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I. INTRODUCTION

Depending on who you ask, the #MeToo movement is either overdue or overreaching, but it seems everyone has heard of it. The response to actress Alyssa Milano’s tweet inviting women who experienced sexual harassment or assault to tweet “#MeToo” was overwhelming.1 “MeToo” was retweeted nearly half a million times within twenty-four hours.2 Several celebrities tweeted “#MeToo” or shared their stories, including Anna Paquin, Debra Messing, Rosario Dawson, Gabrielle

* Margo Kaplan is a Professor of Law at Rutgers Law School, where she teaches courses on criminal law and sex crimes. Her research explores legal limitations on intimate decisions, particularly the use of criminal law in areas of sex and health.


2 See Gilbert, supra note 1; Hill, supra note 1.
Union, and Evan Rachel Wood. #MeToo jumped mediums to Facebook and expanded to include male survivors, as celebrities like Terry Crews and Brandon Fraser shared their experiences of sexual abuse by powerful men in their industry. The tweet’s initial impact was in part attributable to its adept use of social media. Unlike other campaigns that sought specific changes outside their medium, #MeToo illustrated the prevalence of sexual violence simply by having survivors use its hashtag.

Milano’s tweet was not the first use of the words “Me Too” to advocate for victims of sexual violence. Tarana Burke established the Me Too movement in 2006 to unify survivors of sexual violence in underprivileged communities, particularly women of color. Burke initially provided healing circles in which she shared her story and encouraged others to join. Me Too continues to support these communities. In particular, it works to change the dialogue surrounding sexual violence.

---

3 See Gilbert, supra note 1.

4 See Gilbert, supra note 1; Hill, supra note 1; Laura Bradley, “I was terrified, and I was humiliated”: #MeToo’s Male Accusers, One Year Later, VANITY FAIR (Oct. 4, 2018), https://www.vanityfair.com/hollywood/2018/10/me-toos-male-accusers-terry-crews-alex-winter-michael-gaston-interview.


“Rape” and “sexual assault” are legal terms, referring to criminal offenses defined in statutes. Jurisdictions use and define these terms differently, and these terms often require some sort of penetration. Compare N.Y. PENAL Law § 130.35 (McKinney 2014) (using the term “rape”), with N.J. STAT. ANN. § 2C:14-2 (West 2018) (using the term “sexual assault”). “Sexual violence” is a broader term that encompasses when an individual is forced or manipulated into any non-consensual sexual activity. NAT’L SEXUAL VIOLENCE RESOURCE CTR., WHAT IS SEXUAL VIOLENCE? 1 (2010), https://www.nsvrc.org/sites/default/files/Publications_NSVRC_Factsheet_What-is-sexual-violence_1.pdf. Sexual violence includes not only rape, but also any unwanted sexual contact or touching, as well as sexual harassment, sexual exploitation, and showing one’s genitals or naked body to someone without their consent. See id. These terms may also be used to refer to something broader than what the law prohibits—a normative conception of what is unacceptable conduct.

I use all three terms in both the descriptive and normative sense. I discuss the criminal justice system’s failure to meet the needs of those who have survived what is prohibited under rape, sexual assault, and sexual violence laws. I also use the normative meaning of these terms to analyze the gap between what the law prohibits and what survivors (in particular women) experience as a sexual violation and to acknowledge that these actions occur within a larger context of issues related to sex, aggression, and consent that may be more expansive and complex than existing legal definitions.

violence to better reflect the experiences and needs of Black women and girls, along
with queer, trans, and disabled individuals.8

The #MeToo movement ("#MeToo")9 that followed Milano’s tweet differs from Burke’s work in many ways—perhaps most notably in how it pivoted from a survivor-focused movement to a widespread reckoning of powerful men’s sexual misconduct. In a matter of weeks over eighty women publicly identified themselves as victims of producer Harvey Weinstein’s harassment and assault, including celebrities such as Ashley Judd and Salma Hayek.10 Survivors’ reports and media investigations brought to light how prominent men across the private and public sectors engaged in sexual harassment and assault. These men included television journalists Charlie Rose and Matt Lauer, directors Bryan Singer and Bret Rattner, playwright Israel Horowitz, Senate candidate Judge Roy Moore and Senator Al Franken, Ninth Circuit Judge Alex Kozinski, actors Louis C.K. and Kevin Spacey, chef Mario Batali, and opera singer and conductor Placido Domingo.11 The movement is credited with the convictions of gymnastics coach Larry Nassar, and actor Bill Cosby, as well as the arrests of Weinstein and financier Jeffrey Epstein.12


9 I use the terms “#MeToo” and “the #MeToo movement” to discuss not merely the #MeToo tweet, but also the broader dialogue and actions that followed. See #MeToo: A Timeline of Events, CHICAGO TRIB. (last visited Apr. 19, 2020), https://www.chicagotribune.com/lifestyles/ct-me-too-timeline-20171208-htmlstory.html. This includes the allegations against over 200 well-known and influential men, the public reaction to and media coverage of these allegations, the consequences of these allegations (professional, legal, and otherwise), the increased attention to sexual violence in the media and in both the public and private sectors, and the various other campaigns that followed, such as #WhyIDidntReport and #TimesUp.


12 See Carlson, supra note 11; see also MacKinnon, supra note 5. MeToo founder Tarana Burke asserted that the charging of Harvey Weinstein has been cathartic for sexual violence survivors. See Ricardo Lopez, Me Too Founder Says Looming Weinstein Arrest Is “Cathartic” For Survivors of Sexual Assault, VARIETY (May 24, 2018, 2:21PM), https://variety.com/2018/film/news/tarana-burke-harvey-weinstein-1202821447/. At the time of writing, the case is awaiting trial.
This response stands in stark contrast to how police or prosecutors previously disregarded victims’ allegations against Weinstein, Nassar, and Cosby or, in Epstein’s case, allowed a plea deal that led to only three and half months in prison for assaulting multiple girls.13

In this article I argue that #MeToo ultimately demonstrates the criminal justice system’s substantial limitations as a tool to respond to and prevent sexual violence by calling attention to the criminal justice system’s failures. While #MeToo was not exclusively—or even primarily—about criminal justice, it brought into sharp relief the myriad ways this system fails to meaningfully and effectively address sexual violence. Yet #MeToo has at best ignored, and at worst perpetuated, many of these shortcomings. It largely excludes women of color and other subordinated groups. Its focus on perpetrators also furthers a narrative that ignores many survivors’ experiences and impedes accountability.

While we should not resign ourselves to the criminal justice system’s many limitations, reforms that expand the carceral state will likely aggravate rather than resolve these limitations. It is laudable for #MeToo to address law enforcement’s dismissive response to rape accusations. Expanding the criminal justice system’s mandate to punish, however, will likely increase the disproportionate incarceration of men of color while providing little benefit to women of color.14 Such reforms fail to address survivors’ needs and the underlying myths and attitudes that perpetuate sexual violence. They also disproportionately harm communities of color, which include those at most risk of experiencing sexual violence.

I argue that #MeToo demonstrates the need to transform rather than enhance the criminal justice system’s response to sexual violence. While #MeToo highlighted the inadequacy of the criminal justice system’s response, it ultimately demonstrates the need for a less carceral approach. Reforms should provide survivors and their communities more power in the reporting, investigation, and consequences of sexual violence. I discuss two such approaches: confidential reporting methods that provide survivors with control over the consequences of


reporting; and restorative justice processes within the criminal justice system. These approaches better address many of the unmet needs of survivors, communities, and defendants—particularly those of subordinated groups that the criminal justice system has systematically neglected or abused and which #MeToo has largely excluded. Alternatives that meet these needs can increase accountability and provide more just outcomes.

My argument proceeds in three parts. Parts II and III argue that #MeToo’s most salient lessons should be drawn from the ways that it both highlighted the criminal justice system’s failures while paradoxically perpetuating them. Part II draws lessons from the successes of #MeToo—in particular the way it demonstrated the magnitude of sexual violence, the broader social, economic, and cultural context in which it flourishes, and the criminal justice system’s inadequate and often damaging response. Part III argues that #MeToo has reflected, ignored, or internalized many of these problems. As with both the criminal justice system and many efforts to reform its approach to sexual violence, #MeToo has largely excluded women of color and other marginalized communities and failed to adequately consider issues of systemic racism. Its focus on powerful men’s misconduct furthers a problematic “monster narrative” about who can be considered a survivor and a perpetrator of sexual violence.

