors, physically uncapable of a "mans" task and emotional. It is true for men, just as for women, that society is the judge of determining what is morally correct behavior. Men who are shy and quiet are not real men, due to emotionally instability. Timidness is not a characteristic of a man. Also, men lacking athletic capabilities or some sort of physical attraction is less than a man. Unless, without any elaboration, a non-physical man is financially well-to-do he thus is unquestionably a man. Both women and men are scarred with imperfections among their own and opposite sex. It would be a bizarre reality for society to find a man tending to the household while the wife was off to work. So in questioning the role of women and men; is it that there is a natural behavior, or is there a mystification
on society's behalf on the actual nature of their character?

In the study of women/men sex roles one tries to find the primacy for behavior patterns. It is said "man's chief weapon is his mind". Kate Millett, author of Sexual Politics, sought to broaden the meaning of politics to include power relationships of "personal contact and coherent groups". Millett's concern was with male supremacy. She argued that male supremacy, which presented itself as a natural or biological phenomenon, was in fact socially enforced through ideological conditioning, socialization of early childhood, restriction of women to the family, the male monopoly on violence, and other institutions. Through such means women were universally subordinated to men. She insisted that male supremacy was a social rather than a biological phenomenon. But while describing various ways in which male supremacy operated, Millett did not present a unified theory of male supremacy. Millett did not explain what gave rise to male supremacy in the first place nor why, if male supremacy was socially established, it was universally reproduced while other social institutions varied throughout history. Another explanation was attempted in Firestone's The Dialectic of Sex. Firestone agreed with Millett that male supremacy was socially enforced, she insisted that its origins arose before society in the "biological family." According to Firestone, as a result of child-rearing function women have always been at the "mercy of their biology". As society developed, women remained restricted to the family, while men went forth to organize, politics and war. Society was divided into "two distinct biological classes" unequal in their social roles. This rejects the Marxist view that the class struggle originated in the "economic development of society" and "in changes of the modes of production and exchange." Firestone claimed, the family is the primary institution through which women participate in society. This, pinpointing oppression to a specific institution, she totally ignored the important fact that women also work outside the home. Mitchell, a Socialist, criticized Firestone's account as ahistorical, she wrote:

To say that sex dualism was the first oppression and that it underlies all oppression may be true, but it is a
general, non-specific truth, it is simplistic materialism, no more. After all we can say there has always been a master class and a servant class, but it does matter how these function and the working class or so on; there have always been classes, as there have always been sexes, how do these operate within any given, specific society?"

Hence, Mitchell does not attack the family but the different structures that compose it (sexuality, reproduction, and socialization of the young). Mitchell describes the unity of the family in three ways; economic, ideological unit and biosocial form. However, in her analysis she restricts Marxism to the study of economic and ideological activity, and excludes from Marxist analysis areas of life that are critical to an understanding of women and men's stereotyping.

Lastly, a Marxist would defend the reason for sex role playing lies in the mode of production. That is, historically, so long as the family was a productive unit based upon private property, its members understood their domestic life and "personal" relations to be rooted in their mutual labor. Since the rise of industry, however, proletarianization separated most people (or families) from the ownership of productive property. As a result "work" and "life" were separated. Capitalist development gave rise to the idea of the family as a separate realm from the economy, so it created a "separate" sphere of personal life. The rise of capitalism isolated the family from socialized production as it created a historically new sphere of personal life among the masses of people. The family now became the major space in society in which the individual self could be valued "for itself". This process, the "private" accompaniment of industrial development, cut women off from men in a drastic way and gave a new meaning to male supremacy. While housewives and mothers continued their traditional tasks of production-houswork, reproduction, etc. - this labor was devalued through its isolation from the socialized production of surplus value. In addition, housewives and mothers were given new responsibility for maintaining the emotional and psychological realm of personal relations. In con-
cluding, good women depend on men supremacy, due to biological handicap is not convincing enough. On the contrary, through economic development, simultaneously so did society's virtues of set sex roles change.

In evaluation of roles played by women and men in this society, I hesitate to believe that human nature derived certain patterns for sexes to abide by. Adapting historical relationships in direct continuity with ideological and economic adjustments, it is my supposition that economical dependent outside the family led to society's stigmatization of how one reproduces themselves. Agreeing with a Marxist approach, it is not biologically acceptable for male supremacy, but ideologically adapted through the Capitalist state. That is, clearly the state controls the ideological apparatus of society, in which the economic base is the sole conducting force of both. In simple terms, it is the intensification of socialization of the family which, through an array of class dilusions, is force to collectivize on a competitive scale and to be judge and conform to norms. Thus creates in its own bourgeois justification, a scientific cause for discrimination by role playing. In actuality, a biological contradiction is present in those who adapt society's thought. Because, at end, normalness is determined through the advantages of individuals who benefit through the economic base and rely on class conflict to carry returns of profit by the ideological concept of "divide and rule".
There is Nothing Wrong With Rape

Bonnie Hoffman

In this paper, I wish to prove that rape is not morally wrong. I will start off by describing what is a good woman and bad woman, good man and bad man by society. I will show how movies reinforce these stereotypes of good woman, good man, bad woman, and bad man.

A good woman is beautiful, innocent, weak, passive, dependent, submissive, obedient, domestic, unquestioning, satisfied in her role, less intelligent than man, agreeable, loving, always happy and smiling, and married or an eternal virgin.

A bad woman is aggressive, rebellious, career-minded, bitchy or witchy, evil, selfish, strong-minded, provocative, demanding, independent, or a prostitute.

A good man is powerful, aggressive, confident, independent, adventurous, popular with the guys, tough, rugged, wealthy, and protective of women.

A bad man is greedy, poor, alcoholic, gambler, criminal (i.e. murderer, gangster) or has female characteristics.

