

CHAPTER 14

Gender, Violence, and Harassment

MARY R. JACKMAN

Shame, aversion, and denial suffused the subject of gender and violence and sealed it into a long and almost unbroken silence over most of the twentieth century. As late as 1969, a major compendium of research on violence prepared for the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence (Graham & Gurr, 1969) made no mention of gender and violence: indeed, the only mention of the term “domestic violence” was in a chapter title to identify within-nation (as opposed to international) conflict. However, at least since the publication of John Stuart Mill’s essay on “The Subjection of Women” in 1869, there have been sporadic attempts to break the silence, and by the 1970s interest in the topic began to intensify; since then an explosion of research and public interest has unfurled. The primary contributors to research have been sociologists and psychologists of gender, but it has also attracted scholars from criminology, family relations, clinical psychology, public health and medicine, political science, and anthropology.

Research on gender and violence has been driven by political imperatives emanating from both feminists and the conservative right. Paternalistic concern about the proprietary protection and control of women’s bodies has long goaded conservatives to regard illegitimate physical and sexual attacks on women as particularly heinous crimes. Since the 1960s, feminists have refueled public concern about physical and sexual assaults on women, but their stance rests on women’s right to autonomous control over their bodies. These seemingly incompatible political agendas have jointly fixed on the woman’s body as the object of concern, spawning voluminous research on violence against women. Broader questions have usually been bypassed about the ways in which gender has conditioned the practice of violence by and against women and men.

MARY R. JACKMAN • Department of Sociology, University of California at Davis, Davis, California 95616
Handbook of the Sociology of Gender, edited by Janet Saltzman Chafetz. Kluwer Academic/ Plenum Publishers, New York, 1999.

Analysts have focused on specific acts of violence against women that have fallen under the policy spotlight. Large, specialized bodies of research have developed on domestic violence against women and on rape and sexual abuse. In the wake of women's reentry to the workplace, a growing literature on the sexual harassment of women has also emerged. More recently, some scholars have focused attention on a new concept called femicide, "the misogynist killing of women by men" (Radford & Russell, 1992, p. 3), and a literature has begun to develop on the selective abortion of female fetuses, infanticide of female babies, and neglect of female children and women in many cultures. There has also been a growing concern among journalists, activists, and scholars with female genital mutilation, practiced primarily in some African cultures. With the partial exception of work on femicide, which sometimes draws on research on other types of violence against women, research has evolved in discrete bundles of inquiry largely disconnected from each other, let alone violence against men. The result is a patchwork of information about specific forms of violence against women, with no overarching conceptual framework within which to interpret those acts, link them to each other, or situate them in a broader array of gendered behaviors that produce differential experiences of violence among women and men.

The balkanized, social-problems orientation of research on gender and violence has been endemic to research on other types of violence as well. Spurred by a sense of social urgency and the electricity of the subject matter, analysts of violence have generally short-circuited conceptual issues and proceeded directly to the analysis of specific forms of violence that have caught their attention. Thus, the wider literature on violence has been unable to provide a conceptual toolkit that could be applied to the unfurling concern with the relationship between gender and violence. In the absence of a clear, explicit conception of violence, implicit assumptions about the nature of the phenomenon have shaped the research agenda, working like a hidden hand to constrain research on gender and violence. Perhaps the two most prevalent assumptions are that violent behaviors are motivated by a hostile intent to harm the victim and that such behaviors lie outside the bounds of normal social intercourse, that is, that violence is malevolently motivated and socially, morally, or legally deviant from the mainstream. It is also commonly assumed that violence involves the use of force, that is, that the victim is an unwilling recipient of injuries. These three assumptions are so intrinsic to most conceptions of violence that they are rarely stated explicitly. In addition, most analysts focus on interpersonal violence, bypassing both self-inflicted violence and violence in which either the agents or the victims are corporate. Finally, most scholars have granted primacy to physical behaviors and injuries (or the threat thereof), with less significance generally attached to injurious behaviors that are verbal or written or to injuries that are psychological, social, or material.

The types of gender violence that have been the main object of inquiry are in accord with these assumptions. First, analysts of gender and violence have focused almost exclusively on interpersonal violence, while corporate behaviors have been only slightly examined to ascertain violent outcomes by gender. Second, the primary focus has been on the infliction or threat of physical injuries, although there has been increasing recognition of the psychological injuries suffered by victims of domestic violence, rape and sexual assault, sexual harassment, and genital mutilation. Third, analysts have attended primarily to physical behaviors, although some have argued that verbal abuse, verbal harassment, and pornographic materials contribute significantly to patterns of violence against women. Fourth, like other scholars of violence, analysts of gender violence assume that violence

is motivated by ill will and the intent to harm. This assumption, combined with the almost exclusive focus on violence against women, has fostered the argument that social relations are fundamentally misogynist and that women live in a hostile and assaultive world. Fifth, driven by the assumption that violence involves the use of force on unwilling victims, analysts have taken an intense interest in the issue of victim complicity in domestic and sexual violence. Finally, the overriding assumption that violence represents a deviant course of behavior has encouraged students of gender violence to conclude that gender relations are uniquely violent, further encouraging the view that misogyny is the key to understanding gender relations and gender violence.

In sum, research on gender and violence has focused overwhelmingly on interpersonal, physical behaviors in which men inflict physical and psychological injuries on women. The extent to which women share complicity in the violence that they endure is a contentious issue to which much significance is attached. The exclusive focus of most analysts on violence against women, combined with underlying preconceptions about the nature of violence, has fostered the view that gender relations are driven by misogyny. This is reflected in the appearance of popular books with titles such as *The War Against Women* (French, 1992) and *Femicide: The Politics of Woman Killing* (Radford & Russell, 1992). The overwhelming image that emerges is of men as the hostile and abusive dominant class and women as the beleaguered and victimized subordinates.

My purpose in this chapter is to make a broad assessment of the relationship between gender and violence. In keeping with the nucleus of research, I focus primarily on violence against women, but I expand the scope to include violence against men. Detailed reviews are available elsewhere of specific forms of violence against women (e.g., Marshall, Laws, & Barbaree, 1990; Ohlin & Tonry, 1989; Reiss & Roth, 1993, 1994; Ruback & Weiner, 1995). I begin by appraising the daunting problems of observation and measurement that plague research and the main sources of available data. Second, I survey research on the broad variety of violent behaviors found in social life, to assess the prevalence and severity of various forms of violence against women as well as men. What are the main forms of violence to which women and men are vulnerable, and to what extent does each gender participate in the practice of violence? Third, I discuss the issue of cultural and legal support for violence against women and men. Does society distinctively encourage men to assault and abuse women, as some analysts have alleged? Fourth, I examine the contentious issue of victim compliance in incidents of gender violence: are women liable for their own victimization? Finally, I address the theoretical explanation of the relationship between gender and violence. After briefly discussing the leading explanations of violence against women, I propose an alternative approach based on a wider scan of violence in both women's and men's lives.

My discussion throughout is guided by a broad definition of violence as **physical, verbal, or written actions that inflict, threaten, or cause bodily, psychological, social, or material injury** (Jackman, in preparation). Note that this definition includes all injurious actions, regardless of their legality or their popular ideological construction. Violent actions may be committed against either others or oneself; be endured unwillingly or willingly; involve individual or corporate agents and/or victims; be intentional or negligent; be motivated by hostility, benevolence, masochism, or indifference for the victim; or be committed as an end in themselves or in the service of other objectives. What analysts have not acknowledged is that humans appear to have a capacity for violence—as perpetrators, victims, and observers—that is remarkably elastic. People do not have to be filled with hatred or anger to commit violence against others or with despair to inflict

it on themselves. The motivations for and the social sanctioning of injurious actions vary widely.

Because the material and social injuries associated with gender relations are the subject of several other chapters in this volume, this chapter is restricted to those actions that produce bodily or psychological injuries. But even with this restriction, my definition of violence brings a broad array of injurious behaviors within view. In addition to those forms of gender violence that have been the subject of intense research (rape, domestic violence, and sexual harassment), it also includes a variety of behaviors that have usually been kept discrete from discussions of gender violence: painful or hazardous beauty practices, sexual mutilation, suicide, infanticide and progenicide, the use of demeaning or coercive images in pornographic materials, the infliction of working conditions that are hazardous or debilitating, the marketing of consumer products that put people at risk, the dispatch of young adults (usually males) into the jaws of death and mutilation in the military defense of their country, and other state-mandated violence in the form of punishments for behaviors defined as crimes. All of these actions involve the infliction of significant bodily and/or psychological harm, although they vary on many of the dimensions outlined previously. My purpose is to explore how gender affects involvement (both as victims and perpetrators) in the many faces of violence. The pertinent question for this chapter is not how and why there is violence against women, but instead, how the social organization of gender shapes the practice of violence against women and men.

1. PROBLEMS OF OBSERVATION AND MEASUREMENT

Because the social organization of gender routinely places women in institutional settings that are shielded from public view, direct observation of gender violence is difficult, if not impossible. Intimate contact between men and women has been privatized within the institution of the family, while sexual relations and sexuality range from privatized to taboo. Even as women have entered the more public sphere of the workplace, they continue to be thrown into one-on-one contacts with their male superiors or co-workers that are shielded from public view. Further, complex social norms that both stigmatize and deny incidents of rape, domestic violence, and sexual harassment make the disclosure of victimization personally costly, thus further reducing the accessibility of information about these forms of violence. When lower-status victims (and women are lower status by virtue of their gender and often according to other status positions as well) report on incidents that are unwitnessed by others, they frequently find they are granted less credibility than the higher-status perpetrator, with the result that the incident may be either denied or reinterpreted by others to place the blame on the victim herself. Even if they could be sure of successful prosecution, victims of rape, sexual assault, domestic violence, and sexual harassment may feel sufficiently defiled or shamed by the event to shrink from disclosure. In addition, sexual practices that are harmful to women, such as female genital mutilation, are enshrouded in taboos that obstruct their direct observation. In the face of such pronounced difficulties in accessing information, debates (often emotionally charged) have persisted on the incidence and seriousness of violence against women (see, e.g., Satel, 1997).

Most research on violence against women has been conducted in the United States, Canada, or Great Britain, with relatively little work in other countries and even less

cross-national or cross-cultural research. The primary sources of data on domestic and sexual violence against women have been criminal justice statistics, victimization and self-report surveys, studies based on specialized samples of students, clinical or social-service clients, and medical records. In the United States, the most widely cited data sources are: (1) the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports (UCR), compiled annually from official police reports of eight index crimes; (2) the National Crime Survey (NCS), a national, probability, victimization survey administered every 6 months by the Bureau of the Census and the Department of Justice; and (3) the National Family Violence Surveys (NFVS) (Gelles & Straus, 1988; Straus & Gelles, 1990a; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980), which contain personal interviews with a national probability sample of 2143 individuals from intact families in 1975, and telephone interviews with a national probability sample of 6002 individual family members (including single-parent families) in 1985. Cross-national and cross-cultural data sources include the United Nations, INTERPOL, and the World Health Organization data sets, compiled from the official crime or mortality statistics of many nations; an International Crime Survey (ICS), modeled on the NCS, fielded in 1989 in 14 countries; the Conflict Tactics Scale developed in the NFVS, fielded in a number of countries; some multinational surveys of perceptions of deviance or violence; and the Human Relations Area Files (HRAF). Excellent overviews of the features and problems of cross-national and cross-cultural data on violence can be found in Daly and Wilson (1988), Ember and Ember (1995), and Gartner (1995). Studies of sexual harassment have relied primarily on victimization surveys of workers or students. Perhaps the most complete data are from large, probability, mail surveys of United States Federal workers conducted by the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (U.S. MSPB), by mandate of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978: these surveys were conducted in 1980, 1987, and 1994 (U.S. MSPB, 1981, 1995); sample sizes range from almost 20,000 in 1980 to about 8000 in 1987. Studies of feminine beauty practices and female genital mutilation have been primarily ethnographic (based on direct observation and informant reports), sometimes supplemented by small surveys.

These highly varied data sources have been associated with different kinds of problems. Criminal justice data underrepresent all crimes, but assaults and rapes are especially likely to be underreported, and this bias becomes stronger when victims and offenders know each other (Weis, 1989)—precisely the kinds of violence in which women are most likely to be victims. In addition, official records (such as the UCR) contain only minimal information about victim and offender characteristics: for example, the UCR reports detailed information on the relationship between the victim and the offender for homicides only, making it impossible to use these data to examine spousal assaults, and the UCR contains no information on the socioeconomic standing, education, or income of the victim or the offender for any index crime. These problems are compounded in cross-national analyses or trend studies that depend on direct comparison of criminal justice data that have been recorded according to varying rules and biases and that employ varying definitions of nonlethal violence. For these reasons, use of official statistics to analyze cross-national variance in violence is widely regarded as untenable except for some limited analyses of homicide (Gartner, 1995). The HRAF, compiled from ethnographic accounts of diverse cultures, are even more subject to inconsistencies in recording rules across ethnographers and cultures for various forms of violence.

Data from national probability surveys of victimization or self-reported violent behaviors (such as the NCS or the NFVS) provide higher estimates of violence against women than official crime statistics, since they do not depend on incidents finding their

way into the criminal justice system. They also permit more ambitious analyses because they include more information about victims and offenders. However, these data are also subject to underreporting, owing to the sensitivity of the topic and the stigma attached to both perpetrator and victim in family and sexual violence. The impersonal, shotgun approach of survey interviews is ill suited to elicit the disclosure of such sensitive material, and, to make matters worse, in some cases the victim may be answering questions in the presence of either the perpetrator or children. All these factors are exacerbated in telephone interviews, which were used in the second NFVS in 1985. The NFVS probably offers the best source of systematic, detailed data on family violence, but this study has been severely criticized by some for gathering information on violent behaviors for the Conflict Tactics Scale without placing those behaviors in their social context (see, e.g., Brush, 1993; Dobash & Dobash, 1979, 1983; Kurz, 1993; Straus & Gelles, 1990a). The reality is that violence between intimates is usually made up of complex, interactive events that are lodged in ongoing interpersonal relationships that are emotionally saturated: it is a tall order to observe and measure such events with an instrument as blunt and superficial as a public-opinion survey, and yet there is no other way to gain systematic information for a cross-section of the population.

Other measurement issues plague the analysis of violence against women. Analysts have disagreed about how important it is to develop measures that are consistent with legal definitions of violent behaviors. The overriding interest in informing public policy has driven researchers to attend to the specific legal definition of crimes, but such definitions are often overly restrictive and have themselves changed over time. These problems have been especially salient in the analysis of rape and sexual assault. The traditional legal definition of forcible rape in the United States excluded many forms of coercive sex, such as forced sex in which there is a male victim, nonvaginal sex, and marital rape (Koss, 1992; Russell, 1982; Von, Kilpatrick, Burgess, & Hartman, 1991); rape statutes have been reformed in a number of states to broaden definitions along various dimensions, but jurors (and victims themselves) often have difficulty recognizing coercive sex between marital partners or other intimates or friends or become confused in trying to codify some sexually coercive behaviors. Scholars have responded to these inherent difficulties in a variety of ways, ranging from staying within legal definitions (e.g., Russell, 1982) to developing measures that depict coercion as a continuum that extends in a series of gradations from consensual sex to forcible rape (Bart & O'Brien, 1985; Kelly, 1987). Again, cross-national data sets of self-report surveys compound these problems by the introduction of noncomparability across nations in cultural and legal definitions of violence, question wording, and samples (Gartner, 1995).

The main alternatives to systematic data sets have been observational studies or in-depth interviews relying on small, nonrepresentative, purposive, or convenience samples of official offenders, social-service clients, or patients in health facilities (e.g., Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Stark, Flitcraft, & Frazier, 1979; Walker, 1979). These studies often permit greater analytic depth and sensitivity, and investigators may find subjects more willing to disclose and discuss incidents of violence in their lives because, either through their own actions or someone else's, some kind of public acknowledgment of the violence has already taken place. However, such data may also be highly misleading: sampling on the dependent variable creates serious selection bias, resulting in overestimates of the incidence of violence and possibly atypical observations of the associated causal factors (Hirschi & Selvin, 1967; Weis, 1989). A number of studies have also made use of student samples: although often convenient, these are susceptible to overestimates of the inci-

dence of and normative support for gender-related violence because the young are both more sexually active and more violence prone (Daly & Wilson, 1988; Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, & Michaels, 1994, pp. 98, 336–337; Reiss & Roth, 1993, pp. 72–74; Wolfgang, 1967a, b).

Research on other forms of gender-related violence, such as corporate violence against women and ethnic customs or fashion dictates that result in female bodily alteration, have not usually been studied systematically. There have been some case studies of specific instances of corporate violence against women (e.g., see Finley, 1996, on the marketing of the Dalkon Shield IUD despite evidence that it was hazardous), and ethnographic observations of culturally mandated beauty practices, supplemented by interviews with medical practitioners or other knowledgeable informants (e.g., El Dareer, 1982; Lightfoot-Klein, 1989). Ethnographic research has been invaluable in exposing female genital mutilation, but it requires a major personal investment for analysts to obtain sufficient access to gain reliable and valid information about the extent of the practice and normative support for it (Lightfoot-Klein, 1989). Further, the focus in both case-study and ethnographic research on gender and violence has been overwhelmingly on female victimization, providing no information on the violence victimization of women relative to men in corporate and cultural settings.