Part IV argues that applying these lessons requires us to transform the criminal justice system’s response to sexual assault. While it is tempting to equate broader criminal laws with greater accountability and more victim satisfaction, reforms that expand the carceral state are poorly suited to the problems I describe in Parts II and III. Such reforms are unlikely to meet survivors’ needs—particularly those in subordinated communities that both #MeToo and the criminal justice system have neglected—and will likely unjustly target men of color and exacerbate their disproportionate incarceration. A more just state is not necessarily a more carceral one.

Part IV concludes by considering reforms that would reduce the criminal justice system’s carceral response rather than increase it. I discuss the merits and weaknesses of two such approaches: alternative reporting processes and restorative justice. While #MeToo provided a “reckoning” of holding men accountable for sexual violence, criminal justice responses should focus on survivors’ needs rather than fixate on perpetrators. Meeting these needs can help bring survivors back into the criminal justice system from which they have been erased and strengthen its legitimacy.

15 See infra Part IV. A and IV. B.
II. #MeToo’s Achievements

A. Exposing the Criminal Justice System’s Failures

#MeToo brought unprecedented attention to the criminal justice system’s deficiencies. The criminal justice system methodically discounts or burdens the majority of survivors because they do not fit a specific narrative—a white, straight woman who did not know her attacker, clearly resisted, and can demonstrate resulting injuries.16 It consequently excludes, among others, those who knew the perpetrator (particularly if they had a sexual relationship), women of color, LGBT individuals, those who were intoxicated, sexually active, flirtatious, or failed to cut ties with the perpetrator and report immediately, low-income individuals, sex workers, and individuals addicted to drugs.17 While these problems have long been evident to those who practice or study rape law, #MeToo raised substantial public awareness of these failures through media coverage and hashtags like #WhyIDidntReport.18

Victims’ rights and feminist advocates have spent decades attempting to improve rape law.19 These reforms focused on rejecting myths about sexual assault and expanding the state’s responsibility to protect against sexual violence, thereby


17 See Schulhofer, supra note 16, at 1–2; Tuerkheimer, supra note 16, at 14–41; DuMont et al., supra note 16, at 466, 467–70.

18 See, e.g., Brown, supra note 13 (reporting how Jeffrey Epstein manipulated the criminal justice system to avoid punishment); Howley, supra note 13 (describing how Larry Nassar continued to abuse girls despite reports to the police); see also MacKinnon, supra note 5 (describing #MeToo’s effect); Gash & Harding, supra note 1 (describing #MeToo’s consciousness raising effect). After Christine Blasey Ford testified at Supreme Court Justice Brett Kavanaugh’s confirmation hearing that Justice Kavanaugh previously assaulted her, President Trump posted a tweet arguing that “if the attack on Dr. Ford was as bad as she says, charges would have been immediately filed with local law enforcement authorities by either her or her loving parents” and demanding proof that she filed charges. See Allie Malloy, Trump Unleashes on Kavanaugh Accuser, CNN (Sept. 22, 2018, 8:47 AM), https://www.cnn.com/2018/09/21/politics/donald-trump-brett-kavanaugh-accuser-tweets/index.html. Survivors of sexual violence responded with #WhyIDidntReport to challenge the assumption that women promptly report assaults to the police. See Jacey Fortin, #WhyIDidntReport: Survivors of Sexual Assault Share Their Stories After Trump Tweet, N.Y. Times (Sept. 23, 2018), https://www.nytimes.com/2018/09/23/us/why-i-didnt-report-assault-stories.html. Like the hashtag #MeToo, #WhyIDidntReport illustrated the magnitude of sexual violence, but it also shed light on how few survivors report their experiences and the myriad reasons they do not. See id.

increasing the likelihood that sexual violence would be adequately punished and deterred.\textsuperscript{20} The force and resistance requirements were reduced or eliminated to demonstrate that sexual assault can occur without physical struggle.\textsuperscript{21} States repealed corroboration and fresh-complaint requirements, ostensibly rejecting the myths that a woman’s testimony is insufficient evidence to convict and women who do not report quickly are fabricating their experience.\textsuperscript{22} States have slowly begun to eliminate spousal rape exceptions to affirm that rape can be committed by spouses, other sexual partners, or acquaintances.\textsuperscript{23} Rape shield laws have attempted to shift the focus from the victim’s sexuality to the defendant’s actions.\textsuperscript{24}

The criminal justice system continues to fail survivors despite these reforms.\textsuperscript{25} This failure is in part attributable to the enduring influence of rape myths at every level of the criminal justice system.\textsuperscript{26} While sexual assault most commonly occurs when the defendant knows the victim, police are less likely to investigate such cases


\textsuperscript{22} See Gash & Harding, supra note 1, at 4–5; Estrich, supra note 19, at 1133, 1137–43.


\textsuperscript{24} See Gash & Harding, supra note 1, at 4–5; Estrich, supra note 19, at 1133.

\textsuperscript{25} See Gash & Harding, supra note 1, at 8–9 (discussing how rape myths continue to stymie the criminal justice system’s ability to address rape); Kaplan, supra note 19, at 1061–72; Stephen J. Schulhofer, Rape in the Twilight Zone: When Sex is Unwanted But Not Illegal, 38 SUFFOLK U. L. REV. 413, 415 (2005); see also NAT’L VICTIM CTR., RAPE IN AMERICA: A REPORT TO THE NATION 5 (1992); Katharine K. Baker, What Rape Is and What it Ought Not to Be, 39 JURIMETRICS J. 233, 234–36 (1999); Estrich, supra note 19, at 1093 (“[T]he problem has never been the words of the statutes as much as our interpretation of them.”); David P. Bryden, Redefining Rape, 3 BUFF. CRIM. L. REV. 317, 318 (2000); Gruber, supra note 19, at 585, 627, 630–33; Catharine A. MacKinnon, Feminism, Marxism, Method, and the State: Towards Feminist Jurisprudence, 8 SIGNS 635, 651 (1983); see also Lili Loofbourow, Why Society Goes Easy on Rapists, SLATE (May 30, 2019, 5:45 AM), https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2019/05/sexual-assault-rape-sympathy-no-prison.html; Brandon Stahl et al., When Rape Is Reported, STAR TRIB. (July 22, 2018), http://www.startribune.com/when-rape-is-reported-in-minnesota-and-nothing-happens-denied-justice-special-report-part-one/487130861/.

\textsuperscript{26} See SUSAN CARIGELLA, ADDRESSING RAPE REFORM IN LEGAL PRACTICE 2 (2009) (prevailing rape myths and little improvement in reporting and conviction rates demonstrate that “reforms have largely served a symbolic and educative function.”); Gash & Harding, supra note 1, at 8–9 (reporting and conviction rates have improved little because “reform activists did little to alter how rape is conceptualized and concretized.”); Tuerkheimer, supra note 16, at 112–13 (analyzing evidence that prosecutorial charging practices demonstrate rampant societal biases surrounding sexual assault); Kaplan, supra note 19, at 1062–72 (discussing how cultural beliefs and rape myths affect the likelihood of a conviction for sexual assault); Loofbourow, supra note 25.
and much more likely to find allegations of stranger rape credible. Prosecutors are also less likely to pursue cases where the victim knows the perpetrator; when they do, juries are less likely to convict the defendant. Police and prosecutors remain reluctant to take on cases that rely primarily or solely on the victim’s testimony. Yet the expectation of corroboration is unrealistic for an offense that usually occurs in a private setting with no witnesses beside the perpetrator and victim, and which often lacks expected indicators of force and struggle (such as bruises and lacerations).

Survivors have little reason to report if they cannot trust the legal system to take their allegations seriously. Women perceive that police officers harbor specific views about who is a real rape victim and fear they will be met with disbelief if they do not fit that mold. As discussed more thoroughly below, women of color are


28 See Baker, supra note 19, at 235–36; Bryden & Lengnick, supra note 27, at 1251–52; David Lisak & Paul M. Miller, Repeat Rape and Multiple Offending Among Undetected Rapists, 17 VIOLENCE & VICTIMS 73, 73 (2002); Cassia Spohn & David Holleran, Prosecuting Sexual Assault: A Comparison of Charging Decisions in Sexual Assault Cases Involving Strangers, Acquaintances, and Intimate Partners, 18 JUST. Q. 651, 682 (2001); Brandon Stahl et al., Five Factors That Can Determine the Fate of a Sexual Assault, STAR TRIB. (Dec. 18, 2018), http://www.startribune.com/five-factors-that-can-determine-the-fate-of-a-sexual-assault-case/501637071/; see also Loofbourow, supra note 25.