The main function of women is to please men. The easiest way to do this is through beauty. Society has created an ideal woman. All women try to fit into the ideal. We have beauty pageants to pick Miss America. We watch beautiful movie stars whom we try to imitate. We are told that in order to be beautiful we must be tall, thin, and free of excess hair. Magazines stress the importance of beauty in winning a man. We can wear make-up or go to the beauty parlor to be beautiful. We can buy a new wardrobe or wear the right perfume.

A good example of women using their beauty is in the movie, "Beauty Knows No Pain." The Texas Rangerettes are picked according to their beauty and their smile. These girls go through intense training to learn to be beautiful for men. This is the most important thing to them. They do not mind the hard work because it is so rewarding. It is necessary to smile at all times because smiling adds to one's attractiveness. A good woman is always happy.

A good woman is created to save men. By being inferior, she will be good because men will be superior. A good woman is weak, passive, and submissive. This allows the man once more to be superior. She gives him the opportunity to prove his masculinity to her. A good woman must worship her man and be obedient to him. He is her existence. Her life consists of pleasing her man by submitting to his desires, caring for him, taking care of the house, raising "his" children, being supportive of him in good times and in bad.

A good woman must not show her intelligence. She must never appear to know more than a man because she must not let him feel inferior.
In order to please a man, a woman must know the proper tactics. She must be somewhat provocative in order to turn on the man. She can be a tease but she must always control herself. A woman must be an eternal virgin. Men want "unspoiled" women since woman is man's property.

In the movies, women who started off in careers had to fall in love and make that their only career in order to be good.

Jane Wyatt in "Father Knows Best" was the typical housewife and mother. Taking care of her husband and children was her career. She never got angry and was always supportive. In the "Honeymooners", Audrey Meadows portrayed the good wife. She was strong but always submitted to Ralph. In one episode, Alice goes for a job. Ralph gets very upset that Alice is working because he is left to do housework. Alice quits her job only when Ralph admits that housework isn't easy.

The bad woman stands out more. Evil women are dangerous because they are capable of destroying men. Women have always been evil. This can best be seen by our biblical character, Eve. Women who seek power and independence are always portrayed as evil. In movies, actresses such as Betty Davis and Joan Crawford often portrayed this role which usually led to their destruction.

Scarlett O'Hara is portrayed as a bad woman in "Gone With the Wind." She rejects handsome Rhett Butler for a passive man -- Ashley. She wants to be powerful. She is seen as a very selfish woman.

Prostitutes are bad. Good women are not supposed to enjoy sex; they do it to please the man. Prostitutes exist and were created by good men yet they are bad women. Any woman who is too provocative is bad. A good example of this is Marlene Dietrich in "The Blue Angel." She was a bad woman who corrupted the proper professor. He lost his good reputation by hanging around with Lola. He hoped to change her but she was too bad and independent to reform. He ends up the pathetic character. We feel sorry for him for not being able to dominate her.

In movies, the good man always protects the good woman and tries to reform the bad woman. The good man is confident, tough, rugged, and has lots of buddies. Robert Redford always plays those roles. He usually has a close buddy and the two of them are sexy and very masculine. Women do not always star in his movies. Usually his masculinity is enhanced by being with other men in such movies like "Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid" and "The Sting". Even though he was a bad guy in Butch Cassidy, we still saw him and Paul Newman as anti-heroes. Women oftentimes do not star in men's movies. They are used as fixtures or to spice up a scene. This is especially so in war movies such as Patton or Westerns such as Lone Ranger. Yet in all women's films, men are necessary since the plot centers around both of them.
Bad men are usually portrayed in movies the same way as bad women. The good men conquer both and they must succumb to the good men. The difference between the bad man and the bad woman is the former is morally bad while the latter is socially bad. The bad man is sometimes sympathized in movies such as "In Cold Blood" and "Dog Day Afternoon". But the bad guy usually loses.

Our society is sexist. The only good woman is a woman who is inferior to man. Man is naturally good unless he does something morally wrong. A woman who tries to be like a man is bad. The criterion of our society is set by man to protect man. Man wishes to remain superior to woman thus he must set criteria for women. Inferior is bad in our society. A good woman is inferior. A good woman is a bad woman. This contradiction of sexism can best be seen regarding prostitution. Men want women to be provocative and sexy (this is evident from men's magazines such as Esquire and Playboy) yet he condemns this in his wife. Men go to prostitutes yet they have no respect for them. A woman is supposed to be sexy but if she is too sexy, she is a bad woman. It is so hypocritical. It is a trap by men to control women. This judgment of women is responsible for the myths of rape. One common myth is that only bad women are raped. This means that a good woman cannot be raped. This leads to the myth that bad women deserve to be raped. This is a moral statement. This says that rape is moral because bad women deserve it. These myths serve two purposes. 1) They say that women should be good (inferior) so they won't be raped. This helps man stay superior, and 2) They protect man. If only bad women are raped and if all women are bad (inferior is bad) then man is not guilty of rape. If the woman provoked it, how can one blame the man? Thus rape is not morally wrong according to our society since good women are not raped.

I disagree with this statement. According to the logic of our society, it is a valid argument, but I don't agree with the logic of our society. It is clearly seen that more restrictions are placed on women than on men. In order for a woman to be "good" she must have no self-identity and then she isn't really good. This is the basis of sexist society. Man is superior to woman. Woman have been taught to believe this through movies, media and people. Myths on rape will remain until sexism is gone. Since rape is a male crime, it is natural that men will protect themselves from rape. These myths were created to protect men and blame women. The first step in eliminating rape is to educate the society on sexism. Rape must be recognized as a moral crime. In order for this to happen, society would have to be non-sexist. But if society was non-sexist, rape would not exist. It is a dismal problem with only one solution: eliminate sexism.
I can now conclude that society expects women to be inferior to man. Women are conditioned to be inferior through the media. A good man is one who has no "good" woman characteristics. Women cannot be superior to men or even equal. If she is good she is inferior thus she is bad, and if she is bad she is worse. Man is afraid of the bad woman because she threatens man's superiority. These are the prevalent values in eexist society. Rape is not seen by society as a moral crime because only bad women are raped and they deserve it. -Rape will not be immoral until society is non-sexist.
Rape is Wrong Because Assault Is Wrong

Audrey D. Buenaventura

The crime of rape is against the law. It is also immoral. In our society, rape is treated as a legal rather than a moral issue due to the lack of credibility of women. Almost worse than the act itself is the ordeal a rape victim must go through just to make the courts believe her.

