Volume 13 Issue 36
Originally issued as C5

Global Journal of human social science
Sociology & Culture
Volume 13 Issue 5 Version 1.0 Year 2013
Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Publisher: Global Journals Inc. (USA)
Online ISSN: 2249-460X & Print ISSN: 0975-587X

Inclusive Interpretation of Sex, Gender and Sexuality versus Sexual Violence Against Women

By Rabindra Garada (PhD)
Utkal University, Odisha, India

Abstract - Sexual violence against women despite being highly condemned and goddamned in most places, why continues to be an alarmingly endemic and pandemic issue, raises a substantial gender query. This article explores an analytical connection that persists between the inclusive interpretation of sex, gender and sexuality, on the most typical way, and the actuality of human sexual violence, on the strange. This study discloses that the masculine heterosexual and gender interpretation of sex and sexuality perpetuates such violence. The dimensions and factors for sexual abuse/ violence are structured and processed such ways that female gender is often desecrated by men, homosexuals or lesbians are despised by heterosexuals, and feminine submissiveness is violently abused by masculine aggressiveness in different social settings. To demystify the gendered activated stock-still violence against women a sexual exploitation/violence specific based on hetero and non-hetero sexual orientations in cross Figure format has been creatively endeavoured in this article. Our study also tresses that since sexual violence of basic nature going tougher/ complicated with newer individual findings/ interpretations at present context, the researchers have to develop a theoretical comprehensive perspective on the entire gospel of sexual violence against women that has been persisting across global regions, religions, races, etc.

Keywords : *gender, sex, sexuality, violence, exploitation.*

GJHSS-C Classification : *FOR Code: 420303*



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of :

© 2013. Rabindra Garada. This is a research/review paper, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 Unported License http:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/), permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Inclusive Interpretation of Sex, Gender and Sexuality versus Sexual Violence Against Women

Rabindra Garada (PhD)

Abstract - Sexual violence against women despite being highly condemned and goddamned in most places, why continues to be an alarmingly endemic and pandemic issue, raises a substantial gender query. This article explores an analytical connection that persists between the inclusive interpretation of sex, gender and sexuality, on the most typical way, and the actuality of human sexual violence, on the strange. This study discloses that the masculine heterosexual and gender interpretation of sex and sexuality perpetuates such violence. The dimensions and factors for sexual abuse/ violence are structured and processed such ways that female gender is often desecrated by men, homosexuals or lesbians are despised by heterosexuals, and feminine submissiveness is violently abused by masculine aggressiveness in different social settings. To demystify the gendered activated stock-still violence against women a sexual exploitation/violence specific based on hetero and non-hetero sexual orientations in cross Figure format has been creatively endeavoured in this article. Our study also tresses that since sexual violence of basic nature going tougher/ complicated with newer individual findings/ interpretations at present context, the researchers have to develop a theoretical comprehensive perspective on the entire gospel of sexual violence against women that has been persisting across global regions, religions, races, etc.

Keywords : gender, sex, sexuality, violence, exploitation.

I. Introduction

Whether sexual violence may be committed among heterosexuals or among homosexuals/lesbians or against latter by former but why woman is its worst victim has been the intense speculation throughout the entire world. Recently in reaction to the generality of a gang rape in Delhi, it is heatedly reacted, mentioned and debated all over India. Of all violence against women the sexual violence is the most heinous crime committed in manifest and latent forms worldwide. It is also committed against men but like against women it is not significantly widespread and socio-culturally deep rooted. Indeed, the pervasiveness of male violence over female sexuality is far different and laudable. Further, its multiplicity is largely region specific-local/global, tradition/modernity specific-old/new and context specific-actual/virtual, and conjointly its diversity gets reflected in term of women's personal attributes- age, body, beauty, etc, and their primordial identities- ethnicity, caste, religion, etc. It seems to be an act of sexual terrorism because the society has gone astray in ever increasing anomic situation in all places or lets the male perpetrators go scot free amidst its established systems of patriarchy, corruptions, politics, sex trade, pornography, etc. Thus, it is not simply a criminal offense against women's sexuality however, an ensuing violence against their sexual right, bodily chastity, personal dignity, relative honours, relative norms, community ethics, social values, so on and so forth. Sexual violence, whether man commits against woman or woman commits against man that harms both of them in larger context of our humanity. In fact, the sexual violence which refers to any sexual action but physically forced, coerced and non-consented, may be committed against anybody regardless of their gender. But why it is the men who more often commit this crime against ladies, why the ladies moreover, become helpless in the work of such violence or stay silent after being victimized, and even when they react to this action why whole world behave like a blind spectator to it are significant gender queries, that doubt the existence of gender parity in so called civilized world at present. Even a stern legal action against such violence cannot curb the incident of recurring sexual abuse everywhere. It is because of the fact that probably our mutual gender understanding concerning human sexuality is impeded until now or our mutual gender misunderstanding on that is mounting all over. The people therefore, those who commit sexual violence tend to misconceive it as much as they have an inclination to conceive it. Thus, unless we get rid of this misunderstanding/ misconception the sexual violence will persist in the society. Further, regrettably why the female gender's vulnerability to this violence is acute, even then, it is not a gender exclusive outcome. In fact, each gender is not less control of his or her sexuality than his or her counterpart, and is also held equally accountable for this heinous act. The binary opposition between male and female sex is therefore, to be understood inclusively for better understanding of sexual violence in the society. Apart from this, the social concepts-sex, sexuality and gender though, conceived by society inclusively for both gender, but are discriminated against women in the society. However, when sexual violence is

Author : Faculty in Sociology, P.G. Department, Utkal University Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India. E-mail : rabindragarada@rediffmail.com

© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

committed against ladies we not very take these ideas inclusively for its better understanding by analyzing either it as results of an exclusive biological induced sex offense or socially cultured gender violence or a psychologically nurtured intolerant sexuality. We more often misapprehend it due to a biological induced fact that is more important than the social-psychological nurtured gender violence. As a result, the exclusive/individual case of sexual violence/sexual exploitation is, more often, explained whereas not with a conclusive or inclusive finding. Further, the sexual violence of basic nature is getting tougher/ complicated with newer individual findings/ interpretations. In fact, the comprehension of sexual violence by the individual case study usually goes without its holistic conceptualization in term of the notions-sex, gender and sexuality. For instance, once sexual violence committed against women the state governments in the country like India perceives it to be the law and order issues, the police finds it to be sexual crimes and the activists/civil society argue it to be a violation of human right. Further, reacting to the event of sexual violence the abstract comments, electronic media news, editorials and political remarks of variants go on increasing worldwide. For instance, Indian media recently reacting to the event of a gang rape in Delhi has pinpointed some necessary factors accountable for such violence against ladies. These factors such as lack of public safety, lack of adequate range of police personnel or of female police, a sluggish court system, stigmatizing the victim with a victim's contribution to such violence, encouraging rape victims to return to compromize, weak social status of women, masculine attitudes of men toward women, etc (Khazan and Lakshmi, 2012). However, these are far from the elementary conceptual ideas of sex, sexuality and gender that stay as structural invariants in structuring sexual violence against women for century. In fact, the sex as base and gender as superstructure (see Francis, 2012:2) inclusively nurture human sexuality. The concepts associated with sex and gender, as reviewed by Francis (2012) for instance, can provide an elementary clarity on that. Thus, instead of reviewing each empirical case study, it is worth to grasp the abstract concepts as how they are interrelated in perpetuating sexual violence against women. In this article we debate as well as demystify conceptual stereotypes that perpetuate sexual violence against women everywhere. This article is an improved version of my seminar paper entitled "Sexuality and Sexual Exploitation: A Socio-Psychological Interpretation" presented in a UGC sponsored National seminar on "Gender Issues and Problems of Women in India" organized by Sri Satya Sai College for Women on 23rd and 24th March, 2008, Bhubaneswar.

a) Objectives and Analysis

In order to deal with the complexity of sexual orientations and subsequent sexual violence against women, we have attempted on some substantial questions such as how the heterosexual gender interpretation of sex and sexuality perpetuates such violence, how the factors- bio-physical, psychological and social inclusively or exclusively accountable for such violence, and to explore how there is an analytical connection between inclusive interpretation of sex, gender and sexuality and such violence in this article. After critically analyzing some related literatures, we have tried a conceptual and analytical study in this paper. We have developed a resourceful sexual violence/exploitation explicit of cross Figure format for the analysis of the complicated sexual orientations of gender evoked sexual violence.

II. Critical Overview

It has been established that the query of male violence over female's sexuality is a social fact everywhere. Men perpetrate the violent acts against women (Carter and Kasubski, 1998) because they are more aggressive and dominating than women (Tiger and Fox 1972; Haralambos, 1980). Since the men have more aggression-testosterone and upper body strength than women (www.prb.org World Population Data Sheet, 2008) they more often commit such sexual violence. In view of D. Brandt (2003), the men the aggressors whereas the women are the sufferers. According to Lionel Tiger and Robin Fox (1972) 'these differences are, partly, due to genetic inheritance from men's primate ancestors, partly to genetic adaptation to a hunting way of life' (Haralambos, 1980). However, the biological aggression is also motivated in victim's provocation, victim's and victimizer's intoxication, one's deeply entrenched feeling of hate and hostility against others, psychological personality traits, etc (Ahuja, 2001: 255). Although the male's sexual aggression against female is a biological predisposition, it is structured by value system (Millett, 1969). In fact, just like the men the women are capable of doing aggression and violence against men. However, they are suppressed and castigated by the society. M. Alison (2007) in his article entitled 'wartime sexual violence: women's human rights and questions of masculinity' reviews that women's aggression or violence are implicitly condemned by most societies in the world. It is rather socio-psychological subjective dispositions, to which many theories mostly the frustration-aggression theory (innate aggressive drive as supply of frustration), the perversion theory (deviant act of infantile instinct), self attitude theory(improving self image by committing violent act), provocation theory (by normal response to provocations), motive attribution theory (attribution of malevolent intent and motivation), theory of subculture

© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

of violence (cultural values and norms that support and facilitate violent actions), anomie theory (due to strains caused by gap between culturally defined goals and means) and learning theory (violent act committed through direct experiences or observing others), acclaim to be the facts (Ahuja 2001 and 2000). If it is subjective social dispositions then the violence against women is more a reflection of patriarchal domination (Del martin, 1976; Dobash and Dobash, 1983) in the society (Abuja, 2000:225). Further male aggressiveness, male dominancy, female submissiveness and female subordinations are not necessarily biological dispositions but cultural prescriptions. It is a socially attributed fact rather than biological fact (Diamond, 2000). In the late 1960s and 1970s the sexual violence against women (SVAW) was, therefore, assumed as gender-based violence. According to the fourth conference of women, Beijing, 1995 country reports 'any act of gender-based violence which results in, physical, sexual or arbitrary deprivation of liberty in public or private life and violation of human rights' (UN 1996: 48). Women suffers from men's sexual aggression because human society is primarily a masculine society as per Claude Levi-Strauss's views, and women are culturally treated inferior to men by the society as Ortner (1974) argues (Smith, 1997). Thus, the bio-psychological tendencies of men toward women have been developed over the time (Lerner, 1986) that perpetuates such violence against women in the society (ibid). According to Frederick Engels's theory the oppression of women is rooted in the history of patriarchal family and private property (Brewer, 2004). The omnipresent character of sexual oppression (Heasley and Crane, 2003) everywhere, cultural repression of human sexuality within the family life (Freud's psychoanalytical theory, www.angelfire.com/mi/collateral/page2.html) and the socially established stable orientations of heterosexuality, homosexuality, and bisexuality (Weeks, 1986) bear on the sexual violence against women in the society (Sanderson, 2003). Further, the hegemonic masculinity (Jejeebhoy, 2007; Jewkes, 2005; Wilkinson, Bearup and Soprach, 2005), internet global sex sites (Hughes, 2000), circulation and consumption of pornography (Johansson 2007; Mansson 2004; Ricardo and Barker 2008), commercial sex activities (Bindman and Doezema, 1997), trafficking of women and proliferation of sex tourism (Mansson), explicit transactional dimension (the sugar daddy phenomenon) (Luke and Kurz, 2002; Hope, 2007), etc, are some of the major related processes responsible for sexual violence and exploitation against women in the society (Ricardo and Barker, 2008). In fact, these rising processes are unlimited and transcend our imagination and academic analysis. But, somehow, a holistic understanding remains missing in these findings. An important fact of the SVAW as an outcome of inclusively performed triple concepts-sex, sexuality and gender, remains largely neglected. We have a reason to believe that an inclusive interpretation of these ideas will clarify the causes of the SVAW.