29 See Gash & Harding, supra note 1, at 6, 9; Stephanie Mundhenk Harrelson, I Was Sexually Assaulted. And I Believe Incarcerating Rapists Doesn’t Help Victims Like Me, THE APPEAL (July 18, 2019), https://theappeal.org/i-was-sexually-assaulted-and-i-believe-incarcerating-rapists-doesnt-help-victims-like-me/ (describing how police told her “no sane DA” would prosecute her rapist because she lacked corroboration such as eyewitnesses); see also Gash & Harding, supra note 1, at 2, 6; Estrich, supra note 19, at 1159. First Lady Melania Trump recently reinforced these beliefs by arguing that survivors of sexual assault should not come forward unless they have “really hard evidence” to support their allegations. See Being Melania—The First Lady (ABC television broadcast Oct. 12, 2018), available at https://abc.go.com/shows/2020/episode-guide/2018-10/12-being-melania-the-first-lady; see also Marissa G. Muller, Melania Trump Says #MeToo Accusers of Sexual Assault Need “Really Hard Evidence,” W MAG. (Oct. 10, 2018), https://www.wmagazine.com/story/melania-trump-me-too-women-sexual-assault-evidence-comment.


30 See Tuerkheimer, supra note 1, at 1108–13; Gash & Harding, supra note 1, at 5–6; Tuerkheimer, supra note 16, at 11–12. The Justice Department estimates that women in the age group most at risk for sexual assault, those ages eighteen to twenty-four, report to police at a rate of twenty percent for college students and thirty-two percent for non-college students. See Tuerkheimer, supra note 1, at 1108 (citing Sofi Sinozich & Lynn Landgton, U.S. Dep’t of Just. Bureau of Just. Stat., Rape and Sexual Assault Victimization Among College Aged Females, 1995–2013 1, 5 (Dec. 2014)).

31 See DuMont et al., supra note 16, at 468–69.
both more likely to experience sexual assault and less likely to report it compared to white women. Survivors are also less likely to report if they have been assaulted by someone they know, or lack physical injury or other evidence of a struggle.

Survivors are further deterred by the significant obstacles that follow reporting. Those who report endure a process that intrudes into their privacy, debases their character, and exposes them to additional trauma. Conviction relies upon their ability to conform to distorted jury expectations about rape and rape victims. Few prevail in court. Most forego reporting rather than face judgments about their morality, alcohol use, sexual partners, or credibility; the price of reporting simply outweighs the low probability of success.

#MeToo also demonstrated and intensified the extent to which these problems precipitate reporting through informal channels. Women who see no benefit in reporting to the police, or those who report and are met with incredulity, have long relied on “whisper networks” to warn others of perpetrators. On occasion, such women anonymously share their accounts more publicly through what Deborah Tuerkheimer terms the “Shadow Court of Public Opinion.”

These informal channels, however, often fail to provide full or even partial accountability. While some individuals have flatly denied wrongdoings in #MeToo’s New Court of Public Opinion, very few have taken full responsibility or

---

32 See infra Part III. A.


34 See Gash & Harding, supra note 1, at 6, 8–9; Andrea Parrot, Recommendations for College Policies and Procedures to Deal with Acquaintance Rape, in ACQUAINTANCE RAPE: THE HIDDEN CRIME 368, 369 (Andrea Parrot & Larie Bechhofer eds., 1991) (discussing how reporting to police often compounds a survivor’s trauma).

35 See Gash & Harding, supra note 1, at 9.

36 See id. at 6.

37 See Tuerkheimer, supra note 16, at 11–12; Gash & Harding, supra note 1, at 8–9; DuMont et al., supra note 16, at 468–70; see also Michelle Alexander, My Rapist Apologized: I Still Needed an Abortion, N.Y. TIMES (May 23, 2019), https://www.nytimes.com/2019/05/23/opinion/abortion-legislation-rape.html (“I never once imagined that calling the police could help my situation. It could only make things worse. I envisioned prosecutors, courtrooms and interrogations . . . . I know many women who’ve been raped; not one has called the cops.”).

38 See Tuerkheimer, supra note 1, at 1168–69.

39 See id. at 1171–72.


41 See Tuerkheimer, supra note 1, at 1138–40.
faced substantial consequences. More common is the “strangled, vague, blanket apology” that expresses concern and remorse while subtly minimizing culpability.42 Among the several high profile individuals who have been accused of sexual violence, few have faced criminal charges for various reasons: survivors never sought help from the criminal justice system, police or prosecutors declined to pursue the cases, or the statute of limitations precluded prosecution.43 Several men, such as screenwriter Max Landis (who was accused of sexual assault), journalists James Rosen and Glenn Thrush (both of whom were accused of non-consensual sexual touching), comedian Louis C.K. (who admitted he exposed his genitals and masturbated in front of non-consenting women), and political pundit Mark Halperin (who was accused of non-consensual sexual touching) skirted charges and successfully resumed prestigious careers.44 C.K. used his actions as stand up material in which he unapologetically acknowledged his conduct and lamented the consequences he endured when it became public knowledge.45


43 See Carlson, supra note 11.


B. Contextualizing Sexual Violence

Sexual violence is part of a much larger system of intimidation, subordination, and harassment that women and girls must regularly navigate. #MeToo placed sexual violence within this larger context—at least for white women. It called attention to the additional labor many women assume to contend with sexual violence, the culture that promotes this violence, and the way criminal law ignores women’s “lived experiences of sexual violations.” Criminal law does not and ought not punish every harm. It is increasingly clear, however, that criminal law magnifies heterosexual male perceptions of what is harmful and insufficiently values women’s experiences.

By demonstrating the widespread nature of sexual violence, #MeToo inspired a larger discussion about the steps women take to avoid and respond to sexual violence. As one writer commented, women expend significant “energy and preparation ‘being careful’ . . . ‘Practicing caution’ can be frightening. ‘Watching your back’ can be expensive. ‘Staying safe’ can be exhausting.” These myriad informal restrictions prescribe women’s daily activities, spaces they occupy, and create unofficial curfews. Women walk with their keys out as a potential weapon or to be ready to enter their homes quickly; they walk past their homes if someone has been behind them; they avoid parking garages, rest areas, areas that are not well lit, and wooded areas; they frequently change running routes and run without earphones; and they avoid living on the ground floor. In public, they avoid eye contact with men trying to engage them and pretend to listen to music. They are careful of how much alcohol they drink, that they see their drink poured, and that

---


47 See infra Part III. A.

48 See Gash & Harding, supra note 1, at 15–16; see also Kaplan, supra note 19, at 1056.

49 A Saturday Night Live musical skit satirized how #MeToo welcomed men to this reality: “Turns out all these cool powerful men are turning out to be . . . habitual predators? And it’s like, dang, is this the world now? But here’s a little secret that every girl knows. Oh, this been the damn world . . . [t]his is our home town; we’ll show you around. Welcome to hell. Now we’re all in here. Look around, isn’t it nice? It’s a full nightmare.” Saturday Night Live: Season 43, Episode 9 (NBC television broadcast Dec. 2, 2017), available at https://www.nbc.com/saturday-night-live/video/welcome-to-hell/3629589.


51 See JACKSON KATZ, THE MACHO PARADOX 3–4 (2006); Duberman, supra note 50.

52 See Duberman, supra note 50.
they do not leave their drink unattended.53 Women avoid situations that include men who have made them uncomfortable in the past, limiting their ability to socialize.54

That women must consider their safety in ways straight and cisgender men need not is a widely accepted inequity. A simple Google search for “women’s safety tips” reveals several pages of articles, blogs, and studies asking women if they are “neglecting . . . safety tips” and urging them not to “let their guard down.”55 These articles and websites advise women to: “pay attention to [their] surroundings,” “scan areas that may look deserted but could be harboring predators, such as parking lots,” to keep their “eyes and ears open, [and] hands free,” “have a plan” to respond to an attack, and in the event of an attack “fight to escape.”56 They advise women how to protect themselves from violence in multiple roles and circumstances: as a mother57 or student,58 while traveling,59 using the Internet,60 walking alone at night,61 driving alone or with children,62 and exercising.63

53 See KATZ, supra note 51, at 3.
54 See Duberman, supra note 50.
57 See, e.g., Ten Basic Safety Tips for Women, supra note 55.
60 See, e.g., Ashley Thurston, Tips for Women (By Women) On How to Stay Safe On and Offline, DASHLANE (Mar. 8, 2017), https://blog.dashlane.com/tips-for-women-on-how-to-stay-safe-on-and-offline/.
In contrast, a search for “men’s safety tips” reveals primarily health advice. Several sites address avoiding injury in the workplace, while exercising, and while shaving. The few sites that provide advice about avoiding sexual violence address gay, bi, or transgender men, or provide help for men who want to change their own abusive behavior.