Women in this sexist society have been treated as property and denied their rights for so long that it is no wonder that they are not believed. A piece of property hasn't the ability to reason or separate a truth from an untruth. It is a well known fact that women as a sex are emotional and incapable of making cool-headed decisions like their male counterparts. Actually, "counterparts" is incorrect. There is no such thing as a counterpart of women. Certainly a level-headed, unemotional and fair-minded male could not be even remotely considered as such.

Women are notoriously oversexed and scheming. Young men are warned (by their mothers) to beware of wily females who will lure them into bed, playing upon their natural and healthy sexual desires, and then "trap" them into marriage. Even Mama knows that women are untruthful and not to be trusted. Women, in other words, are the downfall of men.

In the movie "The Blue Angel", a respectable professor falls in love with a "bad" woman. Despite all his noble intentions, she drags him down and humiliates him until he is reduced to nothing. In "Gone With the Wind", Scarlett O'Hara uses a series of men who are overcome with her charms to get what she wants. In the meantime she nurses a futile love for Ashley Wilkes, and her succession of husbands are mere stepping stones to her ultimate goal - marriage to Ashley. Even her marriage to Rhett Butler is a means to get money to save Tara. There is a "forced seduction" scene in the film which seems to bring Scarlett to heel, but in the end, after losing everything, she emerges as the same scheming bitch she was in the beginning.
Society looks upon a woman who uses men to achieve her goals as a bad woman. In "79 Park Avenue", a young girl who has been raped by her stepfather refuses to reveal the fact in court when she is arrested for stabbing him. She is afraid of hurting her mother with such a revelation, but more than that, she knows that her boyfriend wants the girl he marries to be "pure". She subsequently serves six months in a reformatory. Upon her release, she finds it impossible to get a job since she is inexperienced and female. She goes from being a taxi dancer to being a stripper and, ultimately, a high priced call girl at 79 Park Avenue - all because of the attitudes of our sexist society. In the end we find our heroine once again on her way to jail for having killed a gangland leader in self defense. Although she is acquitted of a first degree murder charge through the noble intervention of her ex boyfriend, her past is opened up in court like a bag of dirty laundry and nearly gets her convicted. Even though she has led an unblemished and successful life in all other respects, her past marks her as a "bad" woman.

This brings us to the question of what society considers a "good" woman. First, a woman who marries, is monogamous, raises children, attends PTA meetings, keeps a clean house and "acts like a lady" at all times is considered good. Being a martyr doesn't hurt either. If hubby drinks, runs around with other women and beats her when he gets home, if she sticks by him in the face of all that - well, she's good. In other words, the worse he is the better she becomes in the eyes of society. How many times have we heard, "She's a saint", or "She'll go straight to heaven when she dies"?

However, if our betrayed and battered wife steps out to a bar or gets herself a boyfriend, heaven help her! She is no longer a "good" woman, but a woman gone wrong. Her duty, after all, is to stay at home and care for the children no matter what. She must sacrifice her own identity to mother image. Papa can do what he damned well chooses, and folks say, "How unfortunate." But let Mama retaliate in kind and it becomes unforgivable.

A good woman is attractive without being "loose". She makes love with her husband whenever
it is his wish. Her own feelings on the matter should not interfere with her husband's desire. After an exhausting day, she should never be too tired to comply. This is what is expected of a "dutiful" wife. Making herself available to her husband at any time is her duty.

A man, on the other hand, must go out and work. He is the breadwinner. Naturally, his duties are much more exhausting than his wife's. After all, he's out there competing and conquering all day long and deserves to be treated like a king when he comes home. The problems of child rearing should be handled by the wife and not dumped on the poor husband at the end of the day. The wife has the privilege of slaving round the clock for her nine to five husband in return for his protection and support. She should be grateful. Besides, this slavery is a small price to pay for the dividends it earns. The provider and protector returns in all his masculine glory at the end of the day to be waited on and pampered as is his due. Wifey is then rewarded with his sexual favors, unless he is too tired. Naturally that would postpone her reward a bit.

Our society's "good" men raise families, keep their wives at home while they earn a living, drink wity the boys occasionally, play around (occasionally), never get over-emotional, father children, fight for their country (killing lots of innocent people), tell the truth and rape women. Rape is an accepted, natural thing in our society, even though there are laws against it. With all the sexy, provocative women running around to tempt a man, it is to be expected. Chivalry came about as a result of this fact and, according to Susan Griffin in "Rape: The All-American Crime" is an "age-old protection racket which depends for its existence on rape." As long as people accept the crime of rape on this basis it will surely continue on its present scale. It has got to be treated as a crime of assault and not a sex crime stemming from natural, biological urges, if it is to be stopped.

Rape is not an urgent issue to the law (which is enforced by men) because they don't fear rape. Only women are raped and every woman lives with this fear. Unlike men, they are not free to walk alone at night,
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go to bars or do any of the other things men do. It is not safe for a woman to do these things for fear she might put herself in a position to be raped. But, what exactly constitutes this position? A "good" woman in the relative safety of her home still runs the risk of being raped. There is really nothing a woman can do in order to make herself immune to this threat.