a) Sex, Gender and Sexuality as Inclusive Social Concepts that Perpetuate Sexual Violence

It is terribly hard to show that whether sex or gender only accountable for sexual violence against women in the human society. In all probabilities the gender interpretation of sex perpetuates such violence, though, sex elicited violence appears to be evident fact everywhere. Several compatible or incompatible views are there to uphold this probability. Sexual violence is committed against woman all over as a result of they are metabolically found to show a discrepancy from men. Woman as an anabolic being (passive, conservative, sluggish, stable, etc) different from man as a katabolic being (eager, energetic, passionate, variable, etc) (Geddes and Thompson, 1889) is probably dominated by men's sexuality. It's a gendered development by that, the woman as socially structured to be profaned by the men persistently. Since our behavioural traits are culturally learned or acquired (de Beauvoir, 1972) the 'distinguishing biological sex from social gender is unintelligible' (Butler, 1999). According to Butler (1999) the 'sexed bodies never exist outside social meanings, and how we understand gender shapes how we understand sex'. Thus, sex, like gender is socially created construct that perpetuates sexual violence within the society. Further, the conceptualization of gender that maps onto the mind, of sex onto the body, of the gender is between the ears, and of the sex is between the legs (Grosz, 1994; Prokhovnik, 1999) considerably unfold the reality of human sexuality. However, hardly has it processed, as how and why is sexual violence committed by men against women. They (men and women or gender and sex) are different, however, not critical to each other remaining as an inclusive social concepts/facts that we cannot undermine. Every one primarily enhances to another one (ibid). In fact, the conception of gender in relation to sex arises at the intersection of a non-discursive element (corporeal behaviour, gesture, and ritual) and a discursive element (linguistic and normative meaning of bodily activities (Butler, 1993). Thus, however, can gender as a comprehensive reality continue sexual violence is that the vital query? In fact, sex could be a biological reality, whereas gender could be a social reality. Sex refers to our biological stuff/standing, whereas gender refers to our social rank /station. In clearer ideation the term gender could be a social idea, whereas the term sex could be a bio-physiological concept (Johnson, 2012). According to Sachdeva *et al* (2008:41-42) the gender is referring to 'socially constructed roles, relationships, behaviors, relative power, and other traits that societies ascribe to women and men' differently, whereas sex is often equated with

© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

the physical body, essentially the 'biological and physiological characteristics that distinguish females from males'. Whether, male or female, or epicene person, we are, that's our biological standing. Whether or not it's an interior sex organ together with sex chromosomes and gonads or external genital organ, that we have, is our biological facts. Whether or not we have a tendency to become feminine or masculine that's our gender. Thus, the sex as our biological disposition remains mounted, whereas gender as our social construction gets fluid in character. No doubt, sex could be a biological matter but, it is normatively materialized in the society. So sex is another normative term like gender (Butler, 1993). But, every term as a variable carries a unique additional or twin meanings. The sex as a variable refers to male or female with bio-physiological characteristics whereas, the gender as a variable refers to a person or lady with socially determined characteristics. The gender and sex are binary concepts but unitary in characters. The comprehensive character of those two terms is actually social, and it is the society that integrates these concepts along. Therefore, sex versus gender is like nature versus nurture, though gains a profound increment in understanding these concepts, however, actually a deceptive argument. If the binary conception of sex as female and male and of gender as man and woman the conception of sexuality is also binary to some extent like heterosexuals and gay. These structure two kinds of individual beings explaining all types with a completely unique sex, gender and sexuality than that of another being. However, one's sex, gender and sexuality can't be understood while not that of another. There can't be a straightforward separation of those terms-sex, gender and sexuality, and rather, they are reticulate and doubtless indivisible in nature (Johnson, 2012). Due to this fact we tend to interchangeably use sex and gender or sex and sexuality in the society. Thus, sex, gender and sexuality square measure inclusive concepts. These concepts analytical further, as normative, will offer fruitful analysis of the issues related to sexual violence against women. Therefore, the SVAW are often brought up with these inclusive concepts/ideas analytically and normatively for its better understanding.

III. Analytical Finding

Our psychological tendencies (state of mind being male or female), biological tendencies (drive/urge to be instinctual male or female) and environmentally determined tendency (environmentally determined sexual behaviour) go together with the conventional social tendencies (sense of being gender with feminine or masculine roles) in the society. It is because; the sexual tendency is required to be socially and culturally desirable. The conventional sexual tendency thus, inclusively explains the psychological, bio-physical and social tendencies on human sexuality. It is observed from the Figure 1 that the socially determined typical sexual tendency is extremely desirable consequently of it highly generates the gender relation, whereas the biologically determined typical sexual tendency is not desirable consequently of it lowly generate the same.