Women’s social, political, and economic inequality both contribute to and are reinforced by sexual violence. Their social and economic inequality increases vulnerability to rape and limits their ability to leave abusive relationships. At the same time, the threat of sexual violence maintains women’s economic inequality by limiting their access to the workplace and to places of power. Women “show up at work and redirect the conversation away from their bra size, tactfully pull hands off their body, or repeatedly find new ways to avoid the male supervisor who wants to

---


71 See, Jewkes, supra note 70, at 1424–29; Robin L. West, Legitimating the Illegitimate: A Comment on ‘Beyond Rape,’ 93 COLUM. L. REV. 1442, 1452–59 (1993) (discussing consent to sex in exchange for economic security); Naomi R. Cahn, Loosening the Legal Language: The Reasonable Women Standard in Theory and Practice, 77 CORNELL L. REV. 1398, 1429 n.136 (1992) (discussing the case of a woman who was repeatedly raped over ten years by her intimate partner, and who would often return because he promised not to rape her again and she could not earn enough to support herself and their children).
discuss his sexual problems.”

Managing the risks and consequences of sexual violence is unpaid and unwanted labor that women must disproportionately undertake or else forego jobs, networking, and mentorship. As Sara Maurer writes, “Did male comedians have to sit in a room and watch Louis C.K. jerk off in order to network? If they didn’t, why should female comedians have to do that work?”

#MeToo also generated more widespread discussion of the culture that supports sexual violence. Cultural norms characterize sex as something men negotiate or win from women. The idea that sex with a woman is something that an aggressive, sexual male achieves is deeply embedded in our understanding of sex, rape, femininity, and masculinity. These social norms promote male entitlement to sex

72 See Maurer, supra note 46; see also Gash & Harding, supra note 1, at 11.


74 See Maurer, supra note 46; see also Walsh, supra note 73; Tolentino, supra note 73.


76 See SCHULHOFER, supra note 16, at 60–61; Estrich, supra note 19, at 1092–93; see also KATE HARDING, ASKING FOR IT (2015); Filipovic, supra note 75, at 18–19; Brad Perry, Hooking Up with Healthy Sexuality, and Why a Sex-Positive Rape Prevention Paradigm Can Benefit Everyone Involved, in YES MEANS YES, supra note 75, at 193, 200–01; Hipp et al., supra note 75, at 85 (describing rape perpetrators’ citing of sexual scripts, in particular that men desire sex and are supposed to initiate it, that women have weaker sex drives or resist male advances); Kim Shayo Buchanan, Engendering Rape, 59 UCLA L. REV. 1630, 1640–42 (2012); Katharine K. Baker, Sex, Rape and Shame, 79 B.U. L. Rev.
from women and male aggression to obtain it. They reinforce the myth that a woman who does not want sex will continuously resist unless threatened with serious harm. Men therefore commonly overestimate a woman’s interest in sex, dismiss or ignore signs of non-consent, and interpret neutral or negative cues as indicators of consent or a challenge to persuade.

Criminal laws requiring force or clear expressions of non-consent ignore how these norms shape sexual interactions. Force and consent standards explicitly or implicitly require women to unequivocally resist or express non-consent because they assume that, as Joshua Dressler argues, “sexual contact ordinarily is a pleasurable event that humans generally seek rather than avoid.” Yet the same social norms that characterize sex as a game or contest of wills in which the man acts and a woman reacts also condition women to be pleasant and avoid

---

77 See Hipp et al., supra note 75, at 86–87 (describing attitudes that lead to rape, including the view of women as objects that exist for sexual gratification); Filipovic, supra note 75, at 18–19; Elizabeth Lopatto, Rape Culture is a Public Health Issue, FORBES (May 24, 2014), http://www.forbes.com/sites/elizabethlopatto/2014/05/24/rape-culture-is-a-public-health-issue/#13c0c2ac7c1. For a discussion of “rape culture” see HARDING, supra note 76 passim; TRANSFORMING A RAPE CULTURE iv (Emilie Buchwald, et al., eds., 2005); Joyce E. Williams, Rape Culture, in THE BLACKWELL ENCYCLOPEDIA OF SOC. 3783, 3783–87 (George Ritzer ed., 2007); NICOLA GAVEY, JUST SEX?: THE CULTURAL SCAFFOLDING OF RAPE 35 (Jane Ussher ed., 2005); see also Emily Suran, Title IX and Social Media: Going Beyond the Law, 21 MICH. J. GENDER & L. 273, 277–78 (2014) (discussing history of the term “rape culture”); Dan Subotnik, “Hands Off”: Sex, Feminism, Affirmative Consent, and the Law of Foreplay, 16 S. CAL. REV. L. & SOC. JUST. 249, 252 (2007) (discussing concept of “rape culture”); David S. Lee et. al., Sexual Violence Prevention, in Shifting the Paradigm, supra note 75, at 7; Lydia Guy, Re-visioning the Sexual Violence Continuum, in Shifting the Paradigm, supra note 75, at 10.

78 See Hipp et al., supra note 75, at 4 (describing perpetrators’ belief that women need to resist more if they truly do not want sex).


awkwardness. A woman who does not want a sexual interaction must therefore reject a man gently enough not to hurt his feelings or incur his wrath but also assertively enough to ensure she is not blamed for sending mixed signals. “No,” one writer states, “is, in theory, available to anyone, at any time; in practice, however, it is a word of last resort . . . [e]veryone should be able to say it, but no one really wants to.” Rejecting a man’s advances also comes with a risk of violence. Many women freeze, disassociate, or acquiesce when they feel that refusing sex may be dangerous or simply useless. Abusive relationships and other power imbalances can limit an individual’s ability to refuse sex or attune those who have endured abuse to unspoken threats. In practice, if a man wants sex with a woman, criminal law generally presumes his access to her body and is agnostic to the woman’s lack of desire unless she adequately expresses it.

Prioritizing male sexual pleasure also shapes how police and prosecutors interpret women’s reports, and how judges and juries determine the defendant’s culpability. A defendant’s actions are inherently more reasonable when viewed through the lens of his desires. Compared to stranger rape, cases in which a survivor knew the perpetrator are easier to understand as a well-meaning man simply getting carried away by his desires. As a result, police and prosecutors are much less likely to credit these reports, juries and judges are less likely to convict based on them, and where conviction occurs, judges commonly reduce sentences. Even affirmative consent standards have little impact on jury’s expectations. Dan Kahan’s study on jury determinations provided mock juries with a fact pattern in which the
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86 See, e.g., State v. Alston, 312 S.E.2d 470 (N.C. 1984); State v. Lester, 321 S.E.2d 166 (N.C. Ct. App. 1984); see also Estrich, supra note 19, at 1111–12; MacKinnon, supra note 85, at 469.
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victim repeatedly said “no” and was passive during the interaction; the jurors acquitted at nearly the same rate despite whether affirmative consent or force was required.89

A recent and infamous Canadian case demonstrates how these assumptions can affect a trial’s outcome, whether explicitly or implicitly. Judge Robin Camp acquitted a man accused of raping a woman over a bathroom sink during a party, explaining “[y]oung wom[e]n want to have sex, particularly if they're drunk,” and that “sex and pain sometimes go together . . . that’s not necessarily a bad thing.”90 He questioned the victim’s morality and her efforts to fight off the attack, asking her why she did not “just keep [her] knees together.”91

While Judge Camp faced consequences and subsequently resigned, the defendant’s retrial with a new judge demonstrated a similar but more implicit prioritizing of male sexual desire. The defendant testified that he never tried to determine whether the victim wanted to have sex, that she had no role in directing the sexual activity, and that he made all decisions regarding the sexual interaction.92 He persisted, he testified, because she did not resist or tell him to stop.93 His own testimony presented him as a person with desires and the victim as a vector for those desires; he did not think about overpowering the victim’s resistance because he gave her little thought at all. The judge acquitted the defendant based on this testimony.94

III. #MeToo’s Failures

A. The Continuing Erasure of Women of Color

#MeToo illustrated the extent to which women of color and other subordinated groups are removed from the discussion of sexual assault in favor of white and more privileged survivors. Women of color experience sexual violence at higher rates

---


91 See Austen, supra note 90.


93 See Graveland, supra note 92.

than white women, yet are less likely to report this to the police.95 Other subordinated groups, such as poor women, sex workers, and members of the LGBT community, are also more vulnerable to sexual violence and, as discussed above, are distrustful of involving police.96 Their communities have endured a long history of police violence and intimidation.97 They justifiably do not trust the criminal justice system to take their claims seriously and may even fear additional sexual violence from police.98 As a result, sexual violence against these groups is largely invisible in the criminal justice system.