In order to discourage the crime of rape once and for all we must begin by making and enforcing drastic laws against rape. If rape is punished by death or castration, we will see its rapid decline. But first we must begin by giving all the encouragement possible to rape victims to make them come forth and prosecute. As long as shame, degradation and denial of credibility are a woman's lot as a rape victim, what possible reason can she have for reporting the crime? Women do not deserve rape just as men do not deserve harm. Rape is harm. Harm is not deserved by human beings. Therefore, being human, women do not deserve rape. A man who is beaten seeks and finds justice in the courts. The reporting of the assault does not bring him shame, but sympathy. This usually leads to justice. If men deserve justice, women do also. Our biggest barrier is getting both men and women to believe this. We of both sexes have been conditioned for so long to believe the myths about rape, that it is hard to dispel them.

Friedrich Engels points out in "The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State" that the "overthrow of mother-right was the world historical defeat of the female sex". Men took over and women were reduced to servitude. Next, the formation of the monogamous family secured men the right of conjugal infidelity. The wife became the sole property of the husband and was completely under his power. Thus were women put "in their place", from which they are only now beginning to emerge. According to Engels, true equality of the sexes can only be achieved by the overthrow of capitalist production. When this equality is realized, rape will no longer exist.

If we are to believe Engels, I fear we as women have a long wait. Capitalism is a way of life
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in this country and is likely to remain so for some time. I do believe that women should continue to fight for equal rights and that they needn't do it at the expense of their femininity. The "hand that rocks the cradle..." is a strong hand. It is capable of innumerable tasks from stroking a lover to building a bridge. Any belief to the contrary is a myth. Therefore, I feel this hand deserves all the freedom to accomplish that is accorded its male counterpart.
Rapists: Sane or Sick?

Julie C. Pata

Just exactly, who is the rapist? Society at large believes that the rapist is most definitely a "sick", or "insane" man, who is driven by an uncontrollably strong sexual drive. In my paper I choose to challenge this particular myth of the rapist, and prove that the rapist can be as "normal" as the next man.

One could pinpoint a description of a rapist as being a "bad" man. A rapist is a "bad" man, who committed sexual assault on a woman and who left his mark of evil, the rape. This is a description most widely held by people in society. This makes one wonder, what exactly is a "bad" man? In our society, a so called "bad" man is criminal, a thief, a gambler, or possibly some crooked politician. An irresponsible reckless man, who possibly drinks an excess of alcohol is also considered to be a "bad" man. The alcoholic also carries the taboo of being an emotionally sick person, who usually seeks out, and depends on, the care of an emotionally stronger woman. Many times, in his drunken stupor, the drunk may lash out and physically abuse the woman who is caring for him. The alcoholics are usually not jailed for their abuse of women, rather they are sent to hospitals to be detoxified, then they are released again, only to continue the downward spiral of abusing women.

There are "bad" man all throughout the web of society, and in that there are so many, it is common, and therefore accepted by the majority. The "bad" man is also portrayed for us to view and appreciate on the silver screen. Early screen stars in leading roles, such as Humphrey Bogart and Marlene Dietrich were considered to be evil, yet they were glorified by the audiences and were box office sellouts!

Many of these stars were criminals or the legendary "bad" guy. Some "bad" guys of more recent times, soon to become classics, are Robert Redford and Paul Newman, hos cohort with the tantalizing "baby blues". They were rough and though and they carried guns and stole other people's money. The leading lady in the flick, "Butch Cassidy and the
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Sundance Kid," was the lovely and demure Katherine Ross. She was the epitome of passivity and submission portrayed as the willing lover and sometimes "nurse" of the "bad" men. She was an accomplice to their criminal behavior and therefore was also touched with society's evil mark. Miss Ross was courted and overpowered by Butch and Sundance and she loved it! This movie was a sexist portrayal of the men of the Old West and their relationships to their women. These relationships, and the people that were involved in them are mixed with evil wrongdoings and are considered as "bad".

How ironic that these "bad" men displaying their maschismo, which many people adore, when they are turned loose on the streets of America, become potential rapists. The handsome "bad" guy was the accepted symbol of the maschismo charisma and male domination over women. If you were an ugly "bad" guy, you could make it in the movies as a gambler, a hitman, or possibly as a conman. "Bad" men in our society have been both loved and hated; yet all of them have been accepted as a part of our society.

Another example of a "bad" man is the notorious "Fernwood Flasher" of the "Mary Hartman, Mary Hartman," alias Grandpa, who got off on exposing himself to the women in the community. In this show, Norman Lear the producer of "M.H.M.H.", captured a distinct reflection of the beliefs and values of contemporary society. He touched on many social issues on the show, and even made warm, wonderful Tom Hartman, the provider of the All American family, into a reckless alcoholic. Yet, even in this "bad" state Tom was loved and accepted by Mary, his wife, and the others in Fernwood. Even the viewing audience was compassionate of his ill mannered behavior, and his short tempered rages, that he directed at Mary, the submission woman.

These are all mythical male characters made to entertain us and to possibly indoctrinate us with traces of male chauvinism. Though it is subtle, the sexism and male aggression towards women, comes through to us all.

In contrast to this subtlety, reality, on the streets and in many American bedrooms, is the "bad" guy as the rapist. Though the rapist commits violent crimes
of abuse on women and children, he is not glorified like the "bad" guy on the screen. Quite the opposite, the rapist is seldom talked about or mentioned. Rapists hold a low profile in America. They are not recognized by the judges, juries and police as well. The rapist is silently despised by the women in our society, yet no one believes or listens to her anger and hatred.

Right at this point in my paper, I would like to incorporate the concept of the good and decent man in our society. The good man is a complete contradiction to the "bad" man in society. He is the "bad" guy's counter partner. The good man is responsible, powerful, and therefore attractive. He is the provider, who is good to his woman and children. His woman is usually standing in this man's shadow, benefiting from whatever this man reaps and gains. She is generally submissive and she also encourages him in his day to day life. This so called good man is also a potential rapist. The myth held over for many years, and even to the present, is that the rapist is not only bad, but he is most likely "sick" and/or emotionally out of control. This concept, I feel is just an excuse for the rapist that actually holds a lot of weight in our society and usually lets the rapist off without a conviction.

