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Lafayette College became coed in 1970 when the first class of women arrived on campus. The inclusion of women initiated discourse about sexual harassment and what it means to feel uncomfortable in a sexual situation. The establishment of sexual harassment policy and the college’s response to the acts of sexual violence demand the gender binary and speaks to it as it is normalized by the institution. The gender binary is not natural but must be made aware of, as it applies to Lafayette College campus policy on sexual harassment, assault and rape. This paper exposes how campus policies about sexual assault reinforce heteronormativity and gender roles. Objectification, homophobia, masculinity, power dynamics and privilege are lenses that demonstrate how the institution of Lafayette College not only normalizes sexual assault but creates specific guidelines that strengthen the divide of what sexual assault is and what it is not.

According to Paul-Michel Foucault, institutions create definitions that control society and strengthen binaries of what is normal and abnormal. In this specific example, when the institution of Lafayette College created policy around sexual assault, sexual harassment and rape it normalized these issues because it was now prevalent enough that it needed a definition. By defining policy around these accounts it acknowledges that there is an issue but also creates the exact issue, “you have to remember that there was no such thing as sexual harassment or gender bias then. We didn’t understand those kinds of concepts.” 1 Nothing exists until it is defined and that definition is established. Foucault believes that these types of institutions determine the “realness” and the divide between what is correct and incorrect. The Lafayette College policies create the theoretical line between sexual assault, sexual harassment and rape and what is not considered a violation. A large issue with these policies is that many of these attacks are

subjective. This subjectivity also hardens the line that exists as these policies. The “looser” a situation is, the more attention an institution gives it in order to create stability and try to compensate for this otherwise lack in control.

The policies around sexual assault create guidelines and lists of what to do after an attack and what constitutes as an attack. An example of these specific policies is when the Lafayette College Sexual Harassment Policy Other Prohibited Conduct: Supervision or Evaluation of Employees states specific behaviors of sexual harassment and what that means. The list provided is; unwanted physical contact, persistent, unwanted sexual/romantic attention, sexually suggestive visual displays, jokes, humor, or insults of a sexual nature, lewd remarks or whistles, unwelcome sexually suggestive gestures, body language or sounds, obscene messages, repeated, unwanted discussions of sexual matters, discussion of and rating sexual attributes and attractiveness, asking or commenting about someone’s sexuality or sex life, subtle or overt pressure for sexual favors and stalking. When this policy was created it formed a divide between what is considered to be harassment and what is not through this specific definition. Another example of harsh lines being made is when Lafayette College decided to derive and redefine the definition of sexual harassment from the definition from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission between 1980 and 1982. The definition of sexual harassment is “unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature that affect employment decisions or create an intimidating, hostile or offensive working

Lafayette College attempted to change this policy by adjusting these terms from “employment decision” and “working environment” to “employment and academic decisions.” Lafayette College constructed this policy in order to “help” victims of sexual harassment by allowing them to instinctively know if they have been sexually harassed. By shaping this policy, Lafayette College is in some ways forming the issue of sexual harassment because before there was no term or strict guidelines to describe what was happening to these people before, therefore creating the problem by giving it a name.

When one looks and analyses an institution and its need to pass specific policy one must look at the reasons why and what led this institution to become the way that it is. Lafayette College was historically an all-male school, accepting its first class of female students and becoming coed in 1970. This campus climate, now including women, created new discourse and language that had to mold to fit this atmosphere. The language created by the new campus climate change allowed for histories to become erased as well as for the language to determine symptoms and stabilize the effects of sexual violence. Throughout Lafayette’s history, starting from 1980 to 1982, when the term sexual harassment was defined and therefore created, there had been language changes surrounding sexual violence. It started off in 1980 to 1982 when policy was solely shaped around sexual harassment, when male faculty were making these new female students feel uncomfortable. The acceptance of female students into a previously all-male

---

school changed the discourse surrounding policy because it now had to accommodate for another gender. The start of policy around sexual violence was created when these professors were harassing students, creating a larger public issue and encouraging the College to form these policies. In 1993 the Lafayette College Security Policies and Procedures discourse was made to include harassment or assault.6 This two words have come to mean very different things as the institutions have formulated these different guidelines. On March 24, 1994 the Lafayette College Board of Trustees decided to strictly define rape, adding language to the discourse around sexual violence.7 The change and addition of words creates more categories for situations to be put in or contained in. The college uses these new words to try and form stability and by doing so creates normalcy around these instances that are now defined.