2. GENDER AND THE PRACTICE OF VIOLENCE

The exact incidence of violence between males and females is unknown, but there is widespread agreement that in such interactions it is women who are more likely to suffer injuries. However, when one casts a broader net across all social relations, the relative victimization of women recedes and it is men who appear more vulnerable. Overall, men are both the main perpetrators and the main victims of physical violence, but women appear to be more at risk of victimization in relations involving intimate, private, or sexual interactions with men. Clearly, the woman's body is contested terrain, with many parties having a strong interest in controlling it. On this pivots both the protection of women from some forms of violence and their disproportionate victimization from others. In addition, women themselves do not abstain entirely from committing violence. In this section, I review men's and women's relative involvement in various forms of physical violence.

2.1. Homicide

Because data for homicide are more complete and accurate than for assault, some scholars have chosen to analyze spousal homicide as a way of addressing the issue of intimate, gender-related violence (e.g., Daly & Wilson, 1988; Mercy & Saltzman, 1989; Wilson & Daly, 1992a, b; Wilson, Daly, & Scheib, 1997; Wilson, Daly, & Wright, 1993; Wilson, Johnson, & Daly, 1995). Spousal homicides are rare, relative to the incidence of spousal assault, but because they are often associated with a prior history of spousal assault, their etiology is assumed to be parallel (Wilson, Daly, & Wright, 1993). Overwhelmingly, women are the victims of spousal homicide: scattered data from Australia, Canada, Denmark, England and Wales, Scotland, Africa, and India suggest that for every 100 spousal homicides perpetrated by husbands, only between 0 (India) and 40 (Scotland) are perpe-

trated by wives (Wilson & Daly, 1992b). In the United States, there is a sharp (and unexplained) distinction between whites and African-Americans in the relative victimization of wives and husbands from spousal homicides. For the years 1976–1985, among white Americans, wives' rate of spousal homicide victimization was 1.3 per 100,000 while for husbands it was 0.7; among African-Americans, the victimization rate was 7.1 for wives and 9.7 for husbands (Mercy & Saltzman, 1989). These rates for African-Americans are not only dramatically higher than for whites, but they also follow an entirely different pattern than for American whites, other minorities, or blacks in other nations, with African American wives showing a uniquely high rate of husband murder (Bohannon, 1967; Kruttschnitt, 1995; Mushanga, 1978; Wilson & Daly, 1992b). Since wives who murder their spouses are much more likely than their male counterparts to have been provoked to murder after suffering abuse and assault from their eventual victims (Browne, 1987; Daly & Wilson, 1988; Fagan & Browne, 1994; Jones, 1980; Langan & Dawson, 1995; Pleck, 1987, pp. 222–223; Totman, 1978; Wolfgang, 1967b, c), it would be useful to compare patterns and dynamics of domestic violence among black and white couples as well as the availability of police and social welfare interventions for battered wives in black and white communities.

Data for the United States over the past two decades (1977–1995) indicate that the rate of spousal homicide victimization has dropped precipitously for husbands (from 1.5 to 0.5 per 100,000) but has only inched down for wives (from 1.6 to 1.3) (Craven, 1996). Although the causes of this are unknown, it is possible that the increase in police and welfare interventions over this period have given battered wives more avenues of escape, thus saving men's lives, even if not women's. Systematic evidence from earlier historical periods is not available, but several factors have encouraged some scholars to presume that wife assault and murder were more frequent in the past: the existence of legal statutes permitting wife beating or murder under designated circumstances, the greatly diminished legal status of wives relative to husbands until relatively recent times (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Fagan & Browne, 1994; French, 1992; May, 1978), and the generally higher rates of physical violence in earlier historical periods (Daly & Wilson, 1988, p. 291; Gurr, 1981; Manchester, 1992; Stone, 1983). However, Stone's (1983) analysis of fragmentary homicide data for England from 1200 to the present suggests that, although the overall homicide rate declined dramatically, the percentage of homicides involving family members has increased steadily, from about 8% in the fourteenth century to about 50% in present-day England. Pleck (1987, pp. 217–225) suggests that the family homicide rate in medieval England was fairly similar to recent rates in England and America, with a somewhat lower rate in the early modern period, and that the percentage of family homicides involving spouses generally decreased from medieval to Elizabethan times and then began to increase again in the Victorian era to the present-day level of about one half of all family murders. This suggests that wives' risk of being murdered by their husbands was fairly similar in the medieval era to what it is today in England and the United States, although women enjoyed somewhat lower risk during the Elizabethan era. Relative constancy in women's rates of homicide victimization is also suggested by analyses of homicide data for varying time periods from the 1870s to the 1980s for 16 nations in different parts of the globe, with rates for men both higher and more prone to fluctuation over time (Daly & Wilson, 1988, pp. 284–286; Verrko, 1967).

In earlier historical periods in which women lacked legal rights, a number of social constraints probably worked informally to limit the amount of physical abuse and murder

that husbands could perpetrate against their wives: the lack of privacy from extended family members and other villagers in close-knit, densely housed village communities, the restricted geographic mobility of most common people (so that your reputation stuck to you), the wife's economic value as a contributing member of the household economy, and the difficulty an abusive husband might have in replacing a murdered wife in a community where everyone knows everything about you. These kinds of factors have not been discussed by feminist scholars addressing the history of wife abuse, who have instead stressed evidence suggesting the legal legitimacy of wife beating in times past.

In the past decade in the United States, spousal homicides have constituted somewhat over one half of homicides involving nuclear-family members, but only about 5% to 8% of all homicides (FBI Uniform Crime Reports, 1986–1995). Once one goes beyond intimate partner relations, it is men who are at greater risk of homicide victimization, even within the family (Reiss & Roth, 1993, p. 234). Thus, for 1995 in the United States, women were the victims in almost three quarters of the spousal homicides, but men were the victims in about 60% of the nonspousal nuclear-family homicides (those between parents and children or between siblings) (FBI UCR, 1995). Outside the family, men are overwhelmingly the victims (and the perpetrators) of homicide: in nonfamily homicides in the United States in 1988, men constituted 82% of the victims and 93% of the perpetrators (Dawson & Langan, 1994; see also Kruttschnitt, 1995). Thus, women are more at risk of being murdered by their spouses, while men are more at risk of being murdered by other family members and even more so by friends, associates, and strangers. Women are much less likely to perpetrate homicide than men, committing only about 10% of all homicides in the United States, Canada, the British Isles, and Australia (Dawson & Langan, 1994; Kruttschnitt, 1995), but most female-perpetrated homicides take place within the family, primarily with spouses or children as the victims. In the United States in 1988, women perpetrated about one third of family homicides and over one half of the murders of offspring (Dawson & Langan, 1994; see also Reiss & Roth, 1994, p. 234). Since spousal and other family homicides constitute only a small minority of all homicides in the United States, homicide is primarily a male affair, but the institution of the family puts women at risk of victimization and also provokes some women to murderous behaviors that they do not exhibit outside the family.

2.2. Suicide

Relatively little research has been done on the relationship between gender and suicide, but it is the ninth leading cause of death in the United States, exceeding the number of homicides every year since 1981 (Kachur, Potter, James, & Powell, 1995). More than 30,000 Americans took their own lives in 1992 (Kachur et al., 1995), compared with about 22,500 homicides (FBI UCR, 1993). As with violence directed at others, males are the main perpetrators. The age-adjusted suicide rate for white males in the United States in 1992 was 19.4 per 100,000, about four times higher than the rate of 4.6 for white females. African-American males have a lower suicide rate than white males (12.3 per 100,000), but still six times higher than the suicide rate of 2.0 for African-American females (Kachur et al., 1995). These differences in suicide rates by gender and race in the United States have been remarkably stable over the course of the twentieth century (Holinger, 1987).

2.3. Assault

Because of the daunting difficulties that beset the observation and measurement of domestic violence and the unknown degree of reporting bias for various forms of assault, researchers have yet to generate confident estimates of the relative incidence of domestic assault for men and women. Estimates of the relative perpetration by and victimization of men and women vary widely, according to the methods of observation and measurement, type of sample, and political agenda of the analyst. Most analyses of gender and assault focus on only one element of the problem, most often wife abuse and assault, making it difficult to address broader issues about the way in which gender conditions the likelihood of committing or suffering assault over the gamut of life situations.

Overall, as with homicide, men are the main perpetrators and victims of assault (Reiss & Roth, 1993, pp. 69, 74), but women's victimization increases sharply in family and sexual relationships (Bachman & Saltzman, 1995; Browne, 1993; Fagan & Browne, 1994; Kruttschnitt, 1994; Reiss & Roth, 1993, 1994). Data from the NCS for 1992–1993 indicate that assaults by intimates (that is, spouses, ex-spouses, or ex- or current boy/girlfriends) account for only a tiny fraction of all male victimizations from simple and aggravated assault (3% and 5%, respectively), whereas almost one third of the female victims of both kinds of assault have been assaulted by intimates (Bachman & Saltzman, 1995). Men are about three times more likely than women to become victims of simple or aggravated assault from a stranger, but victimization by intimates is over seven times more likely for women for simple assault and about three times more likely for aggravated assault (Bachman & Saltzman, 1995). Further, women's intimate victimizations are more likely to be repeated and to become chronic (Browne, 1993; Frieze & Browne, 1989; Langan & Innes, 1986).

The injuries experienced by battered wives have been the subject of considerable research. A recent study of patients visiting 24-hour emergency rooms at a nationwide, American sample of 31 hospitals estimates that in 1994 at least 200,000 women required emergency medical attention for injuries inflicted by intimates, compared with about 39,000 men (Rand & Strom, 1997, p. 5; Satel, 1997). Female victims are most likely to sustain injuries in the face or breasts, unless they are pregnant, in which case they are more likely to be struck in the abdomen (Schroedel & Peretz, 1994, p. 344). Pregnant victims not only sustain physical injuries to themselves but also have higher rates of miscarriage, stillbirths, and low birthweight babies, and there has been some documentation of direct injuries to the baby *in utero* (Schroedel & Peretz, 1994, pp. 345–346). Analysts of partner assaults have also taken the lead in highlighting the often chronic psychological injuries that affect victims: anxiety, depression, attempted suicide, alcoholism, low self-esteem, sense of violation, and the inability to function independently (see, e.g., Browne, 1993; Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Frieze & Browne, 1989; Reiss & Roth, 1993, pp. 237–239; Stark & Flitcraft, 1988, 1991; Tolman, 1989; Walker, 1979). The medicalized concept, Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (or PTSD), which was originally developed to denote a range of negative psychological symptoms resulting from traumatic events such as wars, concentration camps, and airplane hijackings, has now been applied to the victims of partner abuse (see, e.g., Astin, Lawrence, & Foy, 1993; Browne, 1993; Frieze & Browne, 1989, p. 196).

Exact estimates of spousal assault in the United States vary dramatically, depending on the type of sample and methodology employed. The most commonly cited estimate comes from the National Family Violence Surveys from the 1970s and 1980s: responses

to items in the Conflict Tactics Scale suggest that at least 1.8 million women (or 34 out of every 1000 wives) are assaulted by male partners each year in the United States (Browne, 1993; Frieze & Browne, 1989; Straus & Gelles, 1990b; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980). This estimate is substantially higher than those obtained from the NCS, but it is nonetheless widely assumed that it is still an underestimate. Quite apart from the probable underreporting of spousal assaults, the NFVS samples did not include divorced couples or nonfamilial intimate relationships such as boy/girlfriends, and women in both of these categories are known to experience higher assault victimization from their ex- or current partners than do married women who cohabit with their husbands (Daly & Wilson, 1988, p. 219; Fagan & Browne, 1994, p. 155–156; Stark, Flitcraft, & Frazier, 1979). If one could correct for these factors, the incidence of partner assault of women could be twice as high (Browne, 1993). As with other forms of interpersonal, physical violence, spousal assault is inversely related to age (see, e.g., Straus & Gelles, 1990a). Data from the NFVS also indicate that wife battering is two or three times as common among African-Americans as among white Americans (Stark & Flitcraft, 1991; Straus et al., 1980), but as with racial differences in spousal homicide, this difference has not been explained; studies consistently show only a small inverse relation between income and spousal assault (Stark & Flitcraft, 1991).

A more controversial claim from the NFVS has been that women use physically violent behaviors against their spouses at least as much as do men (Steinmetz, 1977–1978; Straus & Gelles, 1990b). This claim has sparked substantial criticism, and a number of studies have pointed to factors that appear to undermine its veracity, most notably, that men's assaultive behaviors are more frequent and severe and result in more serious injuries (see, e.g., Berk, Berk, Loseke, & Rauma, 1983; Browne, 1993; Brush, 1993; Dobash & Dobash, 1979, 1983; Fagan & Browne, 1994, pp. 169–171; Kurz, 1993; Stark & Flitcraft, 1991). Similar male–female patterns of violence (that is, reciprocity of violence but male dominance in severe violence) have been reported for dating couples (Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989, pp. 8–11). In-depth interviews with chronically abused women in Scottish shelters (Dobash & Dobash, 1979) indicated that such women had learned not to attempt resistance when their husbands were assaultive as that only resulted in more serious injuries (see also Pagelow, 1984, pp. 316–319). However, in the general population (which would include many relatively minor incidents), there may be a higher incidence of mutual combat between marital partners, even though women (usually the weaker of the two parties) are more likely to come out the losers from such encounters. There is also some evidence that women are strategic in their use of marital violence. Jones (1980, pp. 286–295) reports that in many cases of lethal retaliation against chronically abusive husbands, women wait until their husbands have temporarily disarmed themselves through heavy intoxication or sleep (see also Pagelow, 1984, p. 317). Detailed data from the items comprising the Conflict Tactics Scale in the NFVS show that men and women tend to employ different kinds of violent behaviors: for example, wives are about twice as likely to “throw something” at their spouses (a more efficacious strategy if your opponent is stronger or bigger than you) while husbands are about twice as likely to “beat up” their spouses (Gelles & Straus, 1988, pp. 250–251). Some have also argued that wives' assaultive behaviors are more likely to be in self-defense, but Straus and Gelles (1990b, pp. 104–105) reported that there was no difference between husbands and wives in the likelihood of initiating physically assaultive encounters. Another controversial finding from the NFVS is that women are at least as likely as men to abuse their children (Gelles, 1979): critics have charged that since mothers spend more time with children and are saddled with more responsibility for them, uncorrected comparisons of

mothers' and fathers' use of violence toward children are invalid (Kruttschnitt, 1994, p. 311; Pagelow, 1984, pp. 184–198). The NFVS data also suggest that fathers' use of violence against children is more likely to be severe (Gelles, 1979), but recall that children are murdered by their mothers somewhat more frequently than by their fathers.

Unlike homicide, assaults by other (nonspousal) family members also appear to be directed disproportionately at female victims, at least for simple assaults, but data may suffer from reporting bias. Data from the NCS indicate that both men and women report victimization by other family members at a rate of 0.4 per 1000 for aggravated assault, but women's victimization rate for simple assault by other family members is 2.2 compared with 0.7 for men (Bachman & Saltzman, 1995). There is some evidence, however, that men's assault victimization by family members is more frequent than these data would indicate (Kruttschnitt, 1994, pp. 307–308). American men are only about half as likely as women to report simple assaults to police, and their self-reports in surveys may also be lower because they are less likely to recognize male-to-male family incidents as assault victimizations unless they sustain a serious injury. Several factors may contribute to the lower recognition of male-to-male family incidents as assaults: such incidents may seem less counternormative than those between males and females; they may involve more mutuality of both combat and injury infliction, especially for less serious assaults; and men may have more of a problem in depicting themselves as the losers/victims in physical encounters with brothers, sons, and fathers. If one could correct for these factors, the observed gender differences in assault victimization by parents, children, and siblings may well diminish, disappear, or reverse themselves—in which case the incidence of family assaults for men and women would be more consistent with the pattern for family homicides. Data from the National Incidence Studies of Child Abuse and Neglect indicate that male and female children suffer very similar rates of physical abuse in the United States (Sedlack & Broadhurst, 1996; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1988), although male children may be somewhat more likely to be seriously injured (Sedlack & Broadhurst, 1996).

Data from the NCS indicate that relationships with friends and other associates pose a significant source of assault risk for both men and women: this risk is somewhat higher for men than for women, but it is still the highest source of assaults on women, with women being somewhat more likely to be assaulted by a friend or associate than by an intimate (Bachman & Saltzman, 1995, p. 3). The relative significance of friends and associates may be overstated because of greater underreporting bias with intimate assaults, but friends and associates do appear to be a significant source of physical violence in women's lives that has not been given analytic attention. For men, the primary risk of assault comes from friends or associates and from strangers, and their risk of assault exceeds women's in both of those categories but especially the latter (Bachman & Saltzman, 1995).