The fact is that, "most rapists are indistinguishable from "sane men". (University Women - Y.W.C.A. Rape Relief, Seattle, Washington). Many male psychologists view rape the way many others tend to see it - as a potential in EVERYMAN! Though everyman has the potential to be a rapist, it is only acted out by a minority of men. Psychologists also have found that most men do have "rape fantasies". The difference is that men who act out their "fantasies" use violence and force, and the women do not submit and give consent as they usually do in their fantasies.

Rape is an act of outright contempt and hostility against women. The sexual act in rape is the culmination of this contemptuous anger in the rapist.

To think, or let anyone else freely think, that this violent sexual outrage directed against women, is conceivable in everyman in our society, even a person's own father, only intensifies the
the fear that women share. It is hard for society to believe that the town preacher is a potential rapist. This is the reason that the rapist is portrayed by many as the vicious ghoul who lurks in dark alleys, stalking his prey. It is much easier to see him, the rapist, in this light, rather than admit openly that he is closer than they would like to think. He could be the man next door, but who would want to believe this, of dear sweet Mr. Smith? This happens everyday in America, when Mr. Normal becomes a rapist. It happens, that an ordinary male commits an act of sexual aggression on a woman. This woman could be the man's wife, a child, a neighbor's wife, or a nun. No one woman in our society is immune to rape, since we are constantly surrounded by all of these potential rapists.

The rapist could be the provider of a family, or the president of a respectable corporation, or the milkman. Everyman disguises a potential rapist. Everyman is now a suspect of committing rape. Men treat women in our society as sex objects to be treated with sexual savagery by men. How many times have we seen in the movies or read in a novel, the passionate love scenes, where the male actor is being quite sexually aggressive and/or abusive to the woman. She may flirt and then decide to reject the man's sexual advances, only to make him more forceful and aggressive towards her. Many times in the movie sex scenes, the woman's consent is mistaken by her scream and her outrage is seen as cute, that she should struggle against this beautiful, "bad" man.

The "double standard" of men that exists in a sexist society causes a woman who is not married and has had sexual intercourse to be seen as "fair game." She is up for grabs by the male, to be seduced and overpowered with his sexual prowess. Because of this label as "fair game", the woman goes unprotected by the law. The man's reputation is protected by the existing rape laws. This is exemplified in the fact that it is so hard to get a conviction on a rapist, if if the woman gets her case to be heard at all.

Many frustrated and angry men use rape as a release of an inner pressure that they may be harboring.
Some rapists have been rejected by another woman and show their anger by raping and humiliating another woman.

Psychologists have classified rapists into certain categories. The first category, being the minority of rapists is the psychopathological rapist. This is a man who has already portrayed anti-social behavior. Most "normal" rapists are often not charged with rape, never brought to trial, or are never convicted of any rape charges if they do stand trial. This type of rapist can come from the ghetto, the middle class or the upper class. There is no division of classes as far as the rapist is concerned.

There are a few points that I feel are necessary for me to bring out in my conclusion of this paper. The first point relates back to the section in this paper that dealt with the "bad" guys of the silver screen. I feel that the acceptance and the encouraged popularity of the "bad" man in the movies abusing his or anyone else's woman, reflects the beliefs and values that society holds dear and perpetuates. This belief is that the male must dominate the woman, and they do this by sexually overpowering them or raping the woman before our eyes.

I also strongly believe that a change of attitude and awareness, by society as a whole is necessary in order to change this idolatry of the "bad" man. If so much attention was not wasted on keeping our eyes on the "bad" man, we might be able to catch Mr. Normal Nice-guy abusing or raping a woman in time to stop him or convict him for his crime. The stereotype of the rapist as the sick, drooling, and sexually deprived individual must be updated with the fact that the rapist may be the nice man next door, with the wife, three kids and a dog.

It is also crucial, and about time, that society recognize the woman as a human being who has been violated in the case of rape, and to believe what the woman is saying to be true. This I feel is vital if women are ever to receive any justice in rape cases.
Why Do

Rape Laws Protect Men?

Wanda Smith

Rape is one of the major crimes committed against women in our society. Rape, however is not a sex crime but a crime of power. Sex itself is irrelevant to rape. The problem is that our society does not deal with rape because it is a crime committed solely against women. Perhaps the more appropriate question would be, "What's wrong with our society, in that it perpetuates rape?"

In this paper I will attempt to show that not only is rape wrong, but it is a crime against women by men who are protected under the law. In this instance, women will always be subjected and prone to rape. The burden of proof is on the woman. Society lawfully takes an adamant stand on the protection of male rights. There are three causal explanations of rape: the radical feminist view, the Marxist view, and the conservative view. Although these may be causal explanations, they don't explain why our society views rape as natural and inevitable. If this is the case, then why don't all men rape?

Brownmiller would say that women are biologically programmed for rape, due to the structure of their bodies. Radical feminists point out that the rape laws are all offender-oriented. They believe that the class difference (and role differences) make rape a societal problem, perpetuated by male power plays. Since rape is a crime of power and not of sex, this may indeed have some basis. The traditional role of women as irresponsible moral agents make them prey for any males who feel that masculinity is based on sexual dominance. Although rape does not imply consent, it is usually blamed on female sensuality. Women as irresponsible moral agents cannot consent to rape.

Either way, rape is the physical invasion of a woman's body. Although women may ask for sex, they don't ask for rape. If they do it is no longer rape, but sex. Using this criteria, rape is not and cannot be justified. Women are forced to operate under moral paradigms. They are viewed as both models of virtue
and vice. It is easy under these conditions for society to excuse rape as a crime of seduction. One must remember that rape is never consensual, and that passivity does not imply consent. If women are physically weaker, why then doesn't society provide some built-in controls to protect them? We now see a need not only to restructure the society but also its values in regard to the roles of women. The division is one of sex, not class.