Language also takes a crucial role in how histories are formed and erased. Foucault mentions how there is strength in silence or absence. In the policies formed around sexual violence on Lafayette Campus much of the language is centered around women as the victims and men as the perpetrators. Not only does this create gendered roles but also reaffirms that men are supposed to be aggressive while women are passive and more likely to be victimized. The language and attaching a gender to an act has the ability to silence an entire population and therefore erase histories that do not belong to or follow these policies. In 1980 when the college was first defining and creating policy around sexual harassment, there was a large emphasis on male perpetrators in the form of professors and female students as victims. It does not mention
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male students that also may have been harassed by these same professors. The language involved in the policies uses the term “women” when speaking about someone who has become victimized. It is not until March 24, 1994 that the Lafayette College Board of Trustees changed the use of the word women to victim, making it more inclusive. By determining and defining women as victims it not only places them under men and recreates the patriarchy seen as everyday society but also eliminates the history of sexual violence instances where a male has been the victim. Histories have been recreated and formed based on invisibility. In this case, the absence of masculine terms when creating policy allows for the population of male victims to be removed.

The Lafayette College sexual misconduct handbooks describe sexual violence as a medical disorder. From 2001 to 2011 the college created these pamphlets to describe the three forms of sexual violence, sexual assault, sexual harassment and rape. These pamphlets even create symptoms of how one may feel after one of these violent attacks. The sexual misconduct handbook in 2001 listed ways to treat injuries, created symptoms and even transcribed how to recover. When Foucault describes institutions, he mentions medical institutions and how they specifically begin to create what is normal and what is abnormal. These normalcies are thought to be centered around biology, but in reality the biology is used to backup or recreate the abnormalities. The idea of self-awareness and self-evaluation occurs because people are now looking at this list of symptoms and seeing if it applies to themselves. The institution of
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Lafayette College probably believes that these pamphlets are ways to organize the material in a logical way, when in reality Lafayette College has defined these sexual violations as medical and mental health issues. The sexual misconduct pamphlet in 1997 tries to explain some of the feelings that may occur after these attacks and gives a list of emotion symptoms that can be expected such as “shame and disgust with your body.” The normalcy determined from these pamphlets allows sexual violence to become a medical issue, with symptoms and a diagnosis. These brochures have the potential to make victims feel as though the attack was not “bad enough” or abnormal because they may not have all of the emotions that are listed as symptoms.

The power dynamics between men and women, student and professor are highlighted in the creation of these policies. The policies around sexual violence were formed when male professors started to harass the female students, when the college became coed. On October 16, 1982 the Board of Trustees tried to determine what sexual harassment meant between professor and student and how to proceed when these claims are made. It is as followed, “while a particular interaction must be unconsented to and offensive to be defined as harassment, faculty members, other individuals in positions of authority, and students should be sensitive to the questions about mutuality of consent that may be raised and to the conflicts of interest that are inherent in personal relationships where professional and educational relationships are also involved.”

An academic relationship between a student and professor is defined by the Lafayette College Sexual Harassment Policy Other Prohibited Conduct as when a course is
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taught by a professor and has not received a final grade, when a student has a particular professor as their advisor and an athlete with a coach. When a professor is engaging in any of these defined superior roles, they must not have any sexual or emotional relationships with a student. This definition has been created so that there is no question as to whether a student and professor relationship is forbidden. When the policies around sexual harassment were installed, the school had mostly male professors, therefore creating a gendered issue. Not all male professors sexually harassed their female students, but some of them did abuse their power. The “women who avoid friendliness with male instructors in an attempt to forestall sexual harassment are often labeled as “emotionally difficult” and have trouble obtaining academic assistance from the male-dominated faculty.”12 This quote directly demonstrates how not only gender roles are prevalent in this type of violence but also the construct of power and how it is associated with the male gender.