2.4. Rape, Sexual Assault, and Coercive Sex

This category of violent crime is the only one in which women are the prime victims: all but a minuscule proportion of rapes and sexual assaults have male offenders and female victims (Bachman & Saltzman, 1995, p. 3; Greenfeld, 1996, p. 10). In addition, female children are about three to four times more likely than male children to be sexually abused (Reiss & Roth, 1993, p. 69; Sedlack & Broadhurst, 1996; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1988). The widespread incidence of rape was publicized by Brownmiller

in her important book (1975). Brownmiller argued compellingly that the then-common portrayal of rape as a rare and anomalous crime was inaccurate: whenever women become a subject population through war, slavery, riots, pogroms, revolutions, imprisonment, police custody or other circumstances, rape and other forms of sexual exploitation are a routine accompaniment. Since the 1970s, scholars have struggled to develop precise estimates of the incidence of rape, a goal made elusive by both chronic underreporting and widespread confusion about what constitutes a rape. Estimates of the number of women in the United States who have been raped at least once in their lifetimes range from 3,750,000 to 16,500,000 (Von et al., 1991, p. 97). Forcible rapes, defined restrictively as "the carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will," that is, forced vaginal penetration (FBI, 1989, p. 15; Greenfeld, 1997, p. 31), have comprised about 6% to 7% of all violent crimes reported to law enforcement agencies in the United States in recent years (Greenfeld, 1997; Koss, 1992, p. 63; Von et al., 1991, p. 100).

The Uniform Crime Reports (FBI, 1977–1996) for the years 1976–1995 report an annual victimization rate in the United States of about 52 forcible rapes per 100,000 females in 1976, rising steadily to a rate of about 84 in 1992 (a total of 109,060 forcible rapes), and then dropping slightly in each of the subsequent years to a rate of about 72 in 1995 (Greenfeld, 1997). Whatever the meaning of the variation in the rate of forcible rape over the past 20 years (that is, the extent to which it results from changes in willingness to report rape victimization to police or changes in the actual incidence of rape), it is widely acknowledged that rape is "one of the most underreported of all index crimes" (FBI, 1982, p. 14; Koss, 1992; Von et al., 1991). Government estimates indicate that for every rape reported to police, three to ten rapes remain unreported, and some estimates place the percentage unreported even higher (Von et al., 1991, p. 101). Data from the NCS for the 1992–1993 suggest annual victimization rates for rape or sexual assault of about 400 per 100,000 for women and 50 for men, about five times the rates reported by law enforcement agencies (Bachman & Saltzman, 1995, p. 3). The NCS figures are themselves considered an underestimate by many scholars, because of the extreme sensitivity of the questions, the lack of confidentiality of the household interview, the failure to match many interviewers to respondents by gender and ethnicity, the framing of the questionnaire in terms of crime victimization (many respondents may not recognize their victimization as a crime, especially if it was committed by an acquaintance, boyfriend, or spouse), popular confusion about what constitutes a rape or sexual assault, and the exclusion of series victimizations from the calculation of rates (Koss, 1992). A national survey on sexuality conducted by the General Social Survey in 1992 employed a broader definition of forced sex: those data indicate that about 23% of women and 4% of men have been victims of forced sex at least once in their lives, and virtually all the women's cases but only one half of the men's involved a perpetrator of the opposite sex (Laumann et al., 1994, pp. 335–336; see Russell, 1984, p. 35, for similar figures for women from an earlier probability sample of women in San Francisco).

As with wife battering, the injuries sustained by rape victims are not only bodily but also psychological: analysts have emphasized that coerced sex is a traumatic event with long-term psychological consequences such as fear, anxiety, loss of control, betrayal of trust, self-blame, low self-esteem, embarrassment, humiliation, shame, depression, alcoholism, and attempted suicide (Darke, 1990; Finkelhor & Yllo, 1983; Laumann et al., 1994, pp. 338–339; Russell, 1982; Stanko, 1985, pp. 70–82; Von et al., 1991). There is also evidence that a significant proportion of rapes (about one quarter) include acts that appear to be specifically intended to humiliate the victim, such as victim stimulation of

the offender, offender masturbation, or oral or anal penetration (Darke, 1990, pp. 62–65). Unfortunately, victims who avoid physically resisting their sexual assailant to minimize physical injuries may become more vulnerable to psychological injuries such as loss of control, self-blame, and low self-esteem.

Data from both victimization surveys (the NCS) and convicted, imprisoned rapists indicate that the probability of being raped or sexually assaulted is highest for women who are younger (ages 16 to 24), from low-income households, and city dwellers (Greenfeld, 1997; Perkins & Klaus, 1996; Taylor, 1997; Von et al., 1991, p. 101). As with assaults and homicides, African-American women have a higher rate of victimization than white women (Katz & Mazur, 1979, pp. 39–40; Perkins & Klaus, 1996; Reiss and Roth, 1994, pp. 69–70; Von et al., 1991, p. 101), although the racial difference may have declined in recent years, and data from the 1995 NCS show no racial difference (Taylor, 1997).

One of the most important—and provocative—facts to surface about the incidence of rape in the past 20 years is the high proportion of rapes and sexual assaults in which the offender is someone known to the victim. Only about 30% of the victims of rape offenders in State prisons were strangers: 1.5% were spouses or ex-spouses, 9% were girlfriends, 14% were children or stepchildren, 5% were other relatives, and 41% were acquaintances (Greenfeld, 1997, p. 24). Russell's landmark study of marital rape (1982) reported that in her probability sample of San Francisco women, 14% of women who had ever been married said they had been raped by a husband or ex-husband (see Finkelhor & Yllo, 1983, for similar results from a survey in Boston): Russell considers this figure an underestimate, because of underdisclosure by her respondents, confusion of many respondents about the concept of forced sex within marriage, and the conservative definition of rape used in the study (1982, pp. 58–59). Several scholars also report that marital rape often co-occurs with other forms of marital violence (see, e.g., Fagan & Browne, 1994, pp. 164–166; Frieze, 1983; Frieze & Browne, 1989, pp. 186–190; Pagelow, 1984; Walker, 1979). Of the forced sex victimizations reported by a nationally representative sample of adults, only about 4% were perpetrated by a stranger, whereas 55% were perpetrated by a spouse or someone with whom the respondent had a romantic relationship, 22% by someone else the respondent knew well, and 19% by an acquaintance (Laumann et al., 1994, p. 338).

Analysis of the prevalence of rape cross-culturally is a difficult venture, since measurement problems are exacerbated when one factors in different constructions of sexual behaviors across cultures and observers. However, Sanday (1981) conducted a careful analysis of the prevalence of rape in a sample of 156 cultures representing the six major regions of the world, dating from 1750 B.C. (Babylonians) to the late 1960s. Her coding of data from the HRAF and other ethnographic sources counted all forms of rape, including rape of enemy women, rape as a ceremonial act, and use of rape as a threat. She found wide variation in the prevalence of rape across cultures: about 18% were classified as “rape prone” (indicating rape was an accepted practice), another 35% as having a moderate propensity for rape, and in 47% of the cultures rape was reported as rare or absent. Higher rape prevalence was found in societies with high base rates of interpersonal and intergroup violence, pronounced male dominance, and sex-segregated structures or places.

2.5. Sexual Harassment

Until 1976 there was not a precise, shared social definition of sexual harassment (MacKinnon, 1979). Since then, there has been increasing awareness about unwanted

physical and verbal behaviors of a sexual nature that interfere with the conduct of professional or work relations, and the inception of research on the incidence of sexual harassment. That research suggests that sexual harassment primarily, but not exclusively, involves female victims. Mail surveys of large, probability samples of American Federal workers conducted by the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (U.S. MSPB) in 1980, 1987, and 1994 found that more than 40% of female employees and 15% to 19% of male employees reported at least one form of sexual harassment victimization during the previous 2 years; younger women were especially likely to have been harassed (U.S. MSPB, 1995). Respondents were asked specifically about victimizations by fellow workers involving actual or attempted rape or assault; pressure for sexual favors; deliberate touching, leaning over, cornering, or pinching; sexual looks or gestures, letters, telephone calls, or materials of a sexual nature; pressure for dates; sexual teasing, jokes, remarks, or questions; and, in the 1994 survey only, unwanted following or intrusion into the respondent's personal life. Milder forms of sexual harassment were mentioned much more frequently, with 37% of the women and 14% of the men mentioning sexual teasing, jokes or remarks, and 4% of the women and 2% of the men mentioning actual or attempted rape or assault (see also Schneider, 1993, for comparable results from a cross-sectional sample drawn from street and telephone directories). In 1994, a co-worker was named as the perpetrator by almost 80% of both male and female victims of sexual harassment, but female victims were about twice as likely as male victims to have been harassed by a supervisor (28% vs. 14%), whereas male victims were more likely to have been harassed by a subordinate (11% vs. 3%) (some victims were harassed from more than one source). These gender differences probably reflect the disproportionate representation of males in supervisory positions. Sexual harassment is also a pervasive feature of student life. Victimization surveys of university students suggest that anywhere from 17% to 30% of female and about 2% of male students report having been sexually harassed by their teachers (Benson & Thomson, 1982; McCormack, 1985). Again, the disproportionate representation of males on college faculties in itself puts female students at greater risk of sexual harassment from their teachers.

Sexual harassment profoundly affects the quality of the victim's work or school life. Several studies indicate that about one in ten women leave their jobs as a result of sexual harassment, and university students who have been harassed may drop courses or change majors: all of these effects may derail careers or lower earnings (Gutek & Koss, 1997, pp. 153–154). Harassment can also cause a deterioration in interpersonal relationships at work or school, feelings of loss of control, and decreases in job satisfaction, self-esteem, feelings of competence, and work productivity (Gutek & Koss, 1997, pp. 153–154; Stanko, 1985; U.S. MSPB, 1995, pp. 26–27).

The media have been giving increasing attention to the issue of sexual harassment in the military, and it seems plausible that an organization that relies so heavily on physical harassment as an intrinsic part of the training of all recruits might be especially prone to sexual harassment. Comparative data for civilian employees in various U.S. government agencies, including the Air Force, Army, and Navy, suggest that, among civilian employees, the armed forces are at the high end of the range in levels of sexual harassment but not exceptional (U.S. MSPB, 1995, p. 15). A probability survey of enlisted personnel and officers in the Navy conducted in 1989 reported that more than 60% of the women and over 30% of the men said sexual harassment is a problem in the Navy (Culbertson, Rosenfeld, Booth-Kewley, & Magnusson, 1992, cited in Gutek & Koss, 1997). A study of 30,000 personnel in the U.S. Army reported that about 22% of the women and

7% of the men had experienced some kind of sexual harassment within the past year: the report concluded that "soldiers seem to accept such behaviors as a normal part of Army life" (Priest, 1997).

Across the gamut of public settings, the lower status of women and the pervasive, proprietary interest in their bodies has made them more vulnerable than men to a variety of forms of sexual harassment. Studies based on ethnographic, experimental, and survey data have documented the many forms of intrusive harassment to which women are disproportionately vulnerable on the street and in other public places. Catcalls, wolf whistles, staring, touching, pinching, body-grabbing, suggestive or evaluative personal comments, and verbal slurs are commonly reported (Gardner, 1995; Henley, 1977; Henley & Freeman, 1979; Henley & Harmon, 1985). The ready availability and public display of pornographic materials reinforces the sense of sexual vulnerability of women in general, as well as highlighting their self-conscious awareness of cultural demands about their personal appearance and sexual commodification (Dworkin, 1981; Flowers, 1994, pp. 179–185; MacKinnon, 1993; O'Toole & Schiffman, 1997, pp. 365–423; Reiss & Roth, 1993, pp. 111–112). Some forms of harassment, such as obscene phone calls or e-mail messages and stalking, pursue women when they retreat into their homes (Flowers, 1994, pp. 186–192; Sheffield, 1993; Smith & Morra, 1997; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1996). Criminal justice authorities have become increasingly aware of the potential for physically violent and even lethal outcomes from stalking. Data from a telephone survey of a national probability sample of 8000 women and 8000 men indicate that 8% of adult women have been stalked at some time in their lives (compared with 2% of adult men), that most stalking victims are young, and that almost one half of stalking victims are overtly threatened by their assailant (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1997). When women are stalked by former intimate partners (the majority of cases), about one third of the victims are eventually sexually assaulted by the stalker and over 80% are physically assaulted (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1997).

2.6. Bodily modifications

Women's bodies have been especially vulnerable to physical modification through a variety of invasive, painful, and often debilitating "beauty practices" and genital mutilations (Brownmiller, 1984; Wolf, 1992). These widespread practices are usually depicted as symptoms of misogyny, aimed at maiming, crippling, and weakening women. However, it is also possible that the high value placed on women's sexual and reproductive attributes is a powerful motivator to both men and women to commodify and package women's bodies in ways that exaggerate their biological distinctiveness and highlight women's contract with men to exchange exclusive sexual access rights for longterm economic support of women and their offspring (Engels, [1884] 1972).

Throughout history, women have subscribed to a variety of facial and bodily alterations that have adversely affected their physical and psychological functioning. The injuries sustained by women in the pursuit of beauty range from minor to severe: restriction of physical mobility, endurance of physical pain or discomfort, relentless lifetime effort, and constant self-criticism and sometimes humiliation before an unattainable beauty standard. Perhaps the most infamous beauty practice on record is the Chinese custom of footbinding, which survived for about 1000 years (until the early years of the twentieth century) as a rudimentary beauty standard and requirement for marriageability. Young

girls (usually beginning at about 5 to 8 years of age), under their mothers' coercive supervision, had their feet bound increasingly tightly, with a 3-inch foot being the ideal (Blake, 1994; Dworkin, 1994; Levy, [1966] 1992; Mackie, 1996; Mann, Sledzik, Owsley, & Droulette, 1990). As with many beauty ideals, few women attained it, but upper-class women (or aspirants) were held to the most rigorous standard, and thus the physically dysfunctional, crippled woman became the emblem of upper-class membership (Dworkin, 1994; Levy, [1966] 1992). The practice achieved an irreversible alteration to the girl's feet that drastically reduced her physical mobility; upper-class women could not walk unassisted and were able only to hobble over short distances. Their feet were in constant pain for at least the first 6 to 10 years of formative treatment, and complications included ulceration, paralysis, gangrene, and mortification of the lower limbs; it is estimated that footbinding injuries caused the deaths of perhaps 10% of girls (Mackie, 1996). The feminine struggle for small feet has not been exclusive to footbinding; women in the industrialized nations continue to force their feet into shoes that are too small and that have high heels, thus restricting their mobility and causing a variety of foot injuries over the life span to which men are not subject (Jackson, 1990).

Several Western beauty practices have been the focus of research because of their injurious outcomes. The common use of tight corsets to produce an exaggerated hour-glass torso in the nineteenth century and earlier restricted breathing, induced fainting, broke ribs, and sometimes caused prolapse of the uterus (Brownmiller, 1984; Wolf, 1992). When women threw away their corsets in the twentieth century, "dieting" became a widespread female practice, whereby girls and women rely on restricted calorie intake rather than mechanical devices to decrease their body sizes. Most women in the industrialized nations impair their physical and psychological well-being through constant or sporadic dieting regimens and relentless self-criticism, and, in extreme cases, women succumb to life-threatening eating disorders such as bulimia and anorexia (new diseases undocumented before the demise of the corset) (Brownell & Rodin, 1994; Brownmiller, 1984; Rodin, Silberstein, & Striegel-Moore, 1985; Wolf, 1992). The recent advent of advanced surgical techniques has also encouraged an unknown number of women to submit to painful and sometimes hazardous surgeries such as face lifts, breast implants, liposuction, and laser removal of wrinkles (Siebert, 1996). An increasing number of young women in the industrialized nations resort to painful body modifications, such as body piercing (including nipple and genital piercing) and tattooing, which were formerly associated with premodern cultures. Men have not been entirely immune from the painful pursuit of modifications in physical appearance. Men in premodern societies and working-class men in industrial societies have long subjected themselves to tattoos on their arms, torsos, or faces as a way of displaying group identification as well as their ability to endure pain. In the contemporary United States, increasing numbers of men are modifying their personal appearance with hair transplants and other types of cosmetic surgery (Siebert, 1996).

The urge to commodify and control women's sexual capacity perhaps finds its most explicit expression in female genital mutilation, which has been receiving increasing publicity in recent years. It is practiced in about two dozen African countries, where it is a requirement for marriageability and ethnic identification, affecting the health and well-being of an estimated 132 million women (World Health Organization, 1996). The practice ranges from the relatively mild clitoridectomy (removal of the clitoris) to genital infibulation (removal of the entire outer portion of the genitals and the stitching up of what is left with just a pencil-sized aperture left for urination and menstruation). The majority of people who practice some form of female genital mutilation are poor and have

no access to sterile instruments or anesthetic. Girls between early childhood and adolescence (the age varies across cultures) are subjected by their older female relatives to this excruciatingly painful operation. There are a wide range of adverse medical outcomes, both immediate and permanent, such as pain, hemorrhage, shock, psychological trauma, acute urinary retention, urinary infection, blood poisoning, fever, tetanus, or death after the procedure, and subsequently diminished sexual responsiveness (with the least invasive forms of mutilation), painful intercourse (with infibulation), infertility, hazardous childbirth, difficulty urinating and menstruating, and recurrent infections (Dorkenoo & Elworthy, 1992; El Dareer, 1982; *Harvard Law Review*, 1993; Inhorn & Buss, 1993; Lightfoot-Klein, 1989; Mackie, 1996).