Figure 1 : Conventional Sexual Tendency

Generate Gender Relation	Desirable Sexual Tendencies		
	High		Low
High	Social Tendency (Sense of Gender Roles- Feminine/Masculine)		Psychological Tendency (State of Mind- Being Male Sex or Female Sex)
Low	Environmental Tendency (Environmentally Determined Sexual Behaviour)		Biological Tendency (Sense of Being Instinctual- Male or Female)

Source : our own.

The psychologically determined customary sexual tendency though, generates high gender relation but not desirable while not relating social tendency. If typical gender is socially desirable then why square measure women are at risk of sexual violence more than men in the society? If truth be told what's desirable to some men is also undesirable to many other women. In historical time individuals developed their gendered induced sexuality, so as to manage their bio-psychological tendency in a society. Sadly, it resulted into a gender of hegemonic, hetero and political sort that favours men against women consequently. Thus, here the matter isn't what society needs us to behave sexually but, how it perpetuates male's violence over women's sexuality. Judith Butler and Simone de Beauvoir like other existentialists were therefore, critiques of such gender construction developed over the years in the human society (Beauvoir, 1972) (www.plato.stanford.edu/entries/Beauvoir). The existen-tialists firmly believe that the matter of women's oppression is stock-still in our culture however, not in our biological nature. The world health organization's

© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence against women (aged 15-49) in 10 mainly developing countries reveals such incontrovertible fact that intimate partner violence (physical aggression, sexual coercion, sexual abuse, etc) against women are largely perpetrated by men. The men commit this violence believing in their family honour, sexual purity and sexual claims, and also knowing that there are not any sturdy legal sanctions against such violence in the society (WHO, 2012). Largely, it's an open secret that sexual violence is tolerated at the institutions of wedding. However, living at the circle of wedding, it is challenging for women to ascertain this unquestionable fact that their men are committing this violence. As a result of this, any violence committed against women in wedding is treated as traditional. Even the wedding justifies the rape as traditional if the rapists marry to their victims after assaulting /raping them. As for instance, in India if the rapists marry their victims; their sexual crimes are no longer counted as rape (Krishnan, 2012). Therefore, the conventional sexuality within gender relation perpetuates sexual violence against women in the society. This type of analysis will uncover the force behind the contextual reality of sexual violence in the contemporary society.

IV. Finding and Discussion

In the Figure 2 we have developed a sexual violence/exploitation explicit taking gender as socio-psychological dimension and sex as a bio-physical dimension for understanding human sexuality. The former dimension not only orients the latter dimension for a socially desirable sexuality however, additionally helps developing a discriminate sexual hostility against women and homosexuals in the society. Thus, the bio-physical attributes, mostly our primary sex characteristics (sex genital /reproductive organs) and secondary sex characteristics (bodily particulars like hip, breast, muscle, body hairs, etc) though, suggestive or inductive for sexual communality but, are socio-psychologically perceivable for sexual violence in the society. We can observe from the Figure 3 that the primary and secondary sex characteristics of heterosexual and gay otherwise induce sexual violence /exploitation. While the pro-opposite primary sex attraction (POPSA) causes high sexual violence/exploitation owing to high sexual attraction the pro-same secondary sex attraction (PSSSA) causes low sexual exploitation owing to low sexual attraction(see Figure 3). It is because comparison to latter the former induces direct sexual satisfaction. But when the PSPSA is activated publicly, it provokes sexual exploitation, and consequently, this leads to hate crime or sexual exploitation of the opposite sex (see Figure 2).

Figure 2 : Sexual Exploitation Particular

Factors	HSVE /ISE	LSVE/PSVE	NS	RAGS
Biological Attraction	POPSA	PSPSA	POPSA	POSSA
Psychological Orientation	Heterosexuality	Homosexuality	Transsexuality	Transvestite
	Bisexuality	Lesbianism	Intersexuality	Gay
Societal Socialization	Heterosexuality	Homosexuality	Transsexuality	Transvestite
	Bisexuality	Lesbianism	Intersexuality	Gay

Source : our own.

Notes:
HSVE- High Sexual Violence and Exploitation
ISE---- Institutional Sexual Exploitation
LSVE- Low Sexual Violence and Exploitation
PSVE- Provoke Sexual Violence and Exploitation
NS---- Neutral Sexuality
RAGS- Revolution against Gender Sexuality
POPSA- Pro- Opposite Primary Sex Attraction
PSPSA- Pro- Same Primary Sex Attraction
POPSA- Pro- Opposite Primary Sex Attraction
Heterosexuality-Opposite Sex Attraction
Bisexuality- Both Sex Attractions
Lesbianism- Same Female Sex Attraction
Trans Sexuality- Feeling One Sex though Biologically Different
Intersexuality- Having both Sex Anatomies
Transvestites- Adopting the Dress/Manner/ Sexual Role of OppositeSex
Gay- Male Homosexual

The POPSA develops neutral sexuality (NS) because the transsexual and inter sexual people are attracted to their same sex people more than their opposite sexes. The pro-opposite secondary sex attraction (POSSA) brings revolution against gender sexuality (RAGS). Therefore, they are with low sexual violence/exploitation to some extent.

© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

Figure 3 : Bio-Physical Profile of Sexual Exploitation

Sexual Attraction	Sexual Violence/Exploitation		
		High	Low
	High	Pro-Opposite Primary Sex Attraction (POPSA)	Pro-Opposite Secondary Sex Attraction (POSSA)
	Low	Pro-Same Primary Sex Attraction (PSPSA)	Pro-Same Secondary Sex Attraction (PSSSA)

Source : Our own.