Stereotypes around women are that they are passive and beneath the male dominated society of the patriarchy. The patriarchy, how our society is constructed, is centered around the white male. At this time, when the definitions and policies around sexual harassment were created, many of the male professors were white, demonstrating the prevalence of the patriarchy at Lafayette College. Statistics from 1979 and 2017-18 show the increase in professors of color. In 1979 there were 24 female professors, 142 male professors and one professor of color.13 In the year before the policies around sexual assault were created, 14% of professors were women, 85%
were male and less than 1% were professors of color, showing the disparity in gender and in race. The sexual advances made by these professors not only affected the female students emotionally, but also academically. These students had just received the privilege of attending Lafayette and their academic status was already challenged. In the Sexual Assault/ Harassment Resource Guide from September 1994 it gave ways in which to report these instances of sexual violence, one of which being to report the behavior on a course evaluation form. This “guidance” that the college was giving through their policy plays directly into the power dynamic. The professor must acknowledge that the occurrence happened that the student who submitted the form was accurate in how they depicted the occurrence. The entirety of this recommendation is not helpful because not many students would speak up to their attacker if the person who perpetrated the violence holds the power over their academic standing and has the capability to not acknowledge that the account has ever occurred. Another example of gendered power dynamics is,

And this man is pretty old and he sat next to me, and his hand was on my thigh for the majority of the dinner. And I didn’t really think about it too much at the time. I mean, what are you gonna do? This guy was five years older than God, and the guest of honor. I just left his hand there. The academic climate when women were beginning to be assimilated into the college was so segregated and new that women felt the need to give into the desires of their superiors, at this time men. This reinforces the gender roles and differences between men and women, and the passivity of women. Instead these women were in survival mode, unsure of what to do to get a
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good education. A hand on the thigh, like in the previous account, may be needed to not draw attention to oneself and to not offend the guest of honor. Some unwanted touching may have been the consolation that these women received for coming to Lafayette and trying to obtain a higher education. The women had to be complacent because of the overwhelming power the men held within the college.

Throughout the policies created and speeches given around sexual violence, women seem to be the main focus. Many of the mentors allotted to victims of sexual violence are women, therefore furthering the idea that violence happens to women. In the Sexual Misconduct handbook of 1998, the resources and phone numbers given are of Nancy Bio and Deborah Rosen.\textsuperscript{16} The sexual harassment consultants listen in this handbook are Susan Basow, Rose Marie Bukins, Deborah Byrs, Ann Gold, John Leone, Elizabeth McMahon, Rebecca Rosenbauer and Lorenzo Traldi. Most of these people that are mentioned are women emphasizing the idea that sexual violence is a problem felt by women as victims. The idea behind female mentors after a difficult time is to encourage victims to speak with people of the same gender about these issues. On November 5, 1990 the Sigma Nu fraternity made a statement that “the Sigma Nu fraternity will not tolerate or condone any form of sexually abusive behavior (either physically, mentally or emotionally) on the part of any of its members.”\textsuperscript{17} The Sigma Nu fraternity is stating that it will not allow any of its members to be involved in sexual violence, as the perpetrators. This statement acknowledges that this fraternity knows that there is a problem but also emphasises the