The desire to control sexuality, to use sexuality as a fundamental ethnic marker, and to restrict who has sexual access to privileged women, have led primarily to a concentration of effort on the female body, but they have also impelled numerous examples of male genital mutilation. The emblem of Jewish male identity is the circumcised penis, and many premodern cultures include circumcision (without anesthetic) as part of adolescent initiation ceremonies. Several Aboriginal tribes in central Australia subject their adolescent men to genital subincision during initiation, in which an incision of about 1 inch length is cut on the underside of the penis, and the wound is ceremonially reopened at periodic intervals throughout the man's life (Berndt & Berndt, 1964; Montagu, [1937] 1974). Castration was a requirement for male employment as a household servant in the imperial courts in the Ming dynasty in China, and thousands of young men underwent this dangerous, painful, and humiliating operation in the hope of gaining such employment (Tong, 1988, p. 113). Indeed, until the late nineteenth to early twentieth century, the eunuch occupied a venerable place in the administration of secular and religious rule in a wide range of locations, including Rome, China, Byzantium, Egypt, and (until 1878) the Papal Choir of the Sistine Chapel (Tannahill, 1992, pp. 248–254). Eunuchs were viewed as sexually nonthreatening guards for harems and upper-class women and as incorruptible administrators because of their inability to father offspring. Castration was also employed as a punishment throughout history and across cultures until the early twentieth century. In the United States, it was part of the repertoire of punishment used against slaves and it was sometimes (with increasing rarity in the twentieth century) inflicted on black men who were lynched or institutionalized (Elkins, 1968; Hall, 1983; Kolchin, 1993; Stampp, [1956] 1989; Wright, 1994; Wyatt-Brown, 1982).

The reproductive ability of both men and women has been recurrently subject to attack in the cause of class or racial domination or eugenics. With the advent of more advanced surgical techniques in the late nineteenth century, women's reproductive ability became more vulnerable to control. For example, recent revelations indicate that more than 70,000 women and a much smaller number of men were sterilized in Scandinavia between 1929 and 1976 for a variety of reasons relating to their presumed reproductive fitness (*The Economist*, 1997). Some policymakers continue to view poor welfare mothers in the United States as a target for sterilization policy.

2.7. Infanticide, progonicide, femicide

In resource-poor societies, especially preindustrial ones, there is evidence that infanticide is widely practiced as a makeshift means of birth control. Minturn and Shashak (1982, cited in Ember & Ember, 1995, p. 28) report that infanticide occurs in 53% of their

mostly preindustrial sample societies. It appears to be used primarily to eliminate illegitimate children with no male to support them or to achieve a spacing of children that will not strain material or social resources (see also Daly & Wilson, 1988; Skinner, 1993). Such infanticide appears to be motivated by pragmatic concerns about resource allocation in societies that do not have access to safe birth control or abortion, and it almost always occurs before the ceremony that socially marks or announces a birth (Minturn & Shashak, 1982). Scheper-Hughes' ethnographic study of poverty-stricken mothers in urban Brazil (1992) reveals that they sometimes choose to abandon or neglect weaker or sickly children in order to reallocate their meager resources to stronger children with better survival odds. Such infanticide and progenicide appears to be gender neutral in terms of its victims, but it is women—by virtue of their biological link to the child—who are generally saddled with the perpetration of the destructive behavior.

It has also come to light in recent years that in a number of economically less developed societies, female children and women are being systematically neglected, abandoned, or murdered (or female fetuses selectively aborted where technology permits), so that the ratio of females to males in the population is artificially low. There have been scattered reports of selective infanticide of female newborns, and consistent and systematic observations of the selective withholding of food and medical support from female children and women in India, China, Pakistan, and Bangladesh (Coale, 1991; Sen, 1990, 1992; Venkatramani, 1992). Symptomatic of the problem are the widespread reports of "accidental" sari burnings in many parts of India, in which young brides are allegedly burned to death or driven to suicide by their in-laws after they have procured their dowries (Kelkar, 1992). Serious shortfalls have been estimated in the proportion female in the populations of India, China, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, West Asia, Egypt, and some other North African countries (Coale, 1991; Sen, 1990, 1992). Sen (1990) originally estimated that more than 100 million women are missing worldwide (half of them in China), using the ratio of females to males in Europe, the United States, and Japan as the benchmark to evaluate the relative shortfall of women in selected Asian and African countries. However, this estimate was inflated, primarily because of the artificially low proportion of *males* in the "benchmark" countries caused by battle deaths in World Wars I and II (see *War Casualties* below), and also because it did not make appropriate adjustments for the fertility and mortality rates and population age structure of the affected countries. Coale's reanalysis yields a "rough approximation" of the number of "missing females" worldwide as about 60 million, still an enormous number. The two most populous nations in the world contribute disproportionately to this number, with 29 million missing females in China and 23 million missing in India (Coale, 1991, pp. 521–522). When expressed as a percentage of a nation's female population, it is Pakistan that is the worst offender, with just under 8% of its females missing. The comparable figure for China is 5.3%; for India 5.6%; and for Bangladesh, Nepal, West Asia, and Egypt about 2% to 4% (Coale, 1991, p. 522).

Sen argues convincingly that this rudimentary discrimination against women is explained primarily as a resource-management strategy of families in systems in which inheritance rules favor sons and make daughters costly. Whereas sons are the parents' ticket to economic security in their old age, daughters are an economic liability for the household, and thus their welfare is sacrificed to the economic interests of the remaining family members (Sen, 1990). "Surplus" daughters are especially problematic. One study in Khanna, India, found that the death rate before age 5 for daughters with no older sisters was little different from the male death rate, but for females with an older sister it

was about 50% higher than for males (Das Gupta, 1987, cited in Coale, 1991, p. 521). In China, the introduction of the one-child-per-family rule in 1979 made even firstborn daughters a threat to the long-term economic prospects of the parents: that, combined with changes in economic policy that dismantled the commune system and made families more economically self-reliant, resulted in a deterioration in the relative life expectancy of women and a dramatic increase in the rate of female infant mortality from 37.7 per 1000 in 1978 to 67.2 in 1984 (Sen, 1990, p. 65). Sen insists that the selective neglect or abandonment of females in some cultures cannot be explained satisfactorily in terms of prejudice against women, but is instead explicable in terms of sons' versus daughters' economic value to the family, along with the lack of governmentally ensured old-age benefits. He suggests that in those poorer countries in which women have increased their labor force participation (even in menial jobs), women's risk of selective neglect has declined because of their enhanced economic value to their families. There is also some evidence that provision of communal social security and health programs diminishes the material bias against girls and women (Sen, 1990).

2.8. War casualties

Nations have long expected their young men to be ready to sacrifice their lives as soldiers for the security of the remaining citizenry or to protect the "national interest." The number of men whose lives have thus been squandered in international and civil wars (including only those wars with at least 1000 battle deaths) is estimated to have totalled about 5,000,000 between 1816 and 1900, while the twentieth century had, by 1980, swallowed up the lives of about 36,000,000 men in battle deaths (Small & Singer, 1982, pp. 78–99, 221–233). World War I alone took the lives of 9,000,000 soldiers in battle, and another 15,000,000 soldiers were killed in World War II. Germany sacrificed about 5% of its male population in WWI and then another 10% a few years later in WWII. By the time the USSR pulled out of WWI in December 1917, it had already lost about 2% of its males in battle, and in WWII the USSR sacrificed about another 9% of its males (Small & Singer 1982, pp. 89, 91). The most devastating recorded battle casualties were sustained by Paraguay in the Lopez War (1864–1870), in which an estimated 90% of Paraguay's male population was killed in battle (Small & Singer, 1982, p. 84). Further, for every soldier killed in action, approximately four or five soldiers are wounded in action, and at least half of those wounded suffer casualties that leave them physically or emotionally debilitated for the rest of their lives (Dunnigan, 1993). Men who have given their lives in war are typically glorified with public monuments and displays of reverence such as public holidays, speeches, and parades—but the objects of veneration are of course dead. War veterans often do not meet with the same veneration from the government or citizenry on whose behalf they fought.

The embroilment of civilians in war had been steadily declining since the 17th century, but beginning with WWII, civilian casualties have become an increasing component of war (Wright, 1965): these casualties affect noncombatant men, women, and children indiscriminately. In recent history, women have also begun to join men in the ranks as soldiers or assistants in warmaking (although women are still barred from the infantry, artillery, and armor in the U.S. Army (Richter, 1997) and most other armed services). Both of these factors have increased women's share of wartime casualties, but it is overwhelmingly males who have been selected as the cannon fodder of nations. Indeed, the

proportion of many postwar nations' males that is "missing" because of battlefield deaths is roughly equivalent to the proportion of females that is missing in some less developed nations in the 1990s because of institutionally induced selective neglect or murder. The common incidence of wartime rape of women and girls (Brownmiller, 1975) should be placed in context: the men committing those rapes (usually in their most sexually active years) have themselves been transformed into a dehumanized status by the nations that deploy them in battle.

2.9. Lynching

Little work has been done on the effect of gender on participation in and victimization from mob violence, but studies of lynching in the United States are revealing. Between 1882 and the early 1950s, it is estimated that 5000 to 6000 persons were killed by lynch mobs, 82% of them in the South (Hair, 1989; White, [1929]1969). The chivalrous protection and control of white women's sexuality appears to have been a central motivating sentiment behind the violence of the Ku Klux Klan, and in that spirit, most of the victims of lynching were black men. Indeed, men constituted an even higher proportion of lynching victims (more than 95% both nationally and regionally) than did African-Americans (who were 72% of lynching victims nationally and 84% of Southern lynchings) (Hair, 1989). The sexual protection of white women was the most frequently cited justification offered in defence of lynch law, and rape or alleged rape of a white woman was the second leading cause of lynchings (closely behind murder), accounting for about one third of the lynchings of both black and white victims (Hair, 1989; see also Brundage, 1993, pp. 263–264).

Women apparently did not leave their protection entirely in the hands of their menfolk. The participants in lynch mobs appear to have been primarily—but not exclusively—male. In those lynchings carried out by mass mobs, women and even children participated prominently, by "inciting the crowd with cheers, providing fuel for the execution pyre and scavenging for souvenirs after the lynchings" (Brundage, 1993, pp. 37–38; see also Cameron, 1982). Women also provided auxiliary support through their participation in the Women of the Ku Klux Klan when the Klan went through its revival in the 1920s, and Blee argues that "the idea of 'white womanhood' was a crucial rallying point for postbellum Klan violence" (Blee, 1991, p. 13).

2.10. Workplace injuries, diseases, and fatalities

The cruel exploitation of women and children in the industrializing nations during the nineteenth century is well known. The shocking engravings in British parliamentary reports depicting the inhuman working conditions of women and children in the mines in the early 1840s (British Parliamentary Papers, [1842] 1968) graphically illustrate the raw fact that women and children were not exempted from the terrible suffering of the working class in the early days of industrial development. At the same time, reformist governmental agents chose to highlight the plight of women and children workers because their misery was more offensive and shocking to public morality than the suffering of male workers (Perot, 1990, pp. 85–87; Brandeis & Goldmark, [1907] 1969). Working conditions have steadily improved in industrialized nations in the past 150 years, and there has been a consequent decline in the incidence of work-related injuries and deaths.

For example, the number of work-related deaths in the United States (excluding work place homicides) has dropped from about 16,000 annually in the 1930s and 1940s to about 5000 annually in the 1990s (National Safety Council, 1995). Women's exposure to work hazards has been especially reduced.

Even with improvements in working conditions, serious hazards still confront many workers, especially blue-collar workers, and the issue remains sharply contested in labor-management relations (McGarity & Shapiro, 1993). The 5000 people killed by work-related injuries in the United States in 1995 do not include the 1262 workplace homicides or the estimated 47,000 to 100,000 who die annually of occupationally induced diseases (Bureau of Labor Statistics [BLS], 1996; National Safe Workplace Institute, 1990; Office of Technology Assessment, 1985; Pollack & Keimig, 1987). About three quarters of the 5000 enumerated deaths from work-related injuries in 1995 were in blue-collar jobs, and only about 5% were women (BLS, 1996). Thus, one benefit for women of sex-role segregation in the labor force has been to shield them from many of the highest risk, blue-collar occupations. Almost one half of the women killed at work are victims of homicide; even if one includes work place homicides, however, only about 9% of workplace deaths involve female victims (BLS, 1996; see also U.S. Department of Labor, 1994). There is one female-typed occupation that is very hazardous—prostitution—but its illegitimate status leaves it outside the net of BLS statistics. Prostitutes have always been vulnerable to physical assault, sexually transmitted diseases, and murder: a recent study by the Centers for Disease Control indicates that prostitutes have a much higher prevalence of AIDS than the general population, and a study of street prostitutes in Miami found 41% of those tested were HIV-positive (Flowers, 1994, p. 178).

Women's general protection from nonfatal work injuries and illnesses in the United States is not as pronounced, but still substantial. Men account for about two thirds of the 2.3 million annual work injuries and illnesses (well in excess of their 55% share of all private wage and salary workers) (BLS, 1994, p. 3). Women injured on the job usually work for health care providers, food stores, restaurants, lodging places, or other service-producing industries (BLS, 1994, p. 3). The one type of work-related injury (other than workplace assaults) from which women suffer more than men is repetitive-motion injuries and illnesses (most commonly carpal tunnel syndrome): women account for about two thirds of the 90,000 cases annually (BLS, 1994, p. 6; see also BLS, 1995).

The gradual improvement in working conditions that has marked the more highly industrialized nations is not shared by the newly industrializing countries of the world today. There is some evidence that women workers of these countries are subjected to especially grueling work conditions and exploitative wages (Bradshaw & Wallace, 1996, pp. 4–5, 104–106). Unfortunately for such women, the same jobs whose income helps to protect them from the worst excesses of family abuse and neglect (Sen, 1990) also expose them to new work-based hazards. A number of developing countries also employ an uncounted number of women in sexually exploitative jobs (such as the thriving sex tourism industries in the Philippines and Thailand) that expose these women (and their children and subsequent sex partners) to sexually transmitted diseases such as AIDS.

2.11. Deaths and Injuries from Hazardous Consumer Products

There are no systematic data on the total injuries and fatalities that are attributable to the marketing of hazardous consumer products, and thus the overall relative risk borne by

women and men in the consumer marketplace is unknown. Women's interest in controlling their fertility has made them prey to hazardous birth control products, such as the Dalkon Shield (Finley, 1996; Szockyi & Frank, 1996), and their culturally mandated preoccupation with personal appearance has led many women to use questionable or hazardous beauty products ranging from hair dyes and weight-loss products to breast implants (Claybrook, 1996; Szockyi & Frank, 1996). The female-targeted marketing of hazardous reproductive and beauty products has received sporadic publicity in the media and has been the subject of some research on corporate violence against women. However, the two most hazardous consumer products in the United States are guns and cigarettes (although the Consumer Product Safety Commission does not classify guns as consumer products; Combs & Donoghue, 1994): these two lethally dangerous products have done more damage to males' than to females' health and life expectancy.

The United States leads the industrialized world in the incidence of deaths from firearms, and the ready availability of firearms in the American consumer marketplace is more responsible than any other single factor for the unusually high homicide rate in the United States (Lynch, 1995). In the past decade in the United States, about 32,000 to 38,000 people have been killed annually by firearm injuries, which includes both homicides (60% to 70% of which are committed with firearms annually) and accidents (FBI, 1981–1995; U.S. National Center for Health Statistics, 1993, p. 101). Guns are the playthings of men more than of women, and about 85% of the victims of firearm deaths are male (U.S. National Center for Health Statistics, 1993, p. 101). African-American males have an especially high death rate from firearms—more than 64 per 100,000 (age-adjusted rate), compared with about 20 for white males, 8 for black females, and 4 for white females (U.S. National Center for Health Statistics, 1993, p. 101). This gender difference in the incidence of deaths from firearm injuries begins to appear in the 5 to 9 year-old age bracket (especially among blacks) and becomes particularly pronounced in the violence-prone teen and young-adult years (U.S. National Center for Health Statistics, 1993, p. 100).

The leading cause of premature death in industrialized nations is tobacco, and men are again disproportionately the victims. In industrialized countries in the 1990s, smoking accounts for an estimated 39% of all deaths in men between 35 and 69 years of age, compared with 15% of all deaths in women in that age bracket; over age 69, 23% of all male deaths and 8% of all female deaths are attributable to smoking (Peto, Lopez, Boreham, Thun, & Heath, 1992). In the United States alone, the total number of deaths caused by tobacco is conservatively estimated to be 390,000 to 400,000 annually (Peto et al., 1992). The prevalence of smoking in the United States has decreased from 40% of adults in 1965 to 29% in 1987, but women's use of tobacco has declined at a substantially slower rate than men's; in addition, the age of initiation to smoking has fallen over time, especially among females (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1989, p. 11). As gender differences in cigarette use have been declining in the United States, the gender gap in deaths from smoking has been steadily narrowing from the 1960s to the 1990s (Peto et al., 1992).

2.12. State-Mandated Punishments

Women are less likely than men to commit crimes, especially violent crimes, but there is fairly consistent evidence that convicted female criminals receive more lenient sentences than their male counterparts (Nagel & Hagen, 1983). The relationship between gender

and the criminal justice system is discussed more fully in Chapter 26 of this volume. Here, I confine myself to two crimes that have been highlighted by some scholars as exemplifying the legal harassment or control of women: spousal murder and witchcraft.