But why are female's primary and secondary sex characteristics drawn to be exploited and violated by the men? According to Goetz, et al (2012) the ladies having the physical characteristics of a shorter gait, slower walking speed, and low energy are susceptible to sexual exploitation than the others. The incapacitation cues like intoxication, fatigue, or other forms of cognitive impairment could make a lady less able to resist the tactics of sexual exploitation than men. Thus, with their physical strength and biological impulses the men more often violate women's sexuality. Contrary to this view, the female is also found to have a stronger sex drive and greater physical capacity for sexual intercourse than that of the male (Baumeister and Twenge, 2002). If truth be told the sexual oppression of girls/ladies is caused by the society itself, and it is the society that promotes such violence against them (ibid). Further, it is not untrue that the male sexuality is cultivated in such how that female cannot break loose sexual violence in the society. In this sense Catherine MacKinnon's (1989) argument is debated as 'women are viewed and treated as objects of satisfying men's desires' (sexual objectification). The eroticization of masculinity as sexual dominance and of femininity as sexual submission contributes to such violence against women in the society (ibid). Even within the institutionalized heterosexual relation two-way impulsive sexuality is not activated normally. In wedding relation it is the female partner who is more sexually exploited than their counter parts. Usually the intimate sexual activity from holding hands to having intercourse lacks clear, open and honest consent of the partners involved (www.macalester.edu/sexualassault/healthysexuality.html). It is one way culturally conditioned programme where the female partners go into it without their consent sometime. In fact, the married women more often experience coerced sex from their husbands in the society (Jejeebhoy and Bott, 2005). Thus, men's sexual attraction toward women is socio-culturally conditioned, and the 'women's oppression is social but not biologically given' (Brewer, 2004). According to Patricia Mahoney and Linda M. Williams (1998) rape is more perpetrated by a man known to the victim than a stranger, and rape by intimate partners is more common than stranger rape in American society (Bachman ad Saltzman1995 and Russell 1990). The figure of such violence against married women is also reported by the National Family Health Survey (NFHS-3) and National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB) in India (Violence-against-married-women-in-Indiacan-the-data-tell-us.html).

a) Social Construction of Psychological Orientations and Sexual Violence/Exploitation

We can observe from the psychological profile of sexual exploitation given in the Figure 4 that once the heterosexual men or women can have a high sexual perception to their counter parts they are aiming to, they will have high sexual violence/exploitation of that counter parts of utterly different sex. The POPSSP and PSPSSP cause high sexual violence/exploitation than the POSSSP, and PSSSSP due to the former is predicated on primary sex sense perception, and the latter is predicated on secondary sex sense perception. But, even with high sexual perception the POSSSP ends in low sexual exploitation comparison to that of the POPSSP.

© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

Figure 4 : Psychological Profile of Sexual Exploitation

Sexual Perception	Sexual Violence/Exploitation		
		High	Low
	High	Pro-Opposite Primary Sex Sense Perception (POPSSP)	Pro-Opposite Secondary Sex Sense Perception (POSSSP)
	Low	Pro-Same Primary Sex Sense Perception (PSPSSP)	Pro-Same Secondary Sex Sense Perception (PSSSSP)

Source : Our own.

It is due to the pro-opposite secondary sex sense perception which might not provoke direct physical sex satisfaction. Therefore, the heterosexual sex perception causes more sexual exploitation/violence than the gay sex perception, and rather, the homosexuals/lesbians are sexually exploited on the idea of heterosexual perception. Whether men or women commit sexual abuse, hostility, harass and assault no matter, they do so by their biological perception because their invisible sexual mind as provocative as their visible sexual anatomy is. Unlike the animals the humans perceive, experience, categorize and expertise their sexuality following the conventional mind set, self-conception and society. However, this conventional idea helps cultivating and institutionalizing the idea of sex attraction, sex indexical cues, sex discrimination and sexual coercion in institutional settings of every society. Unfortunately, sexualization as a process of sexuality is negatively perceived (Wouters, 2010:726), and the word sexy and sexiness are discriminately used against sexuality of women and children. Especially the cues-psychological, incapacitation and physical make women vulnerable to sexual exploitation and violence (Goetz, et al, 2012). According to Goetz, et al, (2012) the psychological cues indicate that 'a woman is mentally or emotionally manipulable or is flirtatious or promiscuous or revealing a risk-taking proclivity' (ibid: 2). Women, significantly, having low self-assertiveness and low vanity are targets of such sexual violence/exploitations in the society (ibid). The bodily attraction is natural as stated earlier however; one time human develops it into a stimulus-response state of mind (psychological), it becomes risky. A coincident attracted aiming at or gazing at a lady could lead to a coincident sexual hostility against her because symmetrical scientific discipline (similar perception of sex object) or psychological sex fantasy push and pull the perpetrator to actualize the victim's sexuality (like sex object). But the male's hostile mentality toward female's body and sex is an unquestionable social fact that women learn in their social settings. Because of this socialization the same man who sometime madly interested in women sexually, might not have an interest in gay or lesbian with a similar state of mind. The sexual orientations stemming from heterosexual and bisexual sources cause more sexual violation than that of gay and lesbian sources because, the former orientation is assumed to be historically normal while latter orientation is treated to be socially abnormal. The sexual violence against gay and lesbian is not essentially an outburst of gay provocation or gay attraction but an unusual outcome of an aggravated heterosexual aggression in the society. While the transsexual and repose sexual orientations promote neutral sexuality the transvestite and gay orientations bring revolution against sexual violence/exploitation because the former might create divided psychology and the latter might bring a united feeling.

b) Socialization and Sexual Exploitation/Violence

The normally believed masculine characteristics like, outwardly oriented, strong, dominant, freelance, rational, assertive, analytical, brave, active, insensitive etc and feminine characteristics like inwardly oriented, gentle, submissive, dependent, emotional, respective, intuitive, timid, passive, sensitive etc nurture men and women otherwise (www.feminish.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/Brannon_ch07.pdf). On top of these stereotypes the women appear to have possessed higher human qualities than men, but, irony is that they cannot help remaining subservient to men, and because of feminine qualities they miserably fail to assert their strength over masculine sexuality. Thus, this gender dualism perpetuates sexual violence against women everywhere.

c) Conventional Sexual Stereotypes and Sexual Violence

We can observe from the Figure 5 that only adult marital sexuality is found to have positive sexuality because, it generates high institutionalized sexuality with high socialized sexual stereotype. However, it doesn't apply to married men and women equally justifying exclusive gender stereotypes. Further, sometime the positive sexuality negatively ends up in women's married life.

© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

Figure 5 : Conventional Sexual Stereotypes

Socialization Of Sex Stereotypes	Institutionalized Sexuality	
	High	Low
High	Adult Marital Sexuality (Positive Sexuality)	Extramarital Sexuality (Negative Sexuality)
Low	Adult Sexuality (Relative Sexuality)	Premarital Sexuality /Teenage Sexuality (Negative Sexuality)

Source : Our own.

We can also observe from the Figure 5 that the extramarital sexuality is found to be negative sexuality because it is lowly institutionalized. But it is found to have a high socialized sexual stereotype. It is also not equally applied to married men and women in the society. It is usually observable fact that adulterous sexuality is condemned for the stability of inclusive marital sexuality of dual sexual partners in every society. However, beyond dual marital sexual partners it may not even be treated as negative sexuality because there are societies in the world which have structured different types of wedding with only two or more sex partners in different institutionalized settings. But the women's vulnerability to sexual violence stays invariant. For instance, the polygamous practices are the results of such institutionalized settings to which the feminists powerfully pinpoint as socially nurtured practice of sexual hostility against ladies. It is because 'inequality is built into the asymmetric structure of polygamous marriage (Barry, 2001: 369-70 and Brooks, 2009)', and 'women who resist or desert polygamous marriages can often be shunned or otherwise penalized for their deviance or self-assertion' (May, 2012). The pre-marital sexuality or sexuality during adolescent age though treated as negative sexualities because of these are being lowly institutionalized sexuality with low socialized sexual stereotypes the girls are highly discriminated comparison to boys in every society. For instance, here conjointly we can see this discrimination that young boys could approach to female prostitute who is somewhere created out there, but young ladies cannot approach to male prostitute, is obscurity created out all over the places. The boys also usually blame the girl for all sexual acts in the dating system (Wouters, 2010:15). In this way a violation of the feminine body is tolerated and perpetrated within the sex industries. The adult sexuality is found to have relative sexuality because it is highly institutionalized in form of marriage but with lowly socialized sex stereotypes without marriage. This is not equally applicable to men and women in the society. For instance, it's usually found within the Asian countries that the age of married men/ women/girls or the age of sexually ill-used girls and sexual victimizer men is not same, and rather men are more aged than women. It is not that girls/women are assumed to have more capable of bearing with men's sexuality. However, it is the deliberate seniority of men is set by the society, thus, as to dominate and to cause straightforward sexual violence against women. The institutionalized sexuality structuring the construct of performs and pathology within the human sexual actions also structure the construct of sexual oppression within which the ladies and youngsters are the foremost victims. Therefore, the classification of typical /conventional sexual stereotypes given in the Figure 5 exemplifies the deliberate discourse on sexual violence in the society. Corresponding to these tendencies a typology of sexuality has been developed in Figure 6. It is observed that the heterosexual activity is socially desirable, and the society claims it therefore, generates a social relation, whereas the homosexuality/lesbianism is socially undesirable, and so disrupts human relation. The sexlessness may generate human relation however, is not socially desirable. The bisexuality doesn't generate sensible human relation however, not fundamentally undesirable in the society.

© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

Figure 6 : Conventional Sexuality Type

Gender Stereotype Socialization	Sexual Violence/Exploitation	
	High	Low
High	Heterosexuality (Socially Desirable)	Asexuality (Not Socially Desirable)
Low	Bisexuality (Not Socially Desirable)	Homosexuality/Lesbianism (Not Socially Desirable)

Source : Our own.

It is observed from the Figure 6 that the heterosexual and bisexual socialization cause a lot of sexual exploitation than homosexual and lesbian socialization. The gay and lesbian socialization provoke more sexual violence/ exploitation than transsexual and inters sexual socialization, and because of this, the gay and lesbians are sexually assaulted by the heterosexual individuals, and the transsexual and inters sexual are thereby ignored. Further, it is observed that while the transsexual and inter-sexual socialization promotes neutral sexuality, the transvestite and gay socialization bring revolution against sexual violence/ exploitation. The latter kind of socialization grows fast getting additional support from underground cities or metro centers worldwide. The heterosexuality is though socially desirable sexuality it promotes heterosexual masculinity (aggressive sexuality) and heterosexual femininity (submissive sexuality) as well, and that, in turn, perpetuates sexual violence against girls/women, homosexual/lesbians/gay in every society worldwide.