The #MeToo movement compounded this erasure. Alyssa Milano’s original tweet failed to credit Tarana Burke for founding the “Me Too” movement and did not credit her until over a day after the hashtag exploded.99 That Milano’s slight was likely unintentional only underscores her privilege; she does not belong to the communities with which Burke works—women of color, survivors in underprivileged areas overlooked by rape crisis centers and sexual assault workers. Nor did Milano, in Burke’s words, “take a moment to see if there was work already being done.”100

#MeToo has since largely excluded the communities Burke originally sought to reach from its dialogue. Stories of wealthy, white, cisgender women dominate the movement.101 While referring to “women” does not necessarily exclude women of color, a qualitative study of #MeToo and #TimesUp tweets concluded that the tweets


96 See DuMont et al., supra note 16, at 468–70 (analyzing reasons that women of color, lesbians, sex workers, and low-income women do not report to the police); Aya Gruber, The Feminist War on Crime, 92 IOWA L. REV. 741, 776–77 (2007); Hannah Giorgis, Many Women of Color Don’t Go to the Police After Sexual Assault for a Reason, THE GUARDIAN, (Mar. 25, 2015) (describing how she did not report her rape because police consider Black women “undeserving of protection”).


98 See Giorgis, supra note 96.

99 See Hill, supra note 1.

100 See Hill, supra note 1.

lack meaningful description, portrayal, representation, and inclusion of women of color and fail to address the specific risks and challenges women of color face. #MeToo’s exclusive nature is no secret. Burke in particular has argued that #MeToo fails to reflect the voices and needs of indigenous women, trans women, and women of color, noting, “our stories get pushed aside and our pain is never prioritized.” Speaking to a conference on race, Burke urged women of color not to abandon #MeToo, but instead to “take back the narrative.” Her words underscore how #MeToo burdens women of color with “actively reminding the dominant audience that they exist.”

The recall of Judge Aaron Persky—widely hailed as a #MeToo victory—illustrates these problems. Judge Persky had sentenced Brock Turner, a white Stanford student, to two years of probation and six months in county jail after a jury found Turner guilty of sexual penetration of an intoxicated person with a foreign object, sexual penetration of an unconscious person with a foreign object, and intent to commit rape. Judge Persky was widely criticized for focusing on prison’s potential impact on Turner while disregarding the magnitude of Turner’s offenses and his failure to take responsibility for them. This criticism was certainly merited, particularly when the victim’s impact statement detailing her trauma was contrasted with Turner’s statement, which largely spoke of his actions in passive voice, focused on his own pain, and blamed his actions on a culture of alcohol and promiscuity.
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The movement to recall Judge Persky, which self-identified as an embodiment of #MeToo, ignored important issues of race. It took care, as did several media outlets, to describe how Judge Persky’s bias and privilege contributed to leniency for another white, privileged man. Yet this nod to racial bias did not translate into a challenge to the sentencing system’s systemic racial bias. Challenging only Judge Persky—and focusing this challenge on the sentence’s insufficiency—isolated the problem as one of a bad judge and a failure to punish. Voters recalled Persky and sent a message to judges about the dangers of leniency, which the California legislature subsequently reinforced by expanding the definition of rape and limiting the ability of judges to use probation in sentencing.

The #MeToo response sidestepped the larger problem of inequality within the criminal justice system, of which Judge Persky’s actions were but one example. Judge Persky rejected the prosecutor’s recommendation of six years, but Turner’s sentence was within the probation report recommendation, which the judge routinely followed. Yet if Judge Persky believed his actions were color blind—and some defended them as such—it was only because he ignored the underlying disparities that afforded a white Stanford student a lenient probation report recommendation in a state where the ratio of Black to white prison inmates is over eight to one.
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#MeToo also ignored these disparities, focusing instead on recalling Judge Persky and enhancing state sentencing laws.

Not only did the #MeToo response fail to challenge these fundamental inequalities, but it also ignored how its efforts might exacerbate them. Judge Persky’s recall made clear that judges should not be lenient on those convicted of sex offenses; the state legislature cemented this through sentencing restrictions. As Paul Butler argued, “[t]he people who would suffer most from this punitiveness would not be white boys at frat parties,” but rather, nonwhite men.117 Police, prosecutors, witnesses, juries, and judges are all more likely to perceive nonwhite men as violent and predatory, and their sexual interactions are more likely to be perceived as non-consensual, particularly when the victim is white. As a result, Black men are disproportionately reported, convicted, and sentenced for the rape of white women. Black women find their experiences disproportionately dismissed compared to white women.118

#MeToo reflects a larger failure of feminist rape reform to consider the needs and voices of victims who are subordinated in other ways. Feminist theorists’ focus on “women” too often means “white women,” marginalizing the voices of women of color.119 Rape reform efforts commonly focus on the needs of privileged white women to the exclusion of the needs of poor women or women of color.120 As Aya Gruber argues, “the victims who are mistreated by the system, generally members of other subordinated groups that have been unfairly excluded from access to government resources (e.g., minorities, drug users, ex-cons, poor women), are precisely not the victims publicized and represented.”121 #MeToo could challenge
the structural causes of this vulnerability, including poverty and discrimination, as important drivers of sexual violence. It could forge stronger bonds with the Black Lives Matter movement to address police discrimination and violence, including sexual violence, against Black women and men. As yet, it has not risen to this challenge.

B. The Monster Narrative

#MeToo’s pivot from a survivor-focused movement to a reckoning of powerful men limits its ability to meet survivors’ needs; it also, paradoxically, limits its effectiveness in promoting accountability. Burke created MeToo to empower survivors and Milano used social media to give voice to survivors. Survivors’ stories inspired calls for accountability. #MeToo’s focus on punishing the most predatory and powerful men, however, promotes a hyperbolic “monster narrative” that distinguishes sexual violence as the conduct of malicious predators and therefore fails to recognize many survivors and perpetrators.

#MeToo demonstrated this narrative’s strength when it tested its boundaries. When #MeToo’s ambit expanded to include men who could not easily be labeled monsters, it faced substantial backlash. Critics have since argued that #MeToo had become a witch hunt, punishing decent men for minor transgressions rather than truly predatory behavior. Being apathetic toward consent or inappropriate and insistent, they argued, is not worthy of censure because it was not hostile toward its
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victims. Restricting men this way would “strip[] sex of eros.” Daphne Merkin wrote in the New York Times:

It goes without saying that no one is coming to the defense of heinous sorts, like Kevin Spacey and Matt Lauer. But the trickle-down effect to cases like those of Garrison Keillor, Jonathan Schwartz, Ryan Lizza and Al Franken, in which the accusations are scattered, anonymous or, as far as the public knows, very vague and unspecific, has been troubling.

These criticisms demonstrate a considerable bind for survivors. Accusations cannot be “scattered,” yet accusations are far more likely to be taken seriously when multiple women make them. Accusations cannot be “vague and unspecific” to the public; yet workplace complaints are not ordinarily made public, and publicizing explicit details is humiliating. Survivors should not come forward anonymously; yet a woman who comes forward publicly is likely to see her career ruined, her safety threatened, her past laid bare, and her motives questioned.

The criticisms also demonstrate how #MeToo has been unable to challenge—and indeed may have perpetuated—the narrative that only monsters commit sexual violence. While multiple accusers make an allegation more credible, multiple expressions of outrage have the opposite effect. Public outrage elicits sympathy for the responsible individual and concerns that the individual is facing disproportionate consequences. #MeToo has likewise generated concern that
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individuals accused of assault or harassment—even those that admit to their behavior—are the victims of disproportionate responses to well-meaning behavior.\textsuperscript{130} Thus four in ten individuals polled feel that #MeToo “has gone too far,” and holding accountable men less culpable than Weinstein “violates [the public’s] gut sense of decency and moral proportion.”\textsuperscript{131} By both focusing on accountability and publicizing the actions of men who do not fit the monster narrative, #MeToo may have increased sympathy for perpetrators of sexual assault and harassment.