Some analysts have claimed that our legal system, whether from misogyny or male-biased myopia, has shown sympathy for husbands who murder their adulterous wives or wives' lovers, while being unsympathetic to the plight of battered wives who desperately kill their husbands after suffering years of escalating abuse (e.g., Fagan & Browne, 1994). Daly and Wilson (1988, pp. 193–196) review legal statutes cross-culturally and over time and argue that most legal systems have shown at least some degree of leniency to cuckolded husbands who turn murderous. Other scholars have emphasized that any comparable sympathy for wives is lacking. They have argued that wives are only rarely motivated by sexual jealousy to murder their husbands, but when battered wives murder their husbands at strategic moments when they are temporarily incapacitated (asleep or heavily intoxicated), their actions are not construed as self-defense in the narrow legal sense, and they are therefore subject to imprisonment for murder. Even in some cases of victim-precipitated murder of husbands (that is, in which the victim is the first to show a weapon or strike a blow), defendants may be unsympathetically imprisoned for manslaughter (Browne, 1987; Campbell, 1992; Fagan & Browne, 1994; Jones, 1980; Totman, 1978). However, a recent study of 540 spousal murder cases in the 75 largest counties of the United States (Langan & Dawson, 1995) offers no support for these arguments. The study found that wives charged with killing their husbands (41% of the cases) were somewhat less likely to be convicted than husband defendants (70% vs. 87%), more likely to be acquitted (31% vs. 6%), if convicted were slightly less likely to receive prison sentences (81% vs. 94%), and if sentenced to prison received sentences on average about 10 years shorter (6 years vs. 16.5 years). Of course, substantially more wife defendants (44%) than husband defendants (10%) had been assaulted by their spouse at or around the time of the murder. The element of victim provocation appears to explain the gender difference in conviction rates, but not in the length of prison sentences (unprovoked defendants' average prison sentences were 7 years for wives and 17 years for husbands). This study thus suggests, at a minimum, that the contemporary legal system in the United States generally is sympathetic to the mitigating circumstances that more often provoke wives to turn murderous, and there is also some evidence that wife defendants are punished more leniently, regardless of mitigating circumstances. These results are consistent with those found for other crimes and with the chivalry/paternalism thesis long entertained by criminologists (Nagel & Hagen, 1983; Wilson & Herrnstein, 1985, pp. 112–115).

The gruesome torture and punishments inflicted by state and ecclesiastical authorities on an estimated 200,000 accused witches in early modern Europe and America are well known (Barstow, 1995; Hester, 1992; Levack, 1995; Russell, 1972). Some feminist scholars have argued that the witchcraze was a classic example of femicide, in which unconventional women were targeted for severe punishment and death as a means of terrorizing and controlling all women (Barstow, 1995; Hester, 1992). That impression is certainly encouraged by a singular focus on the sadistic and often sexually oriented punishments and the bizarre, superstitious beliefs that surrounded accused witches. However, it is important to situate the witch hunts appropriately. First, they were part of a general preoccupation in the European states throughout this period with maintaining the primacy of received Christian dogma, and freedom of speech was still a long way from being invented as a human-rights principle (Levack, 1995; Manchester, 1992; Peters, 1988). Witchcraft was a popular heretical tradition that stood as a challenge to the authority of

the Church (Russell, 1972), and suspected witches received treatment comparable to other accused heretics. Second, witchcraft was practiced predominantly by women, and thus it is hardly surprising that it was primarily women who fell under suspicion during state attempts to suppress it. Women constituted about 75% of accused witches in most localities in Europe and New England between 1509 and 1777, although the percentage female ranged fairly widely from lows of 32% in Russia, 42% in Estonia, and about 50% in the Scandinavian countries, to 90% or more in Basel, Belgium, and England (Levack, 1995, p. 133–134). Third, the sadistic and superstitious rules of evidence for determining witchhood were quite normal for their historical context (Manchester, 1992; Peters, 1988; Russell, 1972). Recall that the Inquisition and other state-authorized religious persecutions throughout Europe during this period had equally brutal methods for dealing with suspected religious nonconformists, and both sorcerers and scientists suffered for their wayward thoughts, as did religious practitioners who strayed from received Christian dogma (Manchester, 1992; Peters, 1988; Russell, 1972). In short, state authorities threw their suspicious and punishing gaze not only on women but on all citizens.

2.13. Summary

Perhaps because violence against women, especially that taking place in intimate relationships, was overlooked by scholars for so long, much of the literature on gender and violence in the past 20 years has focused exclusively on violence against women: wife battering, rape, and sexual harassment (e.g., Brownmiller, 1975; Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Dutton, 1988, 1995; Flowers, 1994; Stanko, 1985; Walker, 1979). This work has performed an invaluable service in identifying and highlighting an important—and previously hidden—social issue, but the singularity of focus has also fostered the perspective that women are the special targets of male violence. This, in turn, has nourished the inference that it is misogyny that drives violence against women. What has disappeared from view are two important patterns that mark the overall relationship between gender and physical violence. First, men's greater proclivity for physical violence is more likely to be directed at other men, except in the context of intimate or sexual relationships. Second, women apparently do not shrink from committing violence themselves in those circumstances where their deficits in height, weight, and muscle mass are suspended or mitigated. Within the context of male–female interactions, women have been the victims of violence more often than men, but in those contexts where their physical deficits do not make them vulnerable (as in violence against young offspring and in mob violence against overpowered victims), women have not shown a disavowal of violence. Indeed, a meta-analysis of research on gender and aggression concluded that differences between males and females are small and variable across contexts (Eagly & Steffen, 1986; see also Bjorkqvist & Niemela, 1992; Kruttschnitt, 1994, p. 328); the main systematic difference is for women to have a greater proclivity for verbal aggression and men for physical aggression.

The relationship between gender and violence thus appears to be molded by two primary factors: widespread social preoccupation with the proprietary protection and control of women's sexuality, and the respective physical strength of men and women. Men are the main perpetrators and victims of nonsexual, interpersonal violence (homicides and assaults), lethal violence against oneself (suicide), and various forms of nonsexual, corporate violence (in war, the workplace, the consumer marketplace, mob violence, and

state-mandated punishments). It is only sexual violence that men direct primarily at women. Sexual access to women is generally regulated by institutional arrangements without the use of physical force, and concern with controlling sexual access to women on the basis of class or group membership has sometimes prompted surgical assaults on men's bodies (e.g., castration, circumcision, subincision). However, women are the primary victims of rape and sexual assault, and their bodies have been chronically subjected to intense proprietary control, inducing rigorous beauty standards that can be painful or hazardous, a variety of surgical assaults, persistent and invasive public evaluation of women's physical appearance, and disproportionate sexual harassment of women. By the same token, women have been kept relatively secluded from interpersonal violence emanating from non-sexual relations, as well as from the hazards of the battlefield, workplace, consumer marketplace, mob violence, and state-mandated punishments.

3. CULTURAL SUPPORTS FOR VIOLENCE

A repeated refrain has been that violence against women is condoned, justified, or excused by an infrastructure of cultural beliefs and legal statutes that are misogynist. Analysts point to a long history of laws that curtail women's rights relative to their husbands and to popular beliefs that encourage or excuse physical and sexual violence against women. I reserve until the next section a separate discussion of the issue of victim blame, which has played such a prominent role in excusing violence against women. In this section, I begin by briefly reviewing the legal record of intervention in acts of violence against women. I then address the cultural values surrounding wife beating, rape, and sexual harassment, and the belief systems that mandate painful or harmful beauty practices, as well as the values surrounding male-targeted violence. In the light of this evidence, it is difficult to sustain the view that violence against women is unequivocally or uniquely endorsed. Further, scholars have confounded violence with malice and the desire to control women with a hatred for women.

To illustrate the misogynous underpinnings of our society, a number of analysts have referred to the infamous "rule of thumb" by which English and American law as recently as the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries reputedly upheld the right of a man to beat his wife with a rod, provided it was no thicker than his thumb. However, closer examination of the legal trajectory of the rule of thumb does not support the misogyny interpretation. The rule was originally asserted in England by Judge Buller in 1783—but English legal authorities challenged him and writers and cartoonists lampooned him (May, 1978; Pleck, 1989). Some scholars have asserted that the rule of thumb became incorporated into American law as established precedent, and a ruling by the State Supreme Court of North Carolina in 1868 is a critical case cited to support this assertion (e.g., Fagan & Browne 1994, p. 123; Jones, 1980, p. 284). However, closer inspection of that ruling reveals that the North Carolina State Supreme Court repudiated both the right of a husband to beat his wife and specifically the rule of thumb, even ridiculing the latter:

It is not true . . . that a husband has the right to whip his wife. And if he had, it is not easily seen how *the thumb* is the standard of size for the instrument which he may use, as some of the old authorities have said. . . . The standard is the *effect produced*, and not the manner of producing it, or the instrument used. (State v. Rhodes, 61 N.C. 459 [1868])

Although the North Carolina Supreme Court did uphold the lower court's ruling that the husband who had struck his wife with "three licks" from a "switch about the size of one of

his fingers” had not violated the law, the judges emphasized that “The ground upon which we have put this decision is not that the husband has the *right* to whip his wife much or little; but that we will not interfere with family government in trifling cases” (State v. Rhodes, 61 N.C. 459 [1868]). The unusually long ruling (more than four pages) displays a cognizance of the sensitivity and contentiousness of the issue and a view of gender relations that is steeped, not in misogyny, but in paternalism. The wording betrays a complex set of values that includes an exalted respect for the stability and privacy of the nuclear family unit and the authority of its male head, denial of the seriousness of the specific incident, and the earnest belief that spousal love both permits and heals “impulsive violence.” The language also reveals a disgust for the male defendant, albeit offset by a reticence to undermine his paternal authority. Note, too, that the case was originally brought by the State on behalf of the aggrieved wife, and was appealed to the State Supreme Court when the lower court ruled in favor of the husband—hardly evidence of callous neglect of the wife’s grievances by State authorities.

Pleck’s careful analysis of the historical record of legal intervention in domestic abuse cases in the United States indicates a conflicted legal approach that reflects the paternalistic impetus both to protect and control women (Pleck, 1987; 1989). Thus, the legal system has reverted back and forth between a prevailing reticence about interfering in family relations and sporadic attempts to stop wife abuse. The Puritans of New England passed the first laws against domestic violence in the 1640s, and scattered legislative acts, court rulings, and police interventions in the nineteenth century affirmed the right of battered wives to the full protection of the law and punished abusive husbands with beatings, public floggings, fines, or imprisonment (Pleck, 1987, 1989). In recent history, the criminal justice system has taken more initiative in the protection of battered women, from more vigorous prosecution of cases to the provision of temporary restraining order (TRO) workshops for women who are being harassed by assaultive partners or ex-partners (Ferraro, 1993; Pleck, 1987, 1989). Moreover, although some analysts have argued that the criminal justice system is lenient toward wife batterers, careful comparison of the legal treatment of intimate and nonintimate violent offenses found no systematic differences between them (Ferraro, 1993). Without painting too rosy a picture of the level of commitment or the efficacy of legal interventions on behalf of battered women, the recurrence of such attempts contradicts the argument that the driving force has been callous misogyny.

Popular attitudes about violence toward women betray the same ambivalent admixture as has been found in the criminal justice system. It is not difficult to find evidence of popular moral repudiation of wife beaters: May (1978, p. 141) reports that in nineteenth century England, such customs as “noisy music,” the “badger’s band,” and “riding the stang” were employed by villagers to publicly humiliate and ridicule wife beaters; Blee (1991, pp. 80–84) reports that in the Ku Klux Klan’s revival in the 1920s in Indiana, wife beaters and husbands who deserted their wives and families were included among the long list of moral reprobates who required corrective action; countless magazine articles in our contemporary era decry the moral blight of wife beating; and survey data indicate strong, widespread disapproval of husbands hitting wives, and more so than wives hitting husbands (Greenblat, 1983). Similarly, rape has long been popularly viewed as one of the most heinous of crimes. In a large, probability survey of Americans, rape was rated one of the most serious of all crimes; indeed, rape requiring hospitalization was ranked as somewhat more serious than a woman stabbing her husband to death (and both were rated as less serious than a man stabbing his wife to death) (Warr, 1994, pp. 38–45). At the same

time, victims of spousal abuse, rape, and sexual harassment often meet with disbelief when they attempt to disclose their victimization, especially if the perpetrators are respected or well liked in the community; alternatively, they find that the shame is heaped upon them as well. A number of studies have documented the vulgar sexual values and aggressive sexual depictions of women that permeate fraternities and military settings (e.g., Burke, 1992; Martin & Hummer, 1993) (although these young male subcultures are marked by high base rates of male-to-male physical violence and abuse, and age has a strong inverse relationship to rape offending, Reiss & Roth, 1993, p. 73). Studies of male college students have found that 30% to 35% indicate *some* likelihood (and about 20% a somewhat stronger likelihood) that they would rape if they were assured of not getting caught (Malamuth, 1981; Stermac, Segal, & Gillis, 1990). Public-opinion studies have documented a variety of myths about rape that excuse or deny it (e.g., Burt, 1980; Malamuth, 1981). In addition, popular attitudes about sexual harassment indicate considerable confusion about appropriate norms of social and sexual interaction between men and women, with a large "gray area" in which many sexually aggressive behaviors are not readily recognized as transgressions (U.S. MSPB, 1981, 1995). Clearly, sexual access to women is highly prized and continually contested, even as societal norms try to specify the terms of such access.

Beauty practices and genital modifications that confine or mutilate women's bodies are supported by widespread belief systems to which both men and women subscribe. Despite the injurious effects of such practices, their symbolic representation in popular culture betrays no animosity toward women. Footbinding was revered as a sensual art form by both men and women in China (Levy [1966] 1992): little girls may have cried when they began the painful treatments that crippled them, but they no doubt learned to thank their mothers when their tiny feet earned them social admiration and desirable marriages. Genital mutilation in many African countries today is viewed by men and women alike as a rite of passage to womanhood that marks a woman's ethnic identity and enhances her physical appearance, sexual attractiveness, and reproductive ability (Dorkenoo & Elworthy, 1992; Lightfoot-Klein, 1989). It is a basic maxim that "you have to suffer to be beautiful," and countless generations of women have accepted that maxim as a guiding principle in their lives as they have contorted and mutilated their bodies in the quest to become more desirable social and sexual objects. The ideology is so internalized that women as well as men admire those women who excel in meeting the beauty standards of their day, thus adding further to the social and economic benefits that accrue to these behaviors. These beauty practices work to control women's behavior and sexuality, but the individuals who endorse such practices are not generally driven by misogyny: indeed, it is the value placed on women's bodies that impels men to seek control of them.

When we take a broader view of violence, it becomes apparent that women are not alone in enduring violence that is sustained by popular belief systems. Men in some Aboriginal cultures in Australia have been goaded to undergo painful genital subincision in the belief that it will enhance their sexual performance, purify their bodies, and give them a clear ethnic marker. Many cultures have circumcised their sons in the belief that it is in their long-term social and health interests. Countless young men have marched off to war at their communities' behest amid high fanfare and incitements to glory, bravery, honor, and courage. Violence does not require hostility toward its victims to propel it, and the human record indicates an elastic capacity for violence that expands and contracts according to the instrumental goals of the relevant actors (Jackman, in preparation). The intricate networks of beliefs that bolster or repudiate specific forms of violence are shaped

by the political efforts of the contending parties, with stronger parties having a disproportionate impact.

The potency of such belief systems preempts the need for control through more overt means. Although some men do hate women, they are relatively rare: more commonly, as in other intergroup relations, dominant group members try to keep hostility out of their relations with subordinates in the interests of the long-term stability of the unequal exchange relations from which they benefit (Jackman, 1994). The goal of controlling subordinates is neither facilitated by, nor does it promote, hostility toward them. The infamous case of Francine Hughes, who in 1977 burned her abusive husband to death when he lay sleeping in his bed (Jones, 1980, p. 281), demonstrates the bedrock principle that dominant groups have either respected or learned the hard way: if you choose to rule by force, violence, and intimidation, you had better stay awake and alert at all times. As men have sought to control women's bodies and especially their sexuality, the coercive properties of conditional love have made paternalism the weapon of choice, not misogyny (Jackman, 1994).

4. VICTIM COMPLICITY

The issue of victim complicity has been troubling and contentious in the analysis of violence against women. It has come up at two different levels. First, at the individual level, to what extent are women responsible for precipitating interpersonal violence against themselves in the form of partner assaults and homicides, rapes, and sexual harassment? For example, why do many, if not most, battered wives stay with their abusive husbands? To what extent do they engage in behaviors that precipitate the violence against them? Do some women invite rape or sexual harassment by their behaviors? Second, at a group level, why do women participate actively in the perpetuation of customs that mutilate women's bodies (either their own or their daughters') and accede to self-destructive beauty ideals?

Like other scholars of violence, analysts of violence against women have assumed that for injurious behaviors to qualify as violence, the victims must be noncompliant. Concern about this issue has been exacerbated by the inaccessibility of direct observation of most forms of violence against women, making inferences about the victim's resistance or compliance especially susceptible to interpretation as people are reduced to a "he said, she said" scenario. A full treatment of this complex and booby-trapped issue is beyond the scope of this chapter, but I briefly outline some of the generic problems involved in the assessment of victim compliance and review the main ways that these problems apply to research on violence against women.