This leads us to the Marxist explanation which blames rape on sexual oppression within the society. Our society creates an atmosphere in which men are encouraged to be sexually aggressive, and it is the woman's duty to be the passive partner. Woman's main attribute seems to be powerlessness, while man's is power. In our society the commitment to the maintenance of masculinity is in itself, a commitment to sexual inequality. As long as this attitude persists, women will always be targets for rape.

Society does not view rape as an urgent crime. It is committed by men, not against men. Women are programmed to fear males after the age of puberty. Most rapes are not reported due to the victim's fear of some male. If the society will not protect its women, who will? Society is wrong for constantly subjecting women to a "rape prone" environment. Women are assumed in rape cases to be the cause of the rape. Men use all kinds of excuses - provocative behavior, she said "no" but meant yes, etc. The results are that the women involved are publicly humiliated. The pressure on a woman reporting rape is so culturally negative that most rapes don't get reported. It is wrong that in this day woman must fear reporting violations of their own body. She must prove beyond reasonable doubt (which is relative), that she did not provoke the attack. Society denies that it is their problem, that the problem is psycho-social - one of the individual.

Taking the conservative view, (that rape is an individual problem), we must still question societal neglect in dealing with rape. If rape is an individual problem (society being made up of individuals) why doesn't society deal with them? Yes, there are rape laws, but under examination they are for the
protection of men. If women are the victims, then why do the laws protect men? This is an obvious injustice to the female sex. Rape increases woman's dependence on men - who are the very people raping them. Victimology under law works to the benefit of the offender. If rape is the result of individual malfunction (under socialization), why isn't there some help available for these people? Why? Because popular morality does not defend rape, the law does.

An individual rapist argues that rape is sex, and women are sex objects, therefore they deserve to be raped. This is absurd - as to deserve presupposes consent, and women are not responsible enough to give consent (passionate-egoists). Again, rape in this case is wrong because the woman is still being taken advantage of. Myths of provocation will be argued, but the man is usually given the benefit of the doubt. This protection of male integrity is a direct kick in the ass in terms of gender justice.

As Dworkin puts it: "throughout the ages women have been conditioned to have their faces-made-up, ears-ringed, nipples-roughed, neck-perfumed, etc...." This is in itself an indication of how society views womanhood. Men create this attitude, society perpetuates it and women tolerate it.

In conclusion, I wish to state that rape for any reason is wrong. It is a serious, but overlooked crime against women. Since society does not want to embarrass men by dealing with rape, the problem will continue to exist. Handling the problem seems to be a lost cause. The problem is two-fold: a societal as well as a criminal offense. If male-rape became prevalent, there would be new rape laws. Rapists know that apathy and the law is on their side. With this protection, rape is not seriously viewed as a crime. It may be sad, but that seems to be our "state of arrairs" these days.
Rape is defined as the seizure or the act of taking away by force, to plunder, rob. (law) the carnal knowledge of a woman without her consent. Rape is the most vicious crime committed by man against woman. The urgency of this issue must be recognized. For as long as rape continues, women will continue to be denied their freedom of a life they equally deserve.

From the moment a little girl baby is born to the moment an old lady dies they stand the chance of becoming a victim of rape. Our education that led us to believe in our inequality to boys started early. As we grew, so did the difference between us and little boys. The differences slowly became the doubts we had concerning our worth. Our inferiority led us to adore their superiority. We watched our mommies take care of our daddies and the picture came clear as to what our utmost goal as girls should be, "to get a man". We were taught just how they'd want us to be. In the meantime the little boys are being taught to recognize their worth. They are shown how to be strong and to possess the power needed so that they will one day be ready to inherit their rights that have been secured for them by their forefathers. They watch their father with his wife and he is taught how she is his mother. And that one day he'll grow up and earn the right to have one of man's most prized possessions, a woman of his own.

If we consider the myth (that unfortunately has survived pretty well) that women are the property of men, it could then be considered that rape is not just the lashing out of man against woman, but man against man. It is these men that vandalize a woman's body that are also vandalizing the property of another man, whether it be a husband or father. What better way to prove your power than to take away the best property a man has, his woman. We know she is his just by the fact that a woman can't prosecute her husband for rape because she's considered his property to do with as he wishes.

This unnatural act of man against woman shows
more hows and whys when we look at the double standard that exists between men and women. I remember one time when my brother had to be away from home for awhile. To his dismay he couldn't come in contact "with a piece of ass" for quite some time. So when a weekend home was imminent my mother immediately made plans to have his girlfriend on hand to fulfill his "needs". When I questioned my mother concerning the double standard towards the sexual activities of her son compared to her daughters she frantically explained how different it was. How it is to be expected of a boy but a girl it is against the rules. When I told her he'd be screwing someone else's daughter, she actually betrayed herself by betraying another woman. She didn't think she had to be concerned with the behavior of that other girl. She'd been to bed with Scott before so my mother didn't feel she was such a good girl anyway. Besides her main concern was the welfare of her son. Her ways proved she had been brainwashed into thinking of a man as a supreme being. That whatever steps were needed to get them where they wanted to be had to be taken, even though the steps were to be the fate of every woman. Rape has not only turned man against woman and man against man, it has in some instances turned woman against woman.

This injustice towards women's worth has plagued her since the beginning of recordable history. The penetration of man's strength into the vulnerability of a woman has caused her to give up the roles of "person" lest she decide to take the risk of becoming the "victim". This belief is illustrated by Menachem Amir in his book Patterns in Forcible Rape (p. 253). He states:

"From the patterns of forcible rape described and analyzed previously we can shed some light on two aspects of rape: the likelihood that only certain females will become victim of forcible rape and the choice of victims by the offenders."

He then goes on to state it differently even though it connotes the same disgusting attitude that unfortunately prevails in the minds of others who are not willing to
really recognize the horrors of rape.

"the question is of the situations or characteristics of certain potential victims which may actually bring about the offense."

From these words I get sick to my stomach. Here we are giving character to a woman so that ultimately she can be accused as being the offender. By acting a certain way she is almost forcing a man to rape her. She will be judged for her actions possibly by other women too.