The accusation against Aziz Ansari—and the subsequent backlash—demonstrates this paradox. An anonymous woman known as “Grace” described a date with Ansari in which he repeatedly initiated sex at his apartment.\textsuperscript{132} Grace recalled consenting to some sexual activity before asking him to slow down; that he repeatedly placed her hand on his penis, pulling it back to his penis when she removed it several times; that she continuously pulled away from him or moved away from him only to have him follow and continue to kiss her; and that she at one point stopped moving and “turned cold.”\textsuperscript{133} She informed him that she did not want to have sex on their first date, to which he suggested they have more wine and consider it their second date.\textsuperscript{134} After she returned from the bathroom, where she had tried to collect herself, she expressed concerns about feeling forced; he acknowledged her discomfort and suggested they watch a movie.\textsuperscript{135} When they sat down, he motioned for her to perform oral sex and she complied, feeling “pressured.”\textsuperscript{136} He led her to a different part of the apartment and asked where she wanted to have intercourse. She again said she was not ready, and he suggested they “chill” with their clothes on.\textsuperscript{137} As Grace sat with Ansari, she began to grapple with


\textsuperscript{133} See Way, supra note 132.

\textsuperscript{134} See id.
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\textsuperscript{137} See id.
feelings of violation. He began to kiss her again and tried to undo her pants. She left soon after, crying while she rode home and texted friends about the experience.

#MeToo critics and supporters alike argued that Ansari’s story demonstrated the movement’s overreach. Caitlin Flanagan, who had previously lauded #MeToo as “a long-overdue revolution” wrote that the article was mere revenge pornography designed to humiliate Ansari; #MeToo, she cautioned, was a movement of women who “are angry, temporarily powerful—and very, very dangerous.” Many argued that Ansari should not be admonished for ignoring Grace’s cues of consent, particularly where those cues were nonverbal. They conceded that Ansari was “aggressive and selfish” and “not honorable.” But they maintained that Grace should have expected such behavior and it was her responsibility, and consequent failure, to ward him off. In the end, they dismissed Grace’s experience as a “lousy romantic encounter,” “bad sex,” or a bad date. 

Ansari’s conduct elicits complicated reactions because he seemed unaware of his date’s distress. It demonstrates how those who support consent in theory often demonstrate apathy toward it in practice. Ansari identifies as a feminist and told Grace “it’s only fun if we’re both having fun.” His actions, however, ignored her discomfort when it did not further his own desires. Even after he blithely and continuously disregarded her verbal and non-verbal cues, Ansari expressed surprise
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that she felt violated, insisting “everything did seem okay to me.” Indeed, as feminist writer Jessica Valenti wrote in a tweet, “[a] lot of men will read that post about Aziz Ansari and see an everyday, reasonable sexual interaction. But part of what women are saying right now is that what the culture considers ‘normal’ sexual encounters are not working for us, and oftentimes harmful.”

Supporters of #MeToo also protested the resignation of Senator Al Franken as evidence of the movement’s excessive influence. Franken resigned after several women accused him of unwanted kissing or attempted kissing, and touching them on the breasts or buttocks during photographs. Franken and others later characterized his resignation as mistakenly forced by a regrettable rush to judgment. A magazine investigating the claims questioned a victim’s motives and why she did not report it earlier. It implicitly highlighted the accusers’ sexuality by describing one woman’s history modeling lingerie and posing for Playboy and mistakenly identifying another as a “sex therapist.” A crying Franken called an accuser “callous” when she stated that she was not responsible for Franken’s career ending—he was.

In contrast, the article is filled with positive characterizations distinguishing Franken from the type of man who commits sexual harassment or assault. It quotes Franken’s friends describing him “a good man” who talks “sweetly and lovingly.
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about his wife” and “the very last person who would be a sexual harasser.”  He was not, they protested “a predatory person” like others accused of misconduct. It contextualized his actions as the non-sexual fumbles of a clumsy, awkward man. The article ignored that he groped and kissed only women and repeatedly described his unwanted kisses as greetings or expressions of gratitude. It presented the fact that Franken had ignored warnings about how he touched and kissed women as further evidence of his hapless nature, even as these incidents provided evidence of his entitlement to touch women and his apathy about their consent. Franken’s resignation prompted outcry because Franken was “not the type of man we want to see as an abuser . . . not someone we can just call a ‘bad guy’ and toss away.”

Yet such men often commit sexual violence. Peggy Orenstein’s interviews with young men who have sex with women found that these men often assume a woman’s pleasure based on their own desires, interpreting their partner’s actions “through the lens of their own wishes.” They believed in consent, but, as one man stated of ignoring his partner’s reluctance, “I was enjoying myself. I was having what in the moment was a positive sexual experience.” Men who identified as “good guys” described pushing women’s heads down to obtain oral sex or taking a Snapchat video of a prom date performing oral sex and distributing it to friends. A different survey of college men reported that one-third agreed that they intended to use force to obtain sex; the majority of these men, however, expressed that they had no intention to “rape a woman.” Another study found that young men who championed enthusiastic consent engaged in actions that conflicted with their stated definition of consent. When faced with this contrast, these men simply expanded
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their interpretation of consent to include their actions.\(^{167}\) They commonly interpreted women’s desire in accordance with their own.\(^{168}\)

The monster narrative makes it harder to hold accountable many perpetrators of sexual violence because it pathologizes sexual violence as the provenance of immoral predators. It excuses from judgment less forcible or explicit acts of coercion and dominance, as well as perpetrators who have admirable characteristics in other parts of their lives.\(^{169}\) Media coverage of allegations focuses on the resumes of the accused—their past accomplishments or bright futures—because these distinguish the accused from the narrative’s perpetrator.\(^{170}\) Similarly, men defending themselves against allegations often cite their accomplishments as evidence of their innocence or that they do not merit punishment.\(^{171}\)
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\(^{169}\) See C.J. Paskoe & Jocelyn A. Hollander, Good Guys Don’t Rape: Gender, Domination, and Mobilizing Rape, 30 GENDER & SOC. 67, 74 (2015); Chan, supra note 101 (quoting Tarana Burke as stating, “What I realized in the last year is that people are OK when you’re talking about the big, scary bad guy” such as Harvey Weinstein and R. Kelly, but not “the good guy who’s an ally to women, who looks out for everybody, who’s a stand-up person, but maybe behaves in a way that is too permissive.”). Compare Emily Yoffe, Understanding Harvey, HUFFPOST (June 26, 2018), https://highline.huffingtonpost.com/articles/en/harvey-weinstein-psychology-sexual-predators/ (condemning and pathologizing Weinstein, Cosby, and others) with Emily Yoffe, I’m Radioactive, REASON (Aug. 23, 2019), https://reason.com/2019/08/23/im-radioactive/ (describing positively a journalist Yoffe felt was unfairly accused of sexual misconduct and characterizing the source of accusation as “a long-ago, private event that, while regretted, did not involve a sexual assault.”). Racial and class biases about what constitutes an admirable characteristic also make it more likely that individuals will believe that a poor, Black man has committed rape than a white, middle class college student. See Paskoe & Hollander, supra, at 74–75.
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IV. LESSONS FOR THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

A. Reforming Rape Law and the Carceral State

Several legal scholars have suggested reforms to better reflect women’s experience of sexual violence.172 One method of changing rape law to better reflect survivors’ experiences is to alter how the “reasonable person” standard informs determinations of force, coercion, and non-consent. This standard often requires the prosecution to demonstrate that survivors reacted appropriately when faced with unwanted sex. In New York, for example, rape in the third degree requires that the victim demonstrated what a reasonable person would interpret as non-consent in the circumstances.173 The reasonable person standard also informs whether a woman’s lack of resistance was justified. Under Pennsylvania law a defendant’s threat of force to obtain sex does not constitute rape unless the threat would “prevent resistance by a person of reasonable resolution.”174 California law similarly asks juries to determine whether the defendant’s threat would cause a reasonable person to acquiesce to unwanted sex.175 Courts have interpreted force and consent with regard to reasonable resistance even where the requirement is not enshrined in the statute.176

The reasonable person standard also shapes interpretations of the defendant’s mens rea. Many jurisdictions treat rape as a general intent crime. A defendant lacks the requisite mens rea if he honestly and reasonably believed that he was not engaging in the prohibited conduct—that is, if he were honestly and reasonably

172 Such reforms include using a more subjective reasonable person that is specific to women, eliminating the force requirement, refocusing the law on offenders’ mens rea as to consent, using a negotiation model for sex, and requiring affirmative consent. See, e.g., Schulhofer, supra note 20, at 342–48; Anderson, supra note 20, at 1421–37; Cahn, supra note 71, at 1432–35; Schulhofer, supra note 25, at 417–23.
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mistaken about his use of force or the victim’s consent. Even jurisdictions that require a defendant obtain affirmative consent may nonetheless ask whether a reasonable person would interpret the victim’s actions as affirmative consent.