The issue of victim compliance is confounded on two counts (Jackman, in preparation). To begin, as the extensive literature on power has amply demonstrated, the compliance/noncompliance distinction is inherently ambiguous because people rarely act as free agents, but instead usually must make choices from a constrained set that has been predetermined by organizational or situational factors beyond their control (Bachrach & Baratz, 1970; Genovese, 1974, pp. 597–598; M. Jackman, 1994; R. Jackman, 1993; Lukes, 1974). Given a constrained set of choices, the victim's alternatives to compliance may be risky or futile. Depending on the agent's and victim's relative control over resources, compliance may be the victim's best survival strategy. Of course, individuals vary in how they respond to constraints, and situations vary in the extent to which they constrict individuals'

options. However, we do not need to deny the existence of individual agency to recognize that free choices are rarer than hen's teeth.

To compound this conceptual difficulty, the compliance/noncompliance distinction is also difficult to observe empirically. People's revealed behaviors do not always reflect their preferences, especially when they are in threatening situations. Added to this, people's observation and recollection of events, especially volatile ones, are highly subject to bias and confusion. The perpetrator has self-interested reasons for portraying the victim as an instigator or confederate. The victim may lack either the self-confidence or the social credibility to counter the agent's claims effectively or she may be too shaken or humiliated by the event to formulate allegations with fortitude. Even outside witnesses are rarely unbiased, in the sense of having no personal stake in the interpretation of the event. An especially common bias among both bystanders and participants (including victims themselves) is the tendency to "blame the victim" (Bulman & Wortman, 1977; Lerner & Simmons, 1966; Miller & Porter, 1983; Stark & Flitcraft, 1988). In their interpretation of specific events, people tend to take structural risk factors as a given. Organizational arrangements are a longstanding, integral part of their social environment, and they are not subject to individual alteration. People focus instead on individual strategies for negotiating around the risk factors that have become a normal and unquestioned part of their environment. For those individuals who are themselves at risk, this has the psychological benefit of making them feel more in control of their fate, while for others it has the benefit of deflecting social responsibility on to the victim.

The intricate compounding of individual agency and situational constraints is poignantly captured in the recollections of a foot-bound woman, recorded in China in the 1930s (Levy [1966] 1992, pp. 237–238):

When I was just six years old, mother started my footbinding. . . . By eleven, my feet were 4.5 inches long, and bowed. On grandmother's birthday, I went with mother to visit her. My cousins had tiny feet, and my uncle laughed at me for having such big and fat feet by comparison, saying "Who would be willing to be your match-maker?" Everyone who heard this remark laughed, making me so ashamed that I determined to bind my feet to the utmost in order to wipe out the disgrace. That night, when everyone was asleep, I rebound so tightly that I had to clench my teeth because of the pain.

My sleep that night was filled with dreams of tiny three-inch feet. The next morning, though the pain had lessened, I had to cling to the walls for walking support. After ten days of treatment my feet measured only 3.8 inches. . . . Three or five days later, my toes became swollen and filled with pus. After one month, they had become nine-tenths of an inch smaller, or 2.9 inches. My feet had become the best of the surrounding villages!

When confronted with a choice between the threat of stigmatization and material impoverishment, on the one hand, and the promise of social admiration and economic security on the other, most women sought the latter, even though it entailed the endurance of physical pain and functional impairment. In the early years of the twentieth century, the Nationalist government introduced a brutal reversal of incentives by fining families who bound their daughters' feet and by organizing antfootbinding societies in which parents pledged to forbid their sons to marry footbound women: a striking change was achieved in women's behaviors (Levy, [1966] 1992; Mackie, 1996). Equally compelling constraints apply to the practice of female genital mutilation: in many cultures, it is not only a requirement for marriageability but also an essential component of ethnic identity, making the social and economic price of nonparticipation exorbitant (Dorkenoo & Elworthy, 1992; El Dareer, 1982; *Harvard Law Review*, 1993; Lightfoot-Klein, 1989; Mackie, 1996). The threat of economic hardship alone was sufficiently compelling for thousands of Chinese

men in the Ming dynasty to have themselves castrated in the hope of gaining employment in the imperial courts (Tong, 1988), even though this involved a searing physical impairment and drastic loss of social status.

For women, there has been unremitting pressure to participate in the packaging and commodification of their physical and sexual identity. In a male-dominated institutional nexus in which control over women's bodies and reproductive capacity is a highly valued goal, these are the precious resources within a woman's sphere of action that can make the difference between social success or failure. Thus, women are driven to subject their bodies to various forms and degrees of abuse in an attempt to excel in the beauty standards of their day and enhance their life prospects. Interestingly, in the United States, men have begun to get sucked into the beauty vortex themselves, with an increasing number of men undergoing the rigors of hair transplants and other types of cosmetic surgery in an attempt to promote an image of virility and success (Siebert, 1996).

The apparent complicity of women in their own victimization from forms of violence that are not culturally mandated is equally deceptive. In discussion of sexual harassment cases, the victims are sometimes accused of "playing the game" ("an A for a lay," Taylor, 1981), or at least of failing to express noncompliance by filing a grievance or quitting their jobs. Rape victims are frequently accused by both perpetrators and third parties of precipitating the act through their social behaviors or physical appearance or of actively inviting the behavior (Burt, 1980; LaFree, Reskin, & Visher, 1985; Scully, 1990; Von et al., 1991). Battered wives are sometimes dismissed as having a pathological desire for abuse or of being insufficiently resolute in pressing charges against or leaving their abusive husbands (Browne, 1993; Jones, 1980, pp. 295–296). All of these allegations about the victim's responsibility for her fate fail to recognize the constraints that sharply curtail her options.

Workers who continue to work in settings where they are subject to sexual harassment do so because they are either unaware of alternative employment opportunities or they fear substantial economic or career losses if they move to a new job. Once they decide that their best course of action is to stay on the job, they may well surmise that their best survival strategy is to tolerate the harassment rather than to file a grievance: the same factors that make the victim vulnerable to sexual harassment (her lower institutional status and the lack of witnesses) also make it difficult for her to press charges effectively, making this a risky strategy. A few enterprising women may indeed exploit their sexual assets to promote their careers in an organizational setting that offers few other avenues of recognition. The compliance dilemma is revealed especially sharply in rape victimization. Police advise women that if they are sexually assaulted, their best survival strategy is to offer no resistance, since resistance may result in more serious injuries—but if the woman offers no evidence of physical resistance, she instantly undermines her claim to victimhood.

The options facing battered wives are also tightly constrained. They learn that attempts to resist assaults by their husbands only result in worse injuries (Dobash & Dobash, 1979), but their ensuing behavioral passivity is likely to be misinterpreted as compliance. Battered wives who fail to leave their husbands may have little reason to believe that "leaving" their husbands will actually free them from physical threat. A woman with a possessive, bullying husband may calculate (if her husband does not spell it out himself) that any attempt to leave him will only incite him to further violence, and given that she can neither physically disappear nor go into protective custody, her choices become sharply foreshortened (Browne, 1987; Fagan & Browne, 1994). Indeed, data indicate that women

who have attempted to leave their partners are especially at risk of spousal homicide victimization (Campbell, 1992; Daly & Wilson, 1988, p. 219; Wilson & Daly, 1992a, b, 1993). Within the institution of marriage, the privacy that it affords (and the consequent lack of credible outside witnesses) makes it difficult to press convincing claims of victimhood. The victim is then confronted with the frustrating inconsistency of a society that expresses moral outrage about the category of behaviors but skepticism about her particular case. The battered wife's choices are constricted further by institutionalized practices that give her lower earning potential than her husband, thus reinforcing her economic dependence on him (Ferraro, 1993; Pleck, 1989). Women's vulnerability to harassment in public settings, such as the street and the workplace (Gardner, 1995; U.S. MSPB, 1995), reinforces their wariness of the outside world and drives them to settle for a partner-bodyguard, even if he poses a known physical risk himself (Jackman, 1994). In all but the most extreme cases of wife abuse, wives are also caught in the love trap that envelops paternalistic gender relations. This condones violent outbursts within intimate love relations and mandates forgiveness as the appropriate feminine response: with women's access to love and protection channelled through the institution of marriage, the social and emotional costs of exiting the marriage are escalated (Jackman, 1994, pp. 82–84). Finally, women are trapped in a general "Catch-22," in which they are exhorted to commodify their sexual attributes and to meet a feminine behavioral ideal of deference and compliance, but they are then faulted when their efforts are judged to be responsible for luring men into sexual aggression or inviting physical assault.

In short, the apparent compliance of victims is a booby-trap. Women's lack of resistance to violence against them is no more mysterious than the decision of countless armies of young men to march off to war, with reluctance or enthusiasm, on behalf of causes they may barely understand, or the recurrent decision of workers to submit to hazardous working conditions to support themselves and their families. Tobacco companies may depict cigarette smoking as a matter of individual choice, but it is hardly surprising that the unrestricted marketing of an addictive drug results in immense populations who are unable to quit, despite its known hazards. With any kind of violence, compliance and resistance are difficult to isolate conceptually and are not easily susceptible to empirical observation or measurement. The place of individual agency in submitting to violence is variable, complex, and subject to bias or confusion in its observation.

5. EXPLANATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GENDER AND VIOLENCE

Theoretical explanations of the relationship between gender and violence have fallen into two fairly discrete sets, either focusing singly on violence against women, or on gender differences in the perpetration of violence. There has been little attempt to develop a broad theoretical account of how gender influences both victimization from and the perpetration of various violent actions. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to appraise fully the theoretical accounts that have been offered, but I briefly outline and comment on them. I then sketch out an explanatory approach that addresses the broad range of violent behaviors that are practiced and endured by men and women.

Explanations of the marked gender difference in the propensity to commit violent crimes have centered on whether the difference is due to biological or social factors. Early work suggested that men may be biologically predisposed to aggressive behaviors (Maccoby

& Jacklin, 1974, 1980), but this thesis has since been discredited, on the grounds both that aggression is not linked clearly to hormones and that aggressive behaviors do not differ systematically by gender (Bjorkqvist & Niemela, 1992; Eagly & Steffen, 1986; Kruttschnitt, 1994). Since men and women differ in their rates of physically violent behaviors more than in aggression *per se*, analysts have turned to socialization factors that are gender specific, citing gender differences in closeness of parental supervision and reinforcement of physically aggressive behaviors (Kruttschnitt, 1994). As with other areas of intense debate over nature versus nurture (e.g., the IQ debate), analysts have come increasingly to recognize the point that geneticists have long emphasized—that nature and nurture are not mutually exclusive choices but instead work interactively. Biological proclivities allow a broad range of behavioral expressions, depending on the presence of nourishing or inhibiting environmental factors (e.g., Hirsch, 1973).

Most analysts who have focused on the explanation of violence against women have pursued one or more of the following avenues: (1) *individual-level factors*, relating to the offender and/or the victim, such as childhood socialization into violence, substance abuse, or emotional/psychiatric disturbances that produce either anomalous tendencies toward the commission of violent behaviors, or an attraction toward violent men on the part of battered wives and victims of rape or sexual harassment (e.g., Amir, 1971; Overholser & Beck, 1986; Rada, 1978; Segal & Marshall, 1985; Straus et al., 1980; Taylor, 1981); (2) *social-interaction issues*, relating to strains, tensions, and opportunities for violence inherent in family life or in male–female interaction patterns, or ambiguities in courtship or sexual norms (e.g., Gelles, 1983; Gelles & Straus, 1988; Gillen & Muncer, 1995; Lundberg-Love & Geffner, 1989; Muehlenhard, 1989; Straus et al., 1980); and (3) *gender-politics issues*, such as patriarchal social arrangements and male dominance, whereby men use physical and sexual violence to control and intimidate women (e.g., Brownmiller, 1975; Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Ferraro, 1993; Millett, 1970; Scully, 1990; Scully & Marolla, 1993; Stark & Flitcraft, 1988). All of these theoretical approaches are discussed in more detail elsewhere (e.g., Browne, 1993; Fagan & Browne, 1994; Stark & Flitcraft, 1991; Von et al., 1991): I limit myself here to two brief comments. First, these approaches differ in their expectations about the generality of male-to-female intimate violence: the first treats it as aberrant, while the second and third approaches assume (either implicitly or explicitly) that violence is a normal part of male–female relations. Perhaps for this reason, the first line of explanation has been steadily losing ground to the second and especially the third: the view that social relations are driven by misogyny favors the depiction of violence against women as normal rather than aberrant, and the gender-politics approach is especially consistent with this view. Second, the narrow focus on male-to-female violence of all these explanatory approaches has sharply limited their power. For example, if male violence against women is explained in terms of patriarchal social arrangements or special problems inherent in the institution of the family or in male–female interaction patterns, we are left with no explanation for the more prevalent male-to-male violence.

A more general theoretical explanation of violence against women has been offered by evolutionary psychologists, namely that evolutionary selection has favored a human male with strong sexual proprietariness toward women. Because the successful reproduction of humans requires a major investment from both parents, and because paternity is intrinsically less presumptive than maternity, the human male has evolved with a strong tendency toward sexual jealousy, as men wish to ensure that their parental investment is not squandered on someone else's offspring. This theory posits that most incidents of

male-to-female violence involve some element of sexual jealousy (such as suspected sexual philandering by one's partner, fear of loss of control of or loss of loyalty by one's partner, or presence of stepchildren). This theory has been expounded elegantly and rigorously in a voluminous stream of research (e.g., Burgess & Draper, 1989; Daly & Wilson, 1982, 1988; Wilson & Daly, 1992a, b, 1993; Wilson, Daly, & Daniele, 1995; Wilson et al., 1993, 1995, 1997; Wilson & Mesnick, 1997), although few review essays on violence against women include this theory, presumably on grounds of intellectual taste. Many social researchers find it repugnant to address theories of human behavior that have a biological component: they erroneously believe that the introduction of biological factors rules out the influence of culture and the possibility of socially induced variation around genetic proclivities. This theory is alone among theories of violence against women in its ability to incorporate male-to-male violence as well: Daly and Wilson hold that such violence is spawned by men's rivalrous competition for the economic and status resources that will assist them in gaining control of women and enhancing their reproductive fitness.

Despite its explanatory breadth and power, this theory has two shortcomings. First, in the attempt to subjugate all forms of violence to the drive for reproductive fitness, the latter is elevated to a motivational preeminence that at times seems stretched, especially when trying to address some of the violent behaviors manifested by women (e.g., maternal infanticide). Second, the theory cannot account satisfactorily for the relative lack of violence perpetration among women. Women have every reason to be as jealous as men (and empirical observation confirms this), since evolution should have favored a woman who works to prevent her partner from diverting his resources to other women. However, women's jealousy is less likely to be expressed in violence toward their partners.

A much simpler explanation of the relationship between gender and violence is possible. Violent actions represent one type of behavioral strategy as people negotiate their way through life, attempting to maximize their control over the social, economic, and political resources that will enable them to make the most of their lot and provide for their offspring. People's use of physically violent actions depends on the presumed efficacy of such actions in delivering those resources: when conditions are auspicious, most people apparently do not shrink from employing violent strategies. That, in turn, depends on the attributes of the perpetrator and the victim (their relative size and strength, and their relative ability to protect themselves with social, economic, or political resources), as well as on a number of other facilitating or obstructing factors, such as the presence or absence of sanctions or credible witnesses. Men, on average, commit more physical violence than women because their greater size and strength and their superior command over societal resources makes this a more opportune strategy for them. Most of their violence, however, is directed toward other men: since it is men who disproportionately control societal resources, most contests over resources precipitate encounters with other men, and violence-prone men incite each other into combat. Women—who constitute one of the resources over which men struggle—are less likely to rely on physical violence because they generally lack the physical or institutional means to employ it successfully. However, women do employ violence strategically when it is physically or institutionally opportune: in the confinement or mutilation of their own bodies for social or economic purposes, and in their dealings with those physically or institutionally weaker than themselves (e.g., young children, lower status adults, and men who are weaker or temporarily incapacitated).

The longstanding unequal relationship between men and women has at its core the

contested issue of who shall control sexual access and sexual reproduction. In this contest, men have the biological advantage of greater size and strength, but that initial advantage has long since been converted into the establishment of social, economic, and political institutions that favor men (Jackman, 1994). Those institutions make the constant use of physical force unnecessary to secure male control over women's bodies, and, indeed, stable rule is served better by less clumsy methods as men seek the amicable cooperation of women in their continued subordination (Jackman, 1994). Theorists who attribute violence against women to either patriarchal institutions or the male drive for reproductive fitness erroneously assume that the desire to control women drives men to use violent methods. On the contrary, the quest to control women's bodies has led to the evolution of paternalistic relations between men and women, by which men secure women's subordination through a system of coercive love: women are praised and rewarded for compliant behaviors and stigmatized for noncooperation (Jackman, 1994). Most of the time, this system achieves control without resorting to physical force, although some men do occasionally or habitually use violence to assert their authority. According to this approach, habitual reliance on physical violence is, indeed, an anomaly deriving from counternormative socialization or personality deficiencies, rather than being the central tendency. There is individual variability in the proclivity for physical violence, and some men are sadists, misogynists, psychologically disturbed, or unable to cope with the demands of family life or interpersonal relationships. Other men may employ physical violence on a trial-and-error basis, testing its efficacy against alternative methods of control. Younger men's greater reliance on physical violence may reflect their superior physical strength or their lesser experience with or command of institutionalized gender arrangements.

