

3.2.2.3.2.35 Sexual culture can be changed quickly and easily

Most people think of culture, including sexual culture, as something that has evolved over millennia.

But, why, then, is there often a marked change of culture, including sexual culture, when one crosses national boundaries. Clearly marked boundaries as we know them today are a rather recent development in many parts of the world.

Earlier empires, until as recent a time as pre-World War II, in most parts of the world didn't encompass definite areas throughout which their governments uniformly exercised their authority. Rather, they exercised strong authority in their core areas, while towards the edges, their authority fizzled out.

In many parts of the world, clearly marked boundaries only exist for a few decades, but they have already resulted in grossly diverging cultural developments, for example between Vietnam and China, or between Thailand and Malaysia.

Culture, including sexual culture, is an offshoot of the laws a government enforces over an area it controls. Cultures are easily changed within just a few years, and the changes can be radical indeed.

Japan experienced a significant change of culture within just a few years between 1939 and 1949, and so did Germany. There was a total change of culture in China between 1940 and 1950, and during the Cultural Revolution and between 1978 and 1988.

Humans are highly adaptable, and so is culture. Humans anywhere in the world are likely to avoid behaviors that would get them beheaded or thrown into jail, and they will develop patterns of behavior and thought that will be advantageous for them. And voila, the result is culture.

In the US, “sexual harassment” legislation with a strong anti-male bias has had a great influence on US sexual culture. Radical solidarity groups of women do not have to work through the minds of the people to effect the changes they wish for. They only have to have a few laws changed, and the changes enforced by the police. The minds of the people will change all by themselves, and this happens rather quickly.

The minds of people change in accordance to threats expressed by the law, and corresponding to potential perks offered by the law.

Men avoid behaviors and emotions that could land them in prison. Women who become aware that being sexually harassed or sort-of raped (when the rape is only in her perception) will develop behaviors and emotions that could land them huge compensation payments.

Both men and women do not have to be aware of how their emotions change. Their interests will effect these changes all by themselves.

Thus, in a sexual culture in which it is easy to get trapped in sex-related law-suits men will develop sexual docility and women whose vulnerability is socially overemphasized will develop over-sensibility.

It's probably easier to understand how a permanent threat develops docility, rather than how overemphasized vulnerability develops hypersensitivity.

Women who show up at police stations, or report that what started as consensual intercourse all of a sudden became rape, are not mere pretenders, and do not even act willfully in order to collect compensations or settle scores.

It's rather that the awareness of how easy it has been in many cases for women to collect compensation, or even just to settle a score, leads to an unconscious attitude or preparedness. So, when the opportunity arises to claim sexual harassment or rape, the consciousness of women moves into an "as if" mode, even if everything was consensual.

Humans do not only see what they want to see; they also feel what is advantageous for them, and remember what suits their interests. Some people, when in need of money, can remember very strongly that somebody else owes them money, even if this is false.

This phenomenon explains why the courts in the West have to deal with an ever increasing number of cases in which women falsely claim rape.

In the US, if a man has a promiscuous lifestyle, he is by now better off if he is homosexual. Pursuing a promiscuous heterosexual lifestyle is much more likely to get a man into trouble. Promiscuous females are very well protected.

In heterosexual rape cases, it's not quite sure what has to be proven: violence (by the woman), or the absence of violence (by the man). Feminist organizations will always be very vocal in supporting the alleged victim.

A 17-year female can have sex as she wishes, and even expect a lot of non-sexual gratifications without having ever to fear legal reprisals. But her male partners (if they don't behave in accordance with her wishes) are threatened with lifelong prison sentences.

And what happens if the testimony of a raped woman sends the wrong man to prison for decades? Nothing. She'll just say sorry. She will never be charged for anything.

Blatant anti-male legal bias is, of course, not restricted to the US. Sweden, a European country where feminists have been calling the shots for a number of years, has implemented, and enforced, legislation by which it is legal to sell sexual services, but illegal to buy them. This results in a situation where, in a consensual transaction, only the usually male buyer can be prosecuted. There, legally, the man in commercial sexual transaction is always guilty, and the woman never is. It's as simple as that.

If Sweden thinks that buyers are to blame for the existence of an illegal market, e.g. the sex trade, why don't they try the same approach with the drugs trade. But in the drugs trade, it's always the sellers who are at fault.