A “reasonable person” determination reflects the dominant social norms and cultural attitudes. As discussed above, these norms systematically condition men to either not see, underestimate, or ignore signs of non-consent. Women may freeze, disassociate, or simply acquiesce because they fear an unspoken threat of violence or other retribution, do not think their resistance or “no” would affect the outcome, or because it helps them rationalize sexual violence and avoid confronting trauma.

Legal reforms that improve the likelihood of prosecution and conviction, however, may not reflect the needs of many survivors, particularly women of color. Although the criminal justice system provides women of color less protection than white women, it does not follow that women of color seek to strengthen a system that oppresses their community. Women of color bear the weight of both greater vulnerability to rape and a “unique ambivalence” to punishing it because men of color are disproportionately punished for rape compared to white men.

Women of color are far less likely to benefit from expanding rape law than white women. However #MeToo changes social norms, it is unlikely to affect racial biases because it has largely ignored them. Biases that render women of color hypersexual and therefore unable to be raped are likely to persist. If lawmakers reform the reasonable person standard to reflect a “reasonable woman,” the new standard will reflect, in truth, a “reasonable white woman,” and thus continue to discount the perspectives of women of color, the challenges and threats they face that white women do not, and the unique reasons they may have resisted reporting to the police. A more subjective standard, such as a “reasonable Black woman” may only intensify the effect of racial biases by allowing juries to more easily conclude that the defendant reasonably perceived a Black woman consented because
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of her perceived hypersexuality or that a Black woman has less reason than a white woman to fear a Black man.\textsuperscript{185}

Rape reforms that increase rates of prosecution and conviction are likely to harm communities of color by increasing their disproportionate incarceration. As I. Bennett Capers argues:

[A reasonable woman standard] has, at its core, implicit biases. In determining whether a “reasonable woman” would be in fear, decision makers necessarily rely on implicit biases and heuristics that take into consideration the race of the defendant. The standard allows decision-makers to conclude that a reasonable white female might be in fear of a black stranger, while obscuring the fact that a reasonable white female would not be in fear of a stranger under the identical circumstances if the stranger were white. Indeed, it allows decision-makers to engage in the same calculus and reach the same conclusion, even in cases involving black acquaintances. It thus eases the proof necessary in cases involving black men and white women . . . . [The reasonable woman standard] is, if not overtly racist, very much racialized.\textsuperscript{186}

Domestic violence laws that increase the role of police and rates of incarceration demonstrate how such legal reforms can fare poorly for already subordinated communities.\textsuperscript{187} Mass incarceration destabilizes communities and neighborhoods already weakened by poverty and high unemployment rates.\textsuperscript{188} Half of all incarcerated men previously served as their families’ primary means of support.\textsuperscript{189} When fathers are incarcerated, family income declines to the point that sixty-five percent of families cannot meet their needs.\textsuperscript{190} Men returning to the community, particularly African American men, face substantial barriers to employment.\textsuperscript{191} Incarceration weakens a community’s social network and deprives it of members who would otherwise raise children and contribute to the local economy.\textsuperscript{192} It exposes these community members to violence and increases the risk of mental health problems such as post-traumatic stress disorder.\textsuperscript{193} Prison does little to
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rehabilitate; on the contrary, it discourages empathy and deepens norms that contribute to sexual violence.194

B. Alternative Reporting Mechanisms

A more promising reform may involve allowing survivors alternative means of reporting that refocuses on survivors’ needs rather than formal investigation and prosecution. As discussed earlier, law enforcement practices deter survivors from seeking help from the criminal justice system. Police are unlikely to report sexual assault allegations as “founded” to prosecutors, especially for non-white women and women who knew their perpetrator. Prosecutors often decline to pursue these cases. Many women fear violence from police.

Numerous investigations into police misconduct demonstrate the importance of increased transparency and accountability. Studies have exposed systematic mishandling of sexual assault allegations in several jurisdictions, including Los Angeles, Baltimore, St. Louis, New Orleans, New York, Salt Lake County, Philadelphia, and Missoula.195 Police are particularly likely to inappropriately dismiss or fail to adequately investigate claims by women of color, immigrants, LGBTQ individuals, women in poverty, and sex workers.196

Deborah Tuerkheimer advocates for a less formal process of confidential complaints within the criminal justice system based on the “You Have Options” program in Oregon.197 This more flexible system allows confidential complaints that need not precipitate consequences for the perpetrator or which are subject to limited investigation to determine their strength.198 The program allows most survivors to upgrade or downgrade the investigation at any time.199 The framework particularly supports survivors who are reluctant to come forward by giving them

194 See id. at 29.
195 See Tuerkheimer, supra note 1, at 1101–12.
196 See Tuerkheimer, supra note 1, at 1112.
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199 See Van Sykle, supra note 197. Andrea Parrot notes that many sexual assault survivors “do not even attempt to have the assailant arrested; but they would like him to know that what he did was wrong, so that perhaps he will not repeat that type of behavior with others.” See also Andrea Parrot, Recommendations for College Policies and Procedures to Deal with Acquaintance Rape, in ACQUAINTANCE RAPE: THE HIDDEN CRIME 368, 369 (Andrea Parrot & Larie Bechhofer eds., 1991).
more control over the timing and course of their investigation.\textsuperscript{200} By encouraging survivors to come forward earlier, it might also preserve evidence and avoid a survivor’s credibility being questioned for waiting to report.\textsuperscript{201} It may also provide survivors catharsis and allow police officers to identify individuals against which multiple accusations have been confidentially made.\textsuperscript{202}

It is unlikely that this process alone will benefit survivors. A law enforcement system that quickly dismisses survivors’ claims as unfounded may take even less seriously claims made by women who are unsure whether they want the accused prosecuted.\textsuperscript{203} Officers may assume that these survivors are not serious or are fabricating stories because they are not subject to charges for making a false report. It is also not clear that police would be able to maintain victim confidentiality while doing an investigation thorough enough to provide insight, particularly where the victim knows the offender.

Programs are more likely to effect meaningful change when paired with substantial, evidence-based methods of reforming law enforcement conduct. The You Have Options program began as a process to rebuild trust in a police department that handled reports poorly.\textsuperscript{204} It employs victims’ advocates to reach out to survivors and ensure the program reflected their concerns.\textsuperscript{205} It also trains police to use “trauma informed” interview techniques focus on experiences and asks sensory questions that can be corroborated later, rather than requiring survivors to provide chronological timelines inconsistent with traumatic experiences.\textsuperscript{206} And, it provides survivors support through a team of social workers, advocates, and law enforcement.\textsuperscript{207} Reports in the program’s jurisdiction have doubled since it was launched.\textsuperscript{208}

C. Restorative Justice

Restorative justice brings together victims, offenders, and other members of the community in the aftermath of an offense and uses collective decision-making to determine how to restore the victim and community, and how to prevent the offense
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A restorative justice process is only undertaken when the offender admits fault and is prepared to accept responsibility; it is not an adversarial system that weighs evidence and determines fault. The victim has the opportunity to express how the wrongdoing harmed her and a voice in shaping the consequences the offender faces, as do friends and family of the victim and perpetrator. The offender must engage with the community and consider the full impact of his actions on the many participants.

This process prioritizes the survivor’s healing and validation, rather than merely the offender’s punishment. It provides survivors with the opportunity to be heard about their experiences, an active role in the consequences, and support from the community. Studies of trauma demonstrate that talking about the harms they have experienced and hearing a public admission of responsibility and remorse can promote a victim’s recovery. This is vital for survivors of sexual violence, something which is surrounded by a “norm of silence” that can further trauma. Ordinary criminal justice proceedings—in which a judge determines a defendant’s sentence after an adversarial process between the prosecution and defense—deprives survivors of these opportunities.

Although restorative justice’s utility is limited to circumstances in which an offender takes responsibility for his actions, its less punitive focus may appeal to offenders. Restorative justice entails consequences, including incarceration.