The high value placed on the resource that lies within women's bodies—sexual access and sexual reproduction—has encouraged the proprietary protection and control of women more than the physical assault of women. Men assume the role of paternalistic bodyguards to their women, and women are exhorted to become the submissive objects of that protection. Thus, most men eschew physical violence in their ongoing interactions with women, and women are generally sheltered from the worst rigors of the battlefield, workplace, consumer marketplace, mob violence, and state-mandated punishments. By the same token, women are socially rewarded for pursuing physical weakness and emotional compliance as their feminine ideals, and stigmatized for deviating from those ideals. In response to these pressures, most women develop deferential behavior patterns in their relations with men of the same class and ethnic status as themselves (but not with children, other women or lower status men), and they are moved, as necessary, to subject their bodies to physical confinement or mutilation to gain acceptance or, better yet, win social admiration. Individual men who use physical violence against women violate the basic operating principles of this system of social control, and are thus a source of profound political embarrassment, triggering both moral condemnation and denial of their actions as other men scramble to distance themselves from these occurrences, minimize them, or cover them up.

According to the routine activities theory of crime (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Cohen, Kluegel, & Land, 1981), our everyday activities prime us to become either accessible or inaccessible as victims of specific criminal or violent behaviors. If we apply this logic, it might seem that the social organization of gender relations throws women in harm's way, since their routine activities bring them into daily, intimate contact with men, who are known to be more prone to physical violence. Gender relations throw women into life-

long, intimate contact with men in an institutional setting that is emotionally saturated and legally sanctioned as an autonomous economic unit screened from public view. When one considers, further, that men generally have greater size and strength than women, it would seem that both physical and institutional factors prime women to become the perfect targets for interpersonal violence. On this basis, we should expect a high incidence of physical violence by men against women. Some men do indeed exploit the opportunities for violence against women that are thus provided them, but, in general, men are more likely to inflict violence on other men than on women. The answer to this apparent enigma lies precisely in men's long-standing concern with maintaining control over women's bodies. Although skirmishes and violent outbursts remain a part of the overall pattern of domination and subjugation, stable control is generally served more effectively by institutional means than by raw physical force. Thus, most men, most of the time, direct their physical violence toward male rivals, rather than toward female subordinates.

REFERENCES

- Amir, M. (1971). *Patterns in forcible rape*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Astin, M. C., Lawrence, K. J., & Foy, D. W. (1993). Posttraumatic stress disorder among battered women: Risk and resiliency factors. *Violence and Victims, 8*, 17–32.
- Bachman, R., & Saltzman, L. E. (1995). *Violence against women: Estimates from the redesigned survey: Bureau of Justice Statistics special report*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-154348.
- Bachrach, P., & Baratz, M. S. (1970). *Power and poverty: Theory and practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Barstow, A. L. (1995). *Witchcraze: A new history of the European witch hunts*. San Francisco: Harper Collins.
- Bart, P., & O'Brien, P. (1985). *Stopping rape: Successful survival strategies*. New York: Pergamon.
- Benson, D. J., & Thomson, G. E. (1982). Sexual harassment on a college campus: The confluence of authority relations, sexual interest and gender stratification. *Social Problems, 29*, 236–251.
- Berk, R. A., Berk, S. F., Loseke, D. R., & Rauma, D. (1983). Mutual combat and other family violence myths. In D. Finkelhor, R. J. Gelles, G. T. Hotaling, & M. A. Straus (Eds.), *The dark side of families: Current family violence research* (pp. 197–212). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Berndt, R. M., & Berndt, C. H. (1964). *The world of the first Australians: An introduction to the traditional life of the Australian Aborigines*. Sydney: Ure Smith.
- Bjorkqvist, K., & Niemela, P. (Eds.) (1992). *Of mice and women: Aspects of female aggression*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Blake, C. F. (1994). Foot-binding in neo-Confucian China and the appropriation of female labor. *Signs, 19*, 676–712.
- Blee, K. M. (1991). *Women of the Klan: Racism and gender in the 1920's*. Berkeley & Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Bohannon, P. (1967). Patterns of homicide among tribal societies in Africa. In M. Wolfgang (Ed.), *Studies in homicide* (pp. 211–237). New York: Harper and Row.
- Bradshaw, Y. W., & Wallace, M. (1996). *Global inequalities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Brandeis, L. B., & Goldmark, J. ([1907]1969). *Women in industry*. New York: Arno and the New York Times.
- British Parliamentary Papers. ([1842]1968). *Children's Employment Commission, first report of the commissioners, mines: Vol. 6, Industrial revolution, children's employment*. Shannon, Ireland: Irish University Press.
- Browne, A. (1987). *When battered women kill*. New York: Macmillan/The Free Press.
- Browne, A. (1993). Violence against women by male partners: Prevalence, outcomes, and policy implications. *American Psychologist, 48*, 1077–1087.
- Brownell, K. D., & Rodin, J. (1994). The dieting maelstrom: Is it possible and advisable to lose weight? *American Psychologist, 49*, 781–791.
- Brownmiller, S. (1975). *Against our will: Men, women, and rape*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Brownmiller, S. (1984). *Femininity*. New York: Fawcett Columbine.
- Brundage, W. F. (1993). *Lynching in the new South: Georgia and Virginia, 1880–1930*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

- Brush, L. D. (1993). Violent acts and injurious outcomes in married couples: Methodological issues in the National Survey of Families and Households. In P. B. Bart & E. G. Moran (Eds.), *Violence against women: The bloody footprints* (pp. 240–251). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bulman, R. J., & Wortman, C. B. (1977). Attributions of blame and coping in the “real world”: Severe accident victims react to their lot. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 351–363.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (1994). *Work injuries and illnesses by selected characteristics, 1992*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (1995). *Work injuries and illnesses by selected characteristics, 1993*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (1996). *National census of fatal occupational injuries, 1995*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor.
- Burgess, R. L., & Draper, P. (1989). The explanation of family violence: The role of biological, behavioral, and cultural selection. In L. Ohlin & M. Tonry (Eds.), *Family violence: Crime and justice, a review of research*, Vol. 11 (pp. 19–57). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Burke, C. (1992). The trail to Tailhook. *San Francisco Chronicle Review*, August 16.
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 217–230.
- Cameron, J. (1982). *A time of terror: A survivor's story*. Baltimore: Black Classic Press.
- Campbell, J. C. (1992). “If I can’t have you, no one can”: Power and control in homicide of female partners. In J. Radford & D. E. H. Russell (Eds.), *Femicide* (pp. 99–113). New York: Twayne.
- Claybrook, J. (1996). Women in the marketplace. In E. Szockyj & J. G. Fox (Eds.), *Corporate victimization of women* (pp. 111–142). Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Coale, A. J. (1991). Excess female mortality and the balance of the sexes in the population: An estimate of the number of “missing females.” *Population and Development Review*, 17, 517–523.
- Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review*, 44, 588–608.
- Cohen, L. E., Kluegel, J. R., & Land, K. (1981). Social inequality and criminal victimization. *American Sociological Review*, 46, 505–524.
- Combs, D. L., & Donoghue, E. R. (1994). Child deaths from consumer products and guns. *The Lancet*, 343 (June 25), 1642.
- Craven, D. (1996). *Female victims of violent crime: Bureau of Justice Statistics selected findings*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-162602.
- Culbertson, A. L., Rosenfeld, P., Booth-Kewley, S., & Magnusson, P. (1992). *Assessment of sexual harassment in the Navy: Results of the 1989 Navy-wide survey, TR-92-11*. San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.
- Daly, M., & Wilson, M. I. (1982). Homicide and kinship. *American Anthropologist*, 84, 372–378.
- Daly, M., & Wilson, M. I. (1988). *Homicide*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Darke, J. L. (1990). Sexual aggression: Achieving power through humiliation. In W. L. Marshall, D. R. Laws, & H. E. Barbaree (Eds.), *Handbook of sexual assault: Issues, theories, and treatment of the offender* (pp. 55–72). New York: Plenum Press.
- Das Gupta, M. 1987. “Selective discrimination against female children in rural Punjab, India.” *Population and Development Review*, 13, 77–100.
- Dawson, J. M., & Langan, P. A. (1994). *Murder in families: Bureau of Justice Statistics special report*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy*. New York: The Free Press.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. (1983). The context-specific approach. In D. Finkelhor, R. J. Gelles, G. T. Hotaling, & M. A. Straus (Eds.), *The dark side of families: Current family violence research* (pp. 261–276). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Dorkenoo, E., & Elworthy, S. (1992). *Female genital mutilation: proposals for change*. London: Minority Rights Group.
- Dunnigan, J. F. (1993). *How to make war: A comprehensive guide to modern warfare for the post-cold war era* (2nd ed.). New York: William Morrow.
- Dutton, D. G. (1988). *The domestic assault of women: Psychological and criminal justice perspectives*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Dutton, D. G. (1995). *The domestic assault of women: Psychological and criminal justice perspectives* (revised and expanded edition). Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Dworkin, A. (1981). *Pornography: Men possessing women*. London: Women’s Press.

- Dworkin, A. (1994). Gynocide: Chinese footbinding. In A. M. Jaggar (Ed.), *Living with contradictions: Controversies in feminist social ethics* (pp. 213–219). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1986). Gender and aggressive behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, *100*, 309–330.
- The Economist*. (1997). Nordic eugenics: Here, of all places. August 30, 36–37.
- El Dareer, A. (1982). *Woman, why do you weep?: Circumcision and its consequences*. London: Zed Press.
- Elkins, S. M. (1968). *Slavery: A problem in American institutional and intellectual life* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ember, C. R., & Ember, M. (1995). Issues in cross-cultural studies of interpersonal violence. In R. B. Ruback & N. A. Weiner (Eds.), *Interpersonal violent behaviors: Social and cultural aspects* (pp. 25–43). New York: Springer.
- Engels, F. ([1884] 1972). *The origin of the family, private property and the state*. New York: International Publishers.
- Fagan, J., & Browne, A. (1994). Violence between spouses and intimates: Physical aggression between women and men in intimate relationships. In A. J. Reiss, Jr., & J. A. Roth (Eds.), *Understanding and preventing violence*, Vol. 3: *Social influences* (pp. 115–292). Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (1981–1995). *Uniform Crime Reports: Crime in the United States* (annual). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Ferraro, K. (1993). Cops, courts, and woman battering. In P. B. Bart & E. G. Moran (Eds.), *Violence against women: The bloody footprints*, (pp. 165–176). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Finkelhor, D., & Yllo, K. (1983). Rape in marriage: A sociological view. In D. Finkelhor, R. J. Gelles, G. T. Hotaling, & M. A. Straus (Eds.), *The dark side of families: Current family violence research* (pp. 119–130). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Finley, L. M. (1996). The pharmaceutical industry and women's reproductive health. In E. Szockyj & J. G. Fox (Eds.), *Corporate victimization of women* (pp. 59–111). Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Flowers, R. B. (1994). *The victimization and exploitation of women and children: A study of physical, mental and sexual maltreatment in the United States*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co.
- French, M. (1992). *The war against women*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Frieze, I. H. (1983). Investigating the causes and consequences of marital rape. *Signs*, *8*, 532–553.
- Frieze, I. H., & Browne, A. (1989). Violence in marriage. In L. Ohlin & M. Tonry (Eds.), *Family violence: Crime and justice, a review of research*, Vol. 11 (pp. 163–218). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gardner, C. B. (1995). *Passing by: Gender and public harassment*. Berkeley & Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Gartner, R. (1995). Methodological issues in cross-cultural large-survey research on violence. In R. B. Ruback & N. A. Weiner (Eds.), *Interpersonal violent behaviors: Social and cultural aspects* (pp. 7–24). New York: Springer.
- Gelles, R. J. (1979). *Family violence*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Gelles, R. J. (1983). An exchange/social control theory. In D. Finkelhor, R. J. Gelles, G. T. Hotaling, & M. A. Straus (Eds.), *The dark side of families: Current family violence research* (pp. 151–165). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Gelles, R. J., & Straus, M. A. (1988). *Intimate violence: The causes and consequences of abuse in the American family*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Genovese, E. (1974). *Roll, Jordan, roll: The world the slaves made*. New York: Random House.
- Gillen, K., & Muncer, S. J. (1995). Sex differences in the perceived causal structure of date rape: A preliminary report. *Aggressive Behavior*, *21*, 101–112.
- Graham, H. D., & Gurr, T. R. (Eds.) (1969). *Violence in America: Historical and comparative perspectives. A report to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence*, Vols. I and II. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Greenblat, C. S. (1983). A hit is a hit is a hit...Or is it? In D. Finkelhor, R. J. Gelles, G. T. Hotaling, & M. A. Straus (Eds.), *The dark side of families: Current family violence research* (pp. 235–260). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Greenfeld, L. A. (1997). *Sex offenses and offenders: An analysis of data on rape and sexual assault*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-163392.
- Gurr, T. R. (1981). Historical trends in violent crime: A critical review of the evidence. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (Eds.), *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research*, Vol. 3 (pp. 295–353). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gutek, B. A., & Koss, M. P. (1997). Changed women and changed organizations: Consequences of and coping with sexual harassment. In L. L. O'Toole & J. R. Schiffman (Eds.), *Gender violence: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 151–164). New York: New York University Press.

- Hair, W. I. (1989). "Lynching." In C. R. Wilson & W. Ferris (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Southern culture*, Vol. 1 (pp. 294–297). New York: Anchor.
- Hall, J. D. (1983). "The mind that burns in each body": Women, rape, and racial violence. In A. Snitow, C. Stansell, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Powers of desire: The politics of sexuality* (pp. 328–349). New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Harvard Law Review* (no author attributed). (1993). Note: What's culture got to do with it? Excising the harmful tradition of female circumcision. *Harvard Law Review*, 106, 1944–1962.
- Henley, N. M. (1977). *Body politics: Power, sex, and nonverbal communication*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Henley, N. M., & Freeman, J. (1979). The sexual politics of interpersonal behavior. In J. Freeman (Ed.), *Women: A feminist perspective* (2nd ed.). (pp. 474–486). Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.
- Henley, N. M., & Harmon, S. (1985). The nonverbal semantics of power and gender: A perceptual study. In S. L. Ellyson & J. F. Dovidio (Eds.), *Power, dominance, and nonverbal behavior* (pp. 151–164). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Hester, M. (1992). The witch-craze in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England as social control of women. In J. Radford & D. E. H. Russell (Eds.), *Femicide* (pp. 27–39). New York: Twayne.
- Hirsch, J. (1973). Behavior-genetic analysis and its biosocial consequences. In K. S. Miller & R. M. Dreger (Ed.), *Comparative studies of blacks and whites in the United States* (pp. 34–51). New York: Academic Press.
- Hirschi, T., & Selvin, H. C. (1967). *Delinquency research: An appraisal of analytic methods*. New York: The Free Press.
- Holinger, P. C. (1987). *Violent deaths in the United States: An epidemiologic study of suicide, homicide, and accidents*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Inhorn, M. C., & Buss, K. A. (1993). Infertility, infection, and iatrogenesis in Egypt: The anthropological epidemiology of blocked tubes. *Medical Anthropology: Cross-Cultural Studies in Health and Illness*, 15, 217–244.
- Jackman, M. R. (1994). *The velvet glove: Paternalism and conflict in gender, class, and race relations*. Berkeley & Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Jackman, M. R. (in preparation). *The social capacity for violence*. Berkeley & Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Jackman, R. W. (1993). *Power without force: The political capacity of nation-states*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Jackson, R. (1990). The Chinese foot-binding syndrome: Observations on the history and sequelae of wearing ill-fitting shoes. *International Journal of Dermatology*, 29, 322–328.
- Jones, A. (1980). *Women who kill*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Kachur, S. P., Potter, L. B., James, S. P., & Powell, K. E. (1995). *Suicide in the United States 1980–1992*. Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control.
- Katz, S., and Mazur, M. A. (1979). *Understanding the rape victim: A synthesis of research findings*. New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- Kelly, L. (1987). The continuum of sexual violence. In J. Hanmer & M. Maynard (Eds.), *Women, violence and social control* (pp. 46–60). London: Macmillan.
- Kelkar, G. (1992). Women and structural violence in India. In J. Radford & D. E. H. Russell (Eds.), *Femicide* (pp. 117–122). New York: Twayne.
- Kolchin, P. (1993). *American slavery 1619–1877*. New York: Hill & Wang.
- Koss, M. P. (1992). The underdetection of rape: Methodological choices influence incidence estimates. *Journal of Social Issues*, 48, 61–75.
- Kruttschnitt, C. (1994). Gender and interpersonal violence. In A. J. Reiss, Jr., & J. A. Roth (Eds.), *Understanding and preventing violence*, Vol. 3: *Social influences* (pp. 293–376). Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Kruttschnitt, C. (1995). Violence by and against women: A comparative and cross-national analysis. In R. B. Ruback & N. A. Weiner (Eds.), *Interpersonal violent behaviors: Social and cultural aspects* (pp. 89–108). New York: Springer.
- Kurz, D. (1993). Social science perspectives on wife abuse: current debates and future directions. In P. B. Bart & E. G. Moran (Eds.), *Violence against women: The bloody footprints* (pp. 252–269). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- LaFree, G. D., Reskin, B. F., & Visher, C. A. (1985). Jurors' responses to victims' behavior and legal issues in sexual assault trials. *Social Problems*, 32, 389–407.
- Langan, P. A., & Dawson, J. M. (1995). *Spouse murder defendants in large urban counties*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-153256.
- Langan, P. A., & Innes, C. A. (1986). *Preventing domestic violence against women*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