\textsuperscript{17} Lafayette College. Letter to Robert I. Rotberg. 5 November 1990-. Sexual Assault, Rape, and Harassment/ Discrimination Policies. Reference Files. Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.
idea that these fraternity members are the ones creating these violent attacks and not the victims of them. This is another example of how sexual violence seems to be a women’s problem and not an issue faced by men. On November 28, 1990, Robert I. Rotberg, the president at the time, made a statement on acquaintance rape.\textsuperscript{18} He shared that one in four women have experienced rape but neglected to mention a statistic on men and their connection to violence as victims.\textsuperscript{19} He then began to say that “women on this campus may have been raped without being aware that what happened to them legally was rape. We do not want Lafayette women to remain silent, frightened, ashamed, or self-accusing-feeling isolated and unaware that assistance and support are available to anyone who has been victimized.”\textsuperscript{20} This again makes violence a women’s problem because this talk only mentions women as the victims. An opinion piece on “Dealing with Campus Rape” says that one in six female respondents are victims and that “another survey found that approximately 84 percent of men whose actions fell within the legal definition of rape think that what they did definitely was not rape.”\textsuperscript{21} The gender roles are again stigmatised here as men are the violent perpetrators and women are the victims. The opinion piece may also not be completely valid unless it is anonymous and the respondents will not be named. The people who do in fact respond may skew the results because they are more open to voicing their opinion
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about their attack. The lack of language around men creates silence of an entire gender. If the
“norm” is that only women are assaulted, what does it mean if you are a man who has been
assaulted?

Sexual scripts are important in emphasizing masculinity and creating homophobia. Men
are expected to objectify women in order to bond with other males and prove masculinity. The
constant pressures of this gender performance and proving masculinity have a correlation with
homophobia and crimes against women. Many gang rapes and attacks occur when men feel the
need to prove themselves to others and take advantage of the woman. Before coeducation, “some
fraternities had reputations for having some gang-bang rooms.”22 Some of the other fraternities
“had reputations that the pool table was put to spectacular uses during party weekends.”23 These
are two instances where men feel the need to prove their masculinity to others in a public
location by claiming their sexuality and proving dominance over women. A large part of
male-bonding is enthusiastic talk about sexual conquests and the objectification of women.
These locations in the fraternity houses take the idea of public knowledge to an entirely new
level as not only are these sexual acts done in public places but also shared among fraternity
members. Masculinity plays two keys roles when assessing sexual violence and the policies
associated with it. Masculinity has the potential to silence many because victimization goes
against masculinity and depicts weakness which is not seen as masculine. In the case above,
involving the fraternity members, the men are the perpetrators and victims must be women. Male
bonding is centered around the objectification of women and the sexual dominance over women.

22 “We Were Pioneers” Master Script 2003. Coeducation Oral History Project, Special Collections and
College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.
23 “We Were Pioneers” Master Script 2003. Coeducation Oral History Project, Special Collections and
College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.
If these fraternity members were harming other men in these public locations they would be disproving their masculinity because the focus therefore would be around other men, not fitting into the system of patriarchy. Men are stereotypically aggressive and always wanting sexual relations. If it is determined that sexual advances were unwanted or unconsensual then it goes against the sexual script layed out for men. This causes a decrease in reports of sexual violence for men because they feel as though they are unable to report these violences without questioning their role within the patriarchy. When masculinity is questioned it undermines the entirety of one’s identity and can have severe emotional impacts. At Lafayette College the reported statistics for men that have been victims of sexual violence is nonexistent. The college does not keep statistics on the men that have been assaulted which could mean that men do not report at all or that the college is unwilling to provide the statistics to maintain a specific image. Overall, masculinity acts as a lense to determine not only why sexual violence occurs but also how it has the potential to silence and skew statistics that therefore undermine the issue of sexual violence against men but also to create an entire population of unknown individuals, both victims and perpetrators.