209 See HOWARD ZEHR, THE LITTLE BOOK OF RESTORATIVE JUSTICE 47–52 (2015); Mary P. Koss et al., Campus Sexual Misconduct: Restorative Justice Approaches to Enhance Compliance with Title IX Guidance, 15 TRAUMA, VIOLENCE & ABUSE 242, 246–47 (2014); C. Quince Hopkins, Tempering Idealism with Realism: Using Restorative Justice Processes to Promote Acceptance of Responsibility in Cases of Intimate Partner Violence, 35 HARV. J. L. & GENDER 311, 315 (2012); see also JUSTINE DARLING, RESTORATIVE JUSTICE IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A COMPILATION OF FORMATS AND BEST PRACTICES 3 (2011). Restorative justice models often draw on practices of indigenous cultures such as the Maori of New Zealand, various first nations tribes in the United States, and the Mayan people of Guatemala. See Darling, supra, at 3; see also Zehr, supra, at 19–20; Hopkins, supra, at 333.


214 See Hopkins, supra note 209, at 321–27; see also Harrelson, supra note 29.

215 See Hopkins, supra note 209, at 325.

216 See Harrelson, supra note 29; Alexander, supra note 27.
Affected parties, however, determine these consequences, rather than a judge who may harbor implicit biases. Restorative justice also creates goals for reintegrating the offender into the community, and involves both the offender and the community in meeting these goals. It provides an alternative to registries and residency restrictions, which are at best ineffective and at worst increase recidivism by isolating offenders from social supports and the ability to obtain employment and housing.\footnote{217 See Karen J. Terry, Sexual Offenses and Offenders 232–45 (2d ed. 2013); Corey Rayburn Yung, Banishment by a Thousand Cuts: Residency Restrictions on Sex Offenders, 85 Wash. U. L. Rev. 101, 153–58 (2007).}

In contrast, the adversarial and punitive nature of ordinary criminal justice proceedings discourages offenders from taking responsibility and understanding the consequences of their action. Offenders desperate to avoid prison and up to a lifetime subject to sex offender registries and restrictions have little incentive to acknowledge the harm they caused, accept responsibility, and commit to rehabilitation.\footnote{218 See Kaplan, supra note 213, at 721–22; Harrelson, supra note 29 (arguing that the criminal legal system’s retribution-centered response disincentivizes the accused from admitting or acknowledging the harm they have caused, as they are desperate to avoid the horrors of prison); Alexander, supra note 37.}

The defendant’s denial and subsequent trial—or a guilty plea and sentence approved by a prosecutor and judge without the victim’s approval—can further the victim’s trauma.\footnote{219 See Harrelson, supra note 29 (It is not uncommon for individuals who commit sex offenses to plead to multiple lesser offenses that they did not commit in order to serve a similar sentence but avoid registration and residency restrictions); See also Thea Johnson, Fictional Pleas, 94 Ind. L. J. 855, 856–58, 888–90 (2019) (describing the common use of such “fictional pleas” in sex offense cases). These plea bargains leverage the prospect of sex offender restrictions while providing few, if any, of restorative justice’s benefits.}

Restorative justice requires an offender to take active responsibility for his conduct by confronting the harmful effects of his conduct, grappling with the decisions that precipitated his conduct, and shaping his consequences and eventual reintegration into the community.\footnote{220 See Alexander, supra note 37; see also Harrelson, supra note 29.}

Chanel Miller’s Victim Impact Statement demonstrates the priority many survivors place on the offender accepting responsibility and consequences, and how the denial of this acknowledgment and subsequent trial can traumatize survivors again:

“I thought there’s no way this is going to trial; there were witnesses, there was dirt in my body, he ran but was caught. He’s going to settle, formally apologize, and we will both move on. Instead, I was told he hired a powerful attorney, expert witnesses, private investigators who were going to try and find details about my personal life to use against me, find loopholes in my story to invalidate me and my sister, in order to show that this
Arizona’s RESTORE project—which studied a rare use of restorative justice in the context of sex crimes—demonstrates how restorative justice can benefit sexual violence survivors. Survivors who participated in conferencing with the offender placed high value on explaining how the offense affected them, making the offender accountable for his actions, ensuring the defendant did not reoffend, and “tak[ing] back [their] power.” They described high levels of satisfaction with the process, reporting that they felt safe, were listened to, treated with respect, and supported during the conference. All victims who participated in the conference strongly agreed that they would recommend the program and agreed with the statement “I did not feel blamed.” All but one agreed or strongly agreed that it was a success.

Restorative justice also provides an opportunity for the criminal justice system to consider the broader determinants of sexual violence and engage the community in resolving them. As I have argued elsewhere, reform of the black letter law is unlikely to have significant practical effect absent widespread cultural change. Unspoken cultural norms discussed in Parts II and III—that women must, for example, undertake a unique burden of avoiding or responding to sexual violence in every walk of life, that failure to adequately meet this burden demonstrates complicity—perpetuate rape myths and discount women’s experiences. Police, prosecutors, judges, juries, and even survivors interpret the law in accordance with these norms. It is far less likely that criminal law will shape these norms than continue to be shaped by them. The traditional U.S. criminal justice system focuses on the offender’s individual choices and usually ignores the how systemic failures allowed—or even encouraged—those choices.

Restorative justice requires all parties to view the offense as the product of deeper systemic issues rather than an isolated act of an individual and to consider how to address these systemic issues. Through this process, participants can examine how these factors encourage sexual misconduct and how best to address sexual assault was in fact a misunderstanding. That he was going to go to any length to convince the world he had simply been confused. I was not only told that I was assaulted, I was told that because I couldn’t remember, I technically could not prove it was unwanted. And that distorted me, damaged me, almost broke me. It is the saddest type of confusion to be told I was assaulted and nearly raped, blatantly out in the open, but we don’t know if it counts as assault yet. I had to fight for an entire year to make it clear that there was something wrong with this situation.”

Baker, supra note 110.
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them. Such community involvement can strengthen norms and attitudes that prevent sexual assault, which may have a more powerful deterrent effect than the threat of sanction.\footnote{229}

Restorative justice gives more power to subordinated communities justifiably distrustful of a criminal justice system that subjects them to hyper-incarceration and discrimination. African Americans, for example, are more likely to be targeted by the criminal justice system than those who are white; they are charged with more severe offenses for the same conduct and given more punitive sentences for similar offenses.\footnote{230} African American survivors may not want to contribute to the mass incarceration that negatively affects their communities, particularly where the offender is a member of their community.\footnote{231} A process that gives voice to several stakeholders and uses consensus to shape consequences can reduce the likelihood of racial bias and increase the criminal justice system’s moral legitimacy.\footnote{232}

This less carceral approach also allows communities to focus on reintegration, which may be particularly important to communities that suffer the effects of mass incarceration. Restorative justice outcomes integrate into their reparation plans strategies for reintegration, including specific means for the community to support the offender.\footnote{233} This process strengthens the offender’s social ties to the community rather than disrupting them.\footnote{234} An offender’s lack of voice in the traditional criminal justice system discourages trust, particularly when that system disproportionately
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targets members of his community and demonstrates other systemic bias against him. Requiring an offender actively confront the harm he caused and help determine his consequences increases his investment in the process and strengthens its legitimacy.235

Restorative justice processes also have significant limitations, particularly when they are executed within the criminal justice system. Systemic biases may undermine its use. These biases may, for example, give greater access to white or otherwise privileged offenders at the expense of subordinated groups, particularly where (as with RESTORE), prosecutors determine which cases qualify.236 Communities of color and others affected by hyper-incarceration and discrimination must be given substantial power in creating these restorative justice systems so that their needs are prioritized. Any restorative justice process should keep careful statistics on the offenses and the defendants and survivors who are informed of the process’s availability, and of those who ask to participate and are accepted into the program. A task group must periodically review this data for indicators of systemic bias and, with proper protections for parties’ identities, make the data available to independent organizations and individuals.

Criminal justice has failed many communities in a way that defies rehabilitation. Building restorative justice processes within this system will not fix it; nor will it address the myriad other sources of oppression.237 Such processes may, however, be a promising means to incorporate the needs of subordinated groups in the criminal justice system’s failing approach to sexual violence.

V. CONCLUSION

#MeToo’s lesson may ultimately be about the limits of criminal law. It is unacceptable to accept these limits with a shrug. However, it would be shortsighted to believe that reforming criminal law will respond to what survivors needs most. Strengthening a carceral state disproportionately harms communities of color, which includes the survivors of sexual violence who are most at risk. #MeToo’s ultimate lesson for the criminal justice system may be the need for a less carceral approach shaped and led by those at the margins of both criminal justice and #MeToo’s discourse.
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