- Laumann, E. O., Gagnon, J. H., Michael, R. T., & Michaels, S. (1994). *The social organization of sexuality: Sexual practices in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lerner, M. J., & Simmons, C. H. (1966). Observer's reaction to the "innocent victim": Compassion or rejection? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, 203–210.
- Levack, Brian P. 1995. *The witch-hunt in early modern Europe* (2nd. ed.). London: Longman.
- Levy, H. S. ([1966] 1992). *The lotus lovers: The complete history of the curious erotic custom of footbinding in China*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Lightfoot-Klein, H. (1989). *Prisoners of ritual: An odyssey into female genital circumcision in Africa*. New York: Haworth Press.
- Lukes, S. (1974). *Power: A radical view*. London: Macmillan.
- Lundberg-Love, P., & Geffner, R. (1989). Date-rape: prevalence, risk factors, and a proposed model. In M. A. Pirog-Good & J. E. Stets, *Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues* (pp. 169–184). New York: Praeger.
- Lynch, J. (1995). Crime in international perspective. In J. Q. Wilson and J. Petersilia (Eds.), *Crime* (pp. 11–38, 511–517). San Francisco: ICS Press.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). *The psychology of sex differences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1980). Sex differences in aggression: A rejoinder and reprise. *Child Development*, 51, 964–980.
- Mackie, G. (1996). Ending footbinding and infibulation: A convention account. *American Sociological Review*, 61, 999–1017.
- MacKinnon, C. (1979). *Sexual harassment of working women*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- MacKinnon, C. (1993). *Only words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Malamuth, N. M. (1981). Rape proclivity among males. *Journal of Social Issues*, 37, 138–157.
- Manchester, W. (1992). *A world lit only by fire: The medieval mind and the Renaissance*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Mann, R. W., Sledzik, P. S., Owsley, D. W., & Droulette, M. R. (1990). Radiographic examination of Chinese foot binding. *Journal of the American Podiatric Medical Association*, 80, 405–409.
- Marshall, W. L., Laws, D. R., & Barbaree, H. E. (1990). *Handbook of sexual assault*. New York: Plenum.
- Martin, P. Y., & Hummer, R. A. (1993). Fraternities and rape on campus. In P. B. Bart & E. G. Moran (Eds.), *Violence against women: The bloody footprints* (pp. 114–131). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- May, M. (1978). Violence in the family: An historical perspective. In J. P. Martin (Ed.), *Violence and the family* (pp. 135–167). New York: Wiley.
- McCormack, A. (1985). The sexual harassment of students by teachers: The case of students in science. *Sex Roles*, 13, 21–32.
- McGarity, T. O., & Shapiro, S. A. (1993). *Workers at risk: The failed promise of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Mercy, J. A., & Saltzman, L. E. (1989). Fatal violence among spouses in the United States, 1976–1985. *American Journal of Public Health*, 79, 595–599.
- Mill, J. S. ([1869] 1970). The subjection of women. In A. S. Rossi (Ed.), *Essays on sex equality: John Stuart Mill and Harriet Taylor Mill* (pp. 123–242). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Miller, D. T., & Porter, C. A. (1983). Self-blame in victims of violence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 39, 139–152.
- Millet, K. (1970). *Sexual politics*. New York: Doubleday.
- Minturn, L., & J. Shashak. (1982). Infanticide as a terminal abortion procedure. *Behavior Science Research*, 17, 70–90.
- Montagu, A. ([1937] 1974). *Coming into being among the Aborigines: A study of the procreative beliefs of the native tribes of Australia* (revised edition). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Muehlenhard, C. L. (1989). Misinterpreted dating behaviors and the risk of date rape. In M. A. Pirog-Good & J. E. Stets, *Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues* (pp. 241–156). New York: Praeger.
- Mushanga, T. (1978). Wife victimization in East and Central Africa. *Victimology*, 2, 479–485.
- Nagel, I. H., & Hagen, J. (1983). Gender and crime: Offense patterns and criminal court sanctions. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (Eds.), *Crime and justice: An annual review of research*, Vol. 4 (pp. 91–144). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- National Safe Workplace Institute. (1990). *Beyond neglect: The problem of occupational disease in the United States—Labor Day '90 report*. Chicago: The Institute.
- National Safety Council. (1995). *Accident facts*. Chicago: National Safety Council.
- Office of Technology Assessment. (1985). *Preventing Illness and Injury in the Workplace*, OTA-H-256. 99th Congress. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- Ohlin, L., & Tonry, M. (Eds.) (1989). *Family violence: Crime and justice, a review of research*, Vol. 11. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- O'Toole, L. L., & Schiffman, J. R. (Eds.) (1997). *Gender violence: Interdisciplinary perspectives*. New York: New York University Press.
- Overholser, J. C., & Beck, S. (1986). Multi-method assessment of rapists, child molesters, and three control groups in behavioral and psychological measures. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 54, 682-687.
- Pagelow, M. D. (1984). *Family violence*. New York: Praeger.
- Perkins, C., & Klaus, P. (1996). *Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, National Crime Victimization Survey: Criminal victimization 1994*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-158022.
- Perrot, M. (1990). *A history of private life: From the fires of revolution to the Great War*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Peters, E. (1988). *Inquisition*. Berkeley & Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Peto, R., Lopez, A. D., Boreham, J., Thun, M., & Heath, Jr., C. (1992). Mortality from tobacco in developed countries: Indirect estimation from national vital statistics. *The Lancet*, 339, 1268-1278.
- Pleck, E. (1987). *Domestic tyranny: The making of American social policy against family violence from colonial times to the present*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pleck, E. (1989). Criminal approaches to family violence, 1640-1980. In L. Ohlin & M. Tonry (Eds.), *Family violence: Crime and justice, a review of research*, Vol. 11 (pp. 19-57). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pollack, E. S., & Keimig, D. G. (Eds.) (1987). *Counting injuries and illnesses in the workplace: proposals for a better system*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Priest, D. (1997). Sex harassment rampant, Army reports. *Sacramento Bee*, Friday, September 12.
- Rada, R. T. (1978). *Clinical aspects of rape*. New York: Grune & Stratton.
- Radford, J., & Russell, D. E. H. (Eds.) (1992). *Femicide: The politics of woman killing*. New York: Twayne.
- Rand, M. R., & Ström, K. (1997). *Violence-related injuries treated in hospital emergency departments*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-156921.
- Reiss, A. J., & Roth, J. A. (Eds.) (1993). *Understanding and preventing violence*, Vol. 1. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Reiss, A. J., & Roth, J. A. (Eds.) (1994) *Understanding and preventing violence*, Vol. 3: *Social influences*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Richter, P. (1997). Army seeks sweat equity in wake of sexual harassment. *Los Angeles Times*, Sunday, September 14.
- Rodin, J., Silberstein, L., & Striegel-Moore. (1985). Women and weight: A normative discontent. In T. B. Sonderegger (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation 1984: Psychology and gender*, Vol. 32 (pp. 267-307). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Ruback, R. B., & Weiner, N. A. (Eds.) (1995). *Interpersonal violent behaviors: Social and cultural aspects*. New York: Springer.
- Russell, J. B. (1972). *Witchcraft in the Middle Ages*. Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Russell, D. E. H. (1982). *Rape in marriage*. New York: Macmillan.
- Russell, D. E. H. (1984). *Sexual exploitation: Rape, child sexual abuse, and workplace harassment*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Sanday, P. R. (1981). The socio-cultural context of rape: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Social Issues*, 37, 5-27.
- Satel, S. L. (1997). Feminist numbers game. *The New York Times*, Op-Ed, September 11.
- Scheper-Hughes, Nancy. (1992). *Death without weeping: The violence of everyday life in Brazil*. Berkeley & Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Schneider, B. E. (1993). Put up and shut up: Workplace sexual assaults. In P. B. Bart & E. G. Moran (Eds.), *Violence against women: The bloody footprints* (pp. 57-72). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Schroedel, J. R., & Peretz, P. (1994). A gender analysis of policy formation: The case of fetal abuse. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law*, 19, 335-360.
- Scully, D. (1990). *Understanding sexual violence: A study of convicted rapists*. New York: Routledge.
- Scully, D., & Marolla, J. (1993). "Riding the bull at Gilley's:" Convicted rapists describe the rewards of rape. In P. B. Bart & E. G. Moran (Eds.), *Violence against women: The bloody footprints* (pp. 26-46). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Sedlack, A., & Broadhurst, D. D. (1996). *Third National Incidence Study of Child Abuse and Neglect: Final report*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Segal, Z. V., & Marshall, W. L. (1985). Heterosexual social skills in a population of rapists and child molesters. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 53, 55-63.
- Sen, A. (1990). More than 100 million women are missing. *New York Review of Books*, December 20, 61-65.

- Sen, A. (1992). Missing women: Social inequality outweighs women's survival advantage in Asia and North Africa. *British Medical Journal*, 304, 587–588.
- Sheffield, C. J. (1993). The invisible intruder: Women's experiences of obscene phone calls. In P. B. Bart & E. G. Moran (Eds.), *Violence against women: The bloody footprints* (pp. 73–78). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Siebert, C. (1996). The cuts that go deeper. *The New York Times Magazine*, July 7, 20–45.
- Skinner, G. W. (1993). Conjugal power in Tokugawa Japanese families: A matter of life or death. In B. D. Miller (Ed.), *Sex and gender hierarchies* (pp. 236–270). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Small, M., & Singer, J. D. (1982). *Resort to arms: International and civil wars, 1816–1980*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Smith, M. D., & Morra, N. N. (1997). Obscene and threatening telephone calls to women: Data from a Canadian national survey. In L. L. O'Toole & J. R. Schiffman (Eds.), *Gender violence: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 139–145). New York: New York University Press.
- Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (1996). Obsessive relational intrusion: Victimization and coping. Paper presented at the International Society for the Study of Personal Relationships, Banff, Canada, August 4–8.
- Stampp, K. M. ([1956] 1989). *The peculiar institution: Slavery in the ante-bellum South*. New York: Vintage.
- Stanko, E. A. (1985). *Intimate intrusions: Women's experience of male violence*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Stark, E., & Flitcraft, A. H. (1988). Personal power and institutional victimization: Treating the dual trauma of woman battering. In F. M. Ochberg (Ed.), *Post-traumatic therapy and victims of violence* (pp. 115–151). New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Stark, E., & Flitcraft, A. H. (1991). Spouse abuse. In M. L. Rosenberg & M. A. Fenley (Eds.), *Violence in America: A public health approach* (pp. 123–158). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stark, E., Flitcraft, A. H., & Frazier, W. (1979). Medicine and patriarchal violence: The social construction of a "private" event. *International Journal of Health Services*, 9, 461–493.
- State v. A. B. Rhodes. (1868). In *North Carolina reports*, Vol. 61: *Cases at law argued and determined in the Supreme Court of North Carolina June term, 1866 to January term, 1868 inclusive* (pp. 349–354).
- Steinmetz, S. K. (1977–1978). The battered husband syndrome. *Victimology*, 2, 499–509.
- Stermac, L. E., Segal, Z. V., & Gillis, R. (1990). Social and cultural factors in sexual assault. In W. L. Marshall, D. R. Laws, & H. E. Barbaree (Eds.), *Handbook of sexual assault: Issues, theories, and treatment of the offender* (pp. 143–159). New York: Plenum Press.
- Stone, L. (1983). Interpersonal violence in English society, 1300–1980. *Past and Present*, 101, 122–133.
- Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (Eds.) (1990a). *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (Eds.) (1990b). How violent are American families? Estimates from the National Family Violence Resurvey and other studies. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families* (pp. 95–112). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. (1980). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family*. Garden City, NJ: Anchor.
- Sugarman, D. B., & Hotaling, G. T. (1989). Dating violence: Prevalence, context, and risk markers. In M. A. Pirog-Good & J. E. Stets (Eds.), *Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues* (pp. 3–32). New York: Praeger.
- Szockyj, E., & Frank, N. (1996). Introduction. In E. Szockyj & J. G. Fox (Eds.), *Corporate victimization of women* (pp. 3–32). Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Tannahill, R. (1992). *Sex in history* (revised and updated edition). New York: Scarborough House.
- Taylor, B. M. (1997). *Bureau of Justice Statistics National Crime Victimization Survey: Changes in criminal victimization, 1994–95*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-162032.
- Taylor, R. (1981). Within the halls of ivy—The sexual revolution comes of age. *Change*, 13, 22–29.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1997). Stalking in America: Findings from the National Violence against Women Survey. In *NIJ research in progress seminar*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Tolman, R. M. 1989. The development of a measure of the psychological maltreatment of women by their male partners. *Violence and Victims* 4, 159–178.
- Tong, J. (1988). Rational outlaws: Rebels and bandits in the Ming Dynasty, 1368–1644. In M. Taylor (Ed.), *Rationality and Revolution* (pp. 98–128). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Totman, J. (1978). *The murdereress: A psychosocial study of criminal homicide*. San Francisco: R. E. Research Associates.

- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (1988). *Study findings: Study of National Incidence and Prevalence of Child Abuse and Neglect: 1988*. Washington, D.C.: Westat, Inc.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (1989). *Reducing the health consequences of smoking: 25 years of progress. A report of the Surgeon General*. Washington, D.C.: DHHS Publication No. (CDC) 89-8411.
- U.S. Department of Labor. (1994). *1993 Handbook on women workers: Trends and issues*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor.
- U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board. (1981). *Sexual harassment in the federal workplace: Is it a problem?* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board. (1995). *Sexual harassment in the federal workplace: Trends, progress, continuing challenges*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. National Center for Health Statistics. (1993). *Vital statistics of the the United States, annual*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Center for Health Statistics.
- Venkatramani, S. H. (1992). Female infanticide: Born to die. In J. Radford & D. E. H. Russell (Eds.), *Femicide* (pp. 1125-1132). New York: Twayne.
- Verrko, V. (1967). Static and dynamic "laws" of sex and homicide. In M. E. Wolfgang (Ed.), *Studies in homicide* (pp. 36-44). New York: Harper & Row.
- Von, J. M., Kilpatrick, D. G., Burgess, A. W., & Hartman, C. R. (1991). Rape and sexual assault. In M. L. Rosenberg & M. A. Fenley (Eds.), *Violence in America: A public health approach* (pp. 95-122). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Walker, L. E. (1979). *The battered woman*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Warr, M. (1994). Public perceptions and reactions to violent offending and victimization. In A. J. Reiss & J. A. Roth (Eds.), *Understanding and preventing violence*, Vol. 4: *Consequences and control*, (pp. 1-66). Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Weis, J. G. (1989). Family violence research methodology and design. In L. Ohlin & M. Tonry (Eds.), *Family violence* (pp. 117-162). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- White, W. ([1929] 1969). *Rope and faggot*. New York: Amo Press.
- Wilson, J. Q., & Herrnstein, R. J. (1985). *Crime and human nature*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Wilson, M. I., & Daly, M. (1992a). 'Til death us do part. In J. Radford & D. E. H. Russell (Eds.), *Femicide* (pp. 83-98). New York: Twayne.
- Wilson, M. I., & Daly, M. (1992b). Who kills whom in spouse killings? On the exceptional sex ratio of spousal homicides in the United States. *Criminology*, 30, 189-215.
- Wilson, M. I., & Daly, M. (1993). Spousal homicide risk and estrangement. *Violence and Victims*, 8, 3-16.
- Wilson, M. I., & Mesnick, S. L. (1997). An empirical test of the bodyguard hypothesis. In P. A. Gowaty (Ed.), *Feminism and evolutionary biology: Boundaries, intersections, and frontiers* (pp. 431-465). New York: Chapman & Hall.
- Wilson, M., Daly, M., & Wright, C. (1993). Uxoricide in Canada: Demographic risk patterns. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 35, 263-291.
- Wilson, M. I., Daly, M., & Daniele, A. (1995). Familicide: The killing of spouse and children. *Aggressive Behavior*, 21, 275-291.
- Wilson, M., Daly, M., & Scheib, J. E. (1997). Femicide: An evolutionary psychological perspective. In P. A. Gowaty (Ed.), *Feminism and evolutionary biology: Boundaries, intersections, and frontiers* (pp. 431-465). New York: Chapman & Hall.
- Wilson, M. I., Johnson, H., & Daly, M. (1995). Lethal and non-lethal violence against wives. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 37, 331-361.
- Wolf, N. (1992). *The beauty myth: How images of beauty are used against women*. New York: Anchor.
- Wolfgang, M. E. (1967a). Criminal homicide and the subculture of violence. In M. E. Wolfgang (Ed.), *Studies in homicide* (pp. 3-14). New York: Harper & Row.
- Wolfgang, M. E. (1967b). A sociological analysis of criminal homicide. In M. E. Wolfgang (Ed.), *Studies in homicide* (pp. 15-28). New York: Harper & Row.
- Wolfgang, M. E. (1967c). Victim-precipitated criminal homicide. In M. E. Wolfgang (Ed.), *Studies in homicide* (pp. 72-87). New York: Harper & Row.
- World Health Organization. (1996). *Female genital mutilation: Information pack*. World Health Organization Internet Home-page.
- Wright, G. L. (1994). Deaf black man, 96, free after 68 years in asylum. *The Sacramento Bee*, Saturday, February 5.
- Wright, Q. (1965). *A study of war* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wyatt-Brown, B. (1982). *Southern honor: Ethics and behavior in the old South*. New York: Oxford University Press.