

**Your topic:** Is the institution of heterosexuality detrimental for women