Objectification of women is a way to connect to other men and prove to themselves and other males that they are masculine. If a man does not objectify women and bond with other men over women then he can be seen as gay because he does not “fit into” the system of masculinity. The entirety of masculinity is centered around this idea of women and the beauty of women. To make a woman an object and to objectify her, the woman must qualify and obtain some of the stereotypical beauty standards, “one of the things that we noticed very early is that all the girls
were in rooms with basically roommates the same size.” 24 These decisions were based around physical appearance and the women were “judged on the basis of their looks,” much like many of the other decisions made on the Lafayette College Campus. 25 For example, when Lafayette first became coed the women did not have anywhere to eat because students ate in their fraternity houses and the women could not yet join a fraternity. There were “photograph selections” where female student were chosen by fraternity members to be able to eat at their fraternity houses. 26 The females that were chosen to be able to participate in these fraternity meal plans were those who fit the stereotypical beauty standards of the time. These include whiteness and thinness. One woman mentions that she “had muscles when nobody had muscles,” therefore acknowledging how her image and physical appearance differed from the “norm.” 27 Many of these beauty standards have the ability to change over time but the way in which men look at women does not. Objectify, as determined in the Merriam-Webster dictionary, is to “treat as an object.” 28 In this case, the objectification of women is to create them as sexual objects or objects of desire, which therefore centers around beauty standards. At Lafayette College there are specific examples of how this objectification of women may occur. Some of these examples come from a collection of quotes from oral histories that take the form of a play. This play compares instances
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from the oral histories of students when the college became coed and from students who attended
Lafayette College in 2002. They are as followed;

There was a period of time really early on where we were having a hard time studying
because the boys were standing outside in the evening yelling, “Panty raid. Panty raid.
Panty raid.”
I remember sitting on the steps in front of New Dork and there used to be a gang of boys
that just sat there watching us come in and out. They just would sit there and watch us.
There were men who rated women going through the cafeteria line. It was checkers, they
would hold up one through ten for the women who came through the line.
There was this one professor, he was a law professor. If you sat in the front seat with a
short skirt on you were guaranteed an A.
The first semester guys would get the freshmen year directory and pick out a picture and
dial the phone on that floor and ask the girl out. And that’s how people socialized.

These instances display objectification and what it meant for women who had just entered and
who attend this school in 2002, a large time difference. Although some of these instances and the
blatantness that these situations that occurred may have altered, the ideas surrounding
objectification have not. A current and common topic of discussion between men is about sexual
“conquests,” emphasising their sexuality under the clear understanding that they are
heterosexual.

The bonding and proving of masculinity by turning women into objects highlights
heterosexuality because the entirety of the masculinity complex centers around the idea of
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gender and performing one's gender to others. In 1993 Lafayette College was rated the most 
homophobic college campus by the Princeton Review. Homophobia directly ties into sexual 
viole nce and masculinity. It is in relation to masculinity because the whole concept of the system 
surrounds objectifying women. If one does not take part in the system then they will be seen as 
"other" which in this case is gay. Because the Lafayette College climate was and some may 
argue still is considerably homophobic, it increases participation in this system and the 
objectification of women. A male must make it completely clear that he is heterosexual in order 
to prove masculinity, perform gender correctly and fit into the campus climate. Homophobia is 
also related back to sexual violence and the erasing of histories. Not only does language erase 
histories but also the social dynamics of the Lafayette College campus. When an institution has a 
history of being as homophobic as Lafayette was and may still be, the likeliness of males to 
report sexual violence is small, especially when it was an all male school. The external pressures 
of proving heterosexuality do not correspond with male to male attacks of sexual violence, even 
if it is indeed straying from the male’s heterosexual orientation.

Overall the policies around sexual violence at Lafayette College create a heterosexual and 
male dominated society where women are victimized and male histories are erased. The 
language and the creation of definitions about sexual assault, harassment and rape not only 
normalize these issues but also determine the existence of these occurrences. Nothing exists until 
it is defined and given a label. Although there are many different genders and sexualities, the 
college policies focus solely on the binary and heterosexuality, reinforcing to many that this is

35 LGBTQ Dates in Lafayette College History. Association on Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Issues. 
Reference Files. Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette 
College.
the "norm" or the default. The campus is attempting to formulate discourse that applies to
everyone but it can not forget its homophobic past.
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