The message is obvious. If a woman dares to enter society, expecting to be able to move freely like man can, she risks being punished. But now the risk is no longer isolated among the so called "bad woman". The risk of rape has reached anyone who happens to have a vagina. At first we were told not to enter the man's world but the cases involved show the different types of women falling victim to their crime. So the warnings must be changed. Not only must we not dress a certain way, nor go to certain places, we must now lock any door that stands between us and men. We must not enter this world at all if we don't want to get raped. Our space keeps getting smaller and smaller as long as rape keeps getting bigger and bigger.

So again I ask why Rape? I feel it's because we've been oppressed so long we've come to believe the myths too. What's wrong? What's wrong is that whenever we play man's games we always lose. Rape isn't going to stop unless we decide we want to win when playing the game. The system has it that even after the woman has been totally degraded by a man due to rape, she must almost always turn to another man for justice. But that can be changed. Rape crisis centers are being formed to help bring us one step closer. We see that there is someone around to believe in women. It's other women.
Biology is Destiny

Sheila Mason

The causal explanation of rape that I will give is taken from Susan Brownmiller, who is a radical feminist. Bebel gives this Marxist analysis: "There arose the need of labor power to cultivate the ground. The more numerous these powers, all the greater was the wealth in products and herds. These struggles led first to the rape of women, later to the enslaving or conquered men. The women became laborers and objects of pleasure for the conqueror; their males became slaves."

Zoologists take on this approach: "Our call to sex occurs in the head, and the act is not necessarily linked, as with animals, to Mother Nature's pattern of procreation. Without a biologically determined mating season, a human male can evince sexual interest in a human female at any time he pleases, and his psychologic urge is not dependent in the slightest on her biologic readiness or receptivity." What it all boils down to is that the human male can rape.

A man's "structural capacity to rape and woman's corresponding structural vulnerability" is a basic reasoning for rape itself. The fact that our human anatomy is designed to allow the male to be the one who has most control of the sexual act itself, and rape, automatically works against us females. This alone may have caused the creation of a male ideology of rape. When men discovered that they could rape, they proceeded to do so.

"If the first rape was an unexpected battle founded on the first woman's refusal to have sex, the second rape was indubitably planned." "Rape, not only became a male prerogative, but man's basic weapon of force against woman, the principal agent of his will and her fear. His forcible entry into her body, despite her physical protestations and struggle, became the vehicle of his victorious conquest over her being, the ultimate test of his superior strength, the triumph of his manhood." "Man's discovery that his genitalia could serve as a weapon to generate fear must rank as one of the most important discoveries of prehistoric times. It is used as a deliberate process of intimidation by which all men keep all women in a state of fear."
"By anatomical fiat the inescapable construc-
tion of their genital organs - the human male was a
natural predator and the human female served as his
natural prey. Not only might the female be subjected
at will to a thoroughly detestable physical conquest
from which there could be no retaliation in kind - a
rape for a rape - but the consequences of such a brutal
struggle might be death or injury, not to mention im-
pregnation and the birth of a dependent child."

"The earliest form of permanent, protective
conjugal relationship, the accommodation called mating
that we know as marriage, appears to have been institu-
tionalized by the male's forcible abduction and rape
of the female."

Another causal aspect of rape deals with war.
"It has been said that when killing is viewed as not
only a source of permissible, but heroic behavior sanc-
tioned by one's government or cause, the distinction
between taking a human life and other forms of imper-
missible violence gets lost, and rape becomes an un-
fortunate but inevitable by-product of the necessary
game called war." "War provides men with the perfect
psychologic background to give vent to their contempt
for women, because of the very maleness the military
represents. A certain number of soldiers must prove
their newly won superiority - prove it to a woman, to
themselves, and to other men. In the name of victory
and power of the gun, war provides men with a tacit
license to rape. In the act and in the excuse, rape
in war reveals the male psyche in its boldest form
without the veneer of "chivalry" or civilization."

Rape provides a relief of boredom during war.
It also is used as a way of getting even with the mem-
ers of the opposing side, by violating their women.

During slavery rape was used as a double
exploitation. The women were forced not only into
labor, but also into being a "reproducer", having
children as a steady supply of slave babies.

Later on in time blacks used raping white
women as a payback for what whites did to their an-
cestors as their rationale.
"Uprisings, riots, and minor skirmishes with racial overtones all have provided an outlet, and sometimes even an ideological excuse for men to practice rape on women.

What's Wrong with Rape?

In ancient times rape was considered as theft of virginity, an embezzlement of a woman's fair price upon the market, thus ruining her chances for marriage. Now and even then, rape is used to keep all women in a state of fear.

The crime of rape is accompanied by assault often brutal and maybe even fatal. The psychological damage of rape is another unfortunate aspect. If the damage done to the victim is great enough, she may have to seek psychiatric counselling. It may even prove beneficial for her family to seek counsel, to get a better understanding of the victim's feeling at this time and help her through the ordeal. Lack of understanding may cause abandonment of her spouse or partner.

The fear of rape causes confinement of a woman's freedom. There is a constant danger presented upon a woman who is out after dark or going somewhere unescorted. There is also the possibility of a woman being raped even though she is escorted, or she may even be raped in her own home.

Rape brings on undue stress because of victimology. She may receive callous treatment from police and/or doctors. If the case reaches court, the victim can expect embarrassing aspects of her private life to be brought forward.

Last but not least, are the medical dangers of rape. The victim may become pregnant and have to have an abortion, she may contract venereal disease, or vaginal infection, or she may even suffer physical damage for the rest of her life because of the crime. Rape is indeed a severe violation of a woman's legal and moral rights.
The Myth of Victim Precipitated Rape

Bonnie Hoffman

In this paper, I wish to prove that what is wrong with rape is society's view on it. While rape is a male crime, it is the woman's blame. At first, I was going to write that rape is wrong because it denies the woman her freedom and leaves her powerless. This is true but on further analysis it is clearly seen that society denies women their right to freedom and power.