V. Conclusion

Sexual violence against women is undoubtedly an endemic phenomenon for the reason that gender induced stereotype ranking, symbolic bio-physical attributing and psychological discursive thinking perpetuate this violence everywhere. The fact remains, the masculine heterosexual character of the gender notions-sex/sexiness and sexuality/sexualization is highly perceived against ladies and gay in every society. Resulting from this fact, doing sex is sometime less dangerous than ranking and thinking its stereotypes. Similarly, the dimensions and factors for sexual abuse/ violence are structured and processed such ways that female gender is often desecrated by men, homosexuals or lesbians are despised by heterosexuals, and feminine submissiveness is violently abused by masculine aggressiveness in different social settings. Beside the heterosexual orientations, the gay and lesbian orientations also conjointly nurture the etiquettes of aggression against female, and female, therefore, they are sexually exploited/violated on the thought of heterosexual perception. The hate crimes committed against gay and women are nothing but, a mere reflection of masculine heterosexual bias. The sexual violence is truly a byproduct of inclusively reticulated and socially created triple concepts-sex, gender and sexuality. But there is misunderstanding of understanding of each concept as if nurtures sexual violence exclusively. It is also crucial fact that the secondary sex characteristics aren't less encouraging factors for sexual violence against women. In fact, the hegemonic, heterosexual, political and gender discourses on human's primary and secondary sex characteristics continue this violence. Our reviews of literatures related to sex, gender and sexuality realize an inclusive linkage between masculinity and sexual violence in the society. Further, whether or not the modernism elicited malevolent sexism or the tradition ascribed benevolent sexual discrimination the women's sex is violated directly or indirectly, and usually the whole world moreover, along with victims and victimizers themselves, cannot help remaining blind spectators thereto. If each man and woman so long as emphasizes women's sex, body and sexuality as sexually and socially fascinating/ desirable objects or subjects the sexual exploitation won't be curbed and crippled in virtually any society. It is just a gendered query that must definitely be answered by the every society, however, not primarily excluding sexual victims from sexual victimizers.

VI. Acknowledgement

Like food for thought, the feedbacks on any research/review paper, whether positive or negative certainly stabilize researchers' quest to go for further improvement and consequent publication. In this regard, I am thankful to those erudite scholars/ scientists who not only commented on this paper presented in the UGC sponsored national seminar on "Gender Issues and Problems of Women in India" organized by Sociology Department, Sri Satya Sai College for Women in 2008, Bhubaneswar, but also inspired me to write this paper. Further, the debate and discussion adhering to a gang rape event occurred in Delhi (India) last year, 2012 have greatly enriched this paper. I wish this article should be dedicated to those victims of sexual violence who struggle hard to survive. I also like to convey my

© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

thanks to the Editorial Board of the Global Journals Inc, US for having accepted this research work for publication.

Author's Biographical Sketch:

Dr. Rabindra Garada has obtained his M.A and M.Phil from Jawaharlal Nehru University (J.N.U), Delhi, and Ph.D. from Utkal University, Odisha in Sociology. He was awarded JRF for his research work in J.N.U. Delhi. He started his teaching career as Assistant Professor in Tata Institute of Social Sciences (TISS), Mumbai, and later joined in Utkal University. Now, he is a senior faculty in the Department of Sociology, Utkal University. He has quite a few international and national peer reviewed research publications in his credit. He has more than one and half decade of teaching and research experience at University level.

References Références Referencias

1. Ahuja, R. (2001). Social Problems in India. New Delhi: Rawat Publication.
2. Ahuja, R. (2000). Criminology. New Delhi: Rawat Publication.
3. Alison, M. (2007). Wartime Sexual Violence: Women's Human Rights and Questions of Masculinity, Review of International Studies 33: 75–90. (Accessed 5 January 2013): http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/953/1/WRAP_Alison_Wartime_sexual.pdf.
4. Bachman, R. and Saltzman, L. E. (1995). Violence against women: Estimates from the redesigned Survey, Washington, DC: U.S Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
5. Baumeister, R.F. and Twenge J.M. (2002). Cultural Suppression of Female Sexuality, Review of General Psychology 6(2): 166–203. (Accessed 25 January 2013): http:// www.femininebeauty.info/suppression.pdf.
6. Bindman, J .and Doezema, J. (1997). Redefining Prostitution as Sex Work on the International Agenda. London: Anti-Slavery International. (Accessed 28 January 2013): http:// www.walnet.org/csis/papers/redefining.html.
7. Brandt, D. (2003). Violence against Women from Silence to Empowerment, U.S.A: World Vision International. (Accessed 2 March 2013): http:// www.justice-and-peace.org/.../pahome2.5.
8. Brewer, P. (2004). Frederick Engels the Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, Australia: Resistance Books. (Accessed 20 January 2013): readingfromtheleft.com/PDF/EngelsOrigin.pdf.
9. Butler, J. (1999). Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity. London: Routledge, 2nd edition. (Accessed 26 January 2013): selforganizedseminar.files.wordpress.com/.../butler gender_trouble.p.
10. Butler, J. (1993). Bodies That Matter. London: Routledge 1-2: 10.
11. Carter, K. and Kasubski, J. (1998). Men, Women, and Aggression: A Socio-biological View, WCP 222, Final Paper. (Accessed 21 February 2013): MenWomenandAgg.html.
12. De Beauvoir, S. (1972). The Second Sex, Harmondsworth: (Penguin Accessed 26 January 2013):www.plato.stanford.edu/entries/Beauvoir/ www.marxists.org/reference/.../de-beauvoir/2nd-sex/introduction.htm.
13. Diamond, M. (2000). Sex and Gender: Same or Different? Feminism & Psychology, Volume 10 (1): 46-54. (Accessed 20 February 2013) www2.hu-berlin.de/sexology/BIB/DIAM/sex_gender.htm.
14. Francis, B. (2012). Gender monoglossia, gender heteroglossia: the potential of Bakhtin's work for re-conceptualizing gender, Journal of Gender Studies, 21:1, 1-15.
15. Goetz, C. D., Easton, J. A., Lewis, D. M. G. and Buss, D. M. (2012). Sexual Exploitability: Observable Cues and Their Link to Sexual Attraction, Evolution and Human Behavior 33, 417–426. (7 December 2012):http://homepage.psy.utexas.edu/homepage/group/busslab/pdffiles/Cues.
16. Grosz, E. (1994). Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press (Accessed 19 February 2013): http://plato.stanford. edu/entries/feminism-gender/
17. Haralambos, M. and Heald, R.M. (1980). Sociology: Themes and Perspective, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
18. Hope, R.(2007). Addressing Cross-Generational Sex: A Desk Review of Research and Programs, Washington, DC: Population Reference Bureau. (available on http: //www.igwg.org/igwg_media/AddressingCGSex.pdf.).
19. Gender Stereotypes: Masculinity and Femininity (Accessed 26 February 2013): http://www.feminish.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/Brannon_ch07.pdf.
20. Hughes, D. M. (2000). Men Create the Demand; Women Are the Supply- lecture on Sexual Exploitation, University of Rhode Island, Queen Sofia Center, Valencia, Spain, November (Accessed 10 December 2012): http://www.uri.edu/artsci/wms/hughes/demand.htm.
21. Jejeebhoy, S.J. and Bott, S. (2003). Non-Consensual Sexual Experiences of Young People: A Review of the Evidence from Developing Countries. www. popcouncil.org/pdfs/wp/seasia/seawp16.pdf.
22. Jejeebhoy, S.J. and Bott, S. (2005). 'Non-consensual Sexual experiences of Young People in Developing Countries: An Overview, in Jejeebhoy S J, Shah I and Thapa S (eds) Sex Without Consent: Young People in Developing Countries, London/New York: Zed Books.

© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

23. Jejeebhoy, S. J. (2007), 5 January. Understanding sex without consent among young people: A neglected priority, promoting healthy, safe and productive transition to adulthood Brief no. xa. yimg. com/.../Understanding+sex+without+consent+ among+young.
24. Jewkes, R. (2008). South Africa. Rape Perpetration and Genetics: Dilemmas from Community-Based research on Perpetration, Presentation at a meeting of the Sexual Violence Research Initiative, Pretoria.
25. Johnson, J. (2012).February. What a Difference Sex and Gender Make: a Gender, Sex and Health Research Case book, Canada: CIHR Institute of Gender and Health Research. http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/44734.html.
26. Khazan, O. and Lakshmi, R. (2012). 10 January. The Independent, the Washington Post, New Delhi, India. http://www. independent .co.uk/news /world/ asia/10-reasons-why-india-has-a-sexual-violence-problem-8433386.html.
27. Luke, N. and Kurz, K. (2002). Cross-Generational and Transactional Relationships in Sub-Saharan Africa: Prevalence of Behavior and Implications for Negotiating Safer Sexual Practices.
28. Macionis, J. J. (2006). Sociology. Dorling Kindersley (India) Pvt.L.td.
29. MacKinnon, C. (1989). Toward a Feminist Theory of State, Cambridge, Mass: (Available on www.fair-use.org/...mackinnon/ toward-a-feminist-theory-of... state/chapter-...
30. Mahoney, P. and Williams, L.M. (1998). 'Sexual Assault in Marriage: Prevalence, Consequences, and Treatment of Wife Rape'. 113-163. (Available on www.janedoe.org/site/assets/docs/.../Sexual_Assault_in_Marriage.pdf.).
31. Marriott, R. (2012, Dec 29). Some reflections on sexual violence and the struggles against it All India Progressive Women's Association-AIPWA. (Accessed 22 February 2013): libcom.org/.../some-reflections-sexual-violence-struggles-against-it-k.
32. May, S. C. (2012). 'Liberal feminism and the ethics of polygamy'. www.simonmay. net/LFEP.pdf.
33. Millett, K. (1969). Theory of sexual politics reproduced here, The Second chapter sexual politics Publ. (available on www.marxists.org/ subject/women/authors/millett-kate/theory.htm).
34. Ortner Sherry, B. (1974). 'Is Female to Male as Nature Is to Culture?'in Rosaldo, M .Z. and Lamphere, L, (eds) Woman, Culture and Society: Stanford, 68-87. www.radicalanthropology group.org/old/class_ text_ 049.pdf.
35. Prokhovnik, R. (1999). 19 February. Rational Woman: A Feministic Critique of Dichotomy London: Routledge. (Accessed 19 February 2013): http://plato.stanford. edu/entries/feminism-gender/
36. Ricardo, C. and Barker, G. (2008), 8 February. Men, Masculinities, Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Violence: A Literature Review: PROMUNDO. www.ecpat.net/worldcongressIII/PDF/Publications/SexualExploitation-WorkingDraft-July30.pdf.
37. Russell, D. E.H. (1990). Rape in marriage. Indianapolis, IN:. Indiana University Press.
38. Sachdeva, N., Jimeno, C. and Peebles, D. (2008). Gender Evaluation: Final Report on Phase I - Institutional Assessment of Governance Equity and Health Program, International Development Research Centre, Kartini International. (Available on bnc.idrc.ca/dspace/bitstream/10625/40676/1/128939.pdf.).
39. Sanderson, S.K. (2003, August 18). The Sociology of Human Sexuality: A Darwinian Alternative to Social Constructionism and Postmodernism, Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association Atlanta, Georgia, 18. (Accessed 31January 31 2013): www.chss. iup. Edu /sociology/.../Sanderson%20Articles/H...-United States.
40. Smith, S. (1997). Engels and the Origin of Women's Oppression, International Socialist Review. (2). (available on www.isreview. org/ issues/ 02/ engles_ family.shtml)
41. United Nations Report (1996). United Nations Report of the Fourth World Conference on Women Beijing. http://www.who.Int /mediacentre/factsheets/ fs239/en/
42. Weeks, J. (1986). 'Youth Gang Rape in Phnom Penh' in World Health Organization, 2008, WHO Multi-Country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against Women, Geneva. (Available on www.prb.org World Population Data Sheet, 2008).
43. Wouters, C. (2010). Sexualization: Have Sexualization Processes Changed Direction? Sexualities. 13 (6), 723–74.

© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)