A woman who is raped must not only prove that her assailant is guilty, she must prove her innocence. The trial rests on her innocence so in actuality, she is on trial. Her innocence rests on her chastity. Chastity is good. An unchaste woman is bad.

The trial leaves a woman totally powerless. The defense will do everything possible to make the woman the guilty one. Oftentimes they will not deny that sexual intercourse took place. They will, however, place the blame on the woman. They will say that the woman provoked it by being aggressive or by cock-teasing and the offender only acted out of normal instincts. This is why it is so important to find out the woman's reputation. A woman who has had previous sex is not worthy of "rights." A "bad" woman asks to be raped. A "bad" woman cannot be trusted.

Consent is another problem in the defense. Often the defense says that a woman consented. If no use of brutality is evident, the attorney tries to prove the woman has consented. In other words, the victim must not put up a fight by just saying no (many women say no and mean yes), she must also put up a physical fight to prove her innocence. She can show her sincerity by showing brutal wounds on her body or by being killed. She must remain a good woman.

Sometimes the defense will say that the woman lied to get revenge on a man. They try to get her to make a mistake so they can show how she cannot be trusted.

If the victim and offender knew each other before the rape, there is little chance of succeeding in court. If a woman is dating a man and gets raped, the
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court does not want to intervene. They see it as a lover's quarrel. The rape part is the love part. Even if there is some evidence of brutality, the case will usually be dropped.

The law that a husband cannot be convicted for rape follows along these lines. In marriage, a wife is husband's property. She is not granted equal power. She must be powerless. People's ideas have changed somewhat but some ideas still exist. For example, birth control. A wife is not supposed to enjoy sex, but she is supposed to consent to her husband whenever he desires it in order for procreation. The church still holds this view and the church is still a powerful means of establishing morality for many people. By marrying, a woman is consenting to having sex. Therefore, the courts cannot intervene. She is no longer public property; she is private property.

The worst injustice done to women is the result of Amir's category of victim precipitated rape. This studies the victim as the cause of the crime, thus trying to prove that rape only happens to certain people. By provocative behavior, the woman produced a situation where the man's response was "normal." If a woman leaves the bar with a man, she is giving him justifiable ideas. By inviting a man into your apartment, you are responsible for your rape. Even worse is hitch-hiking. In all these situations, the woman is at fault because she is putting herself in a vulnerable situation where the man desires her and has the right to desire her because she has aroused his desire.

A woman does not have the same rights as a man in our society. In order to have a "good" reputation, she must be a virgin until marriage. A woman cannot go to a bar alone. If she does, she is a potential rape victim. She is not free to go out alone at night and she is not free to drink. She must never invite a man into her apartment or go to his because she will be misleading him into thinking she wanted sex. She cannot have any neighbors or relatives because more than half of the victims who report rape know their offenders (Gager & Schurr, p. 27). According to Amir, 58% of the offenders knew their victim and 33% had close relationships prior to the rape. Women are potential victims if they are indoors, outdoors, or in a car.
Only 20% of reported rapes occurred outside, 15% occurred in a car and the rest were indoors.

Society protects the good woman (the chaste woman). All other women are bad. A woman with a "bad reputation" is at fault for being raped. Under the law, she is not protected. The defense often goes further to say that a good woman cannot be raped. A woman is supposed to avoid being raped. The only justifiable rape for a conviction is one where the woman has a good reputation and has evidence of brutality (i.e., stab wounds). This does not account for the majority of rapes. Thus rape is usually viewed as the woman's fault. If women try to obtain equal rights to men, they are put into the category of having a bad reputation. A good woman must be passive. Yet, if rape is attempted, she must fight back (be aggressive) and must be capable of avoiding rape. This is a contradiction. Our society stops women from becoming equal through rape. If a woman wants to be protected from rape, she must forfeit her rights to freedom. She cannot be equal to men because she would be viewed as a bad woman. Thus she must sacrifice power and freedom to maintain respect and protection. Women have never been granted the freedom and power.

I disagree with Brownmiller that rape is inevitable. We cannot prove that something is natural. We can say that rape is normal for our society but we cannot say it is natural. It is harmful to interchange normal and natural. We cannot prove something natural because we observe it in the animal kingdom (i.e., rape is natural in primates, thus it is natural in humans). We are different than animals. Our behavior is not natural; it is learned through socialization.

Rape must be recognized as a serious crime. I would like to see rapists get convicted more and see more women report rape. Unfortunately, the two are correlated and women won't report rape until they can get convictions more easily. It appears necessary to separate rape into different categories (such as we do murder) with different degrees and sentences. It might be better to have shorter sentences so that juries might not be as reluctant to convict. They might treat it like other crimes and not feel sympathy
for the rapist who does not deserve sympathy. Also, this would discourage the rapist because he will realize his chance for conviction is greater.

The real problem with rape lies in the structure of our society. The problem with our society is we try to blame crime on the individuals rather than society as a whole. We want individuals to conform to society rather than change society to fit individual needs. I believe the Marxist view that women's oppression is due to women as property and exclusion from social production. Women must be equal in society and cannot be equal if division among labor among the sexes is maintained. Men's work is always valued more than women's work. If women were paid for housework, they would not be needed as wives to increase the husband's surplus. Furthermore, if children were not the responsibility of the mother, there would be no need for division of labor among the sexes. Women cannot be equal if they are the property of their husbands. Thus marriage as it exists today stops women from being equal. If marriage were not a pre-requisite for sex, marriage would not be necessary. If everyone were equal, men would not have to own their wives in order to own their children. If there were no demands for chastity, there would be no conquest for the rapist. It is up to society to change its attitudes about women and their reputation. It is the sexist attitude which prevails that causes rape. If women are granted the same rights as men and are seen and treated as equals, there would be no need for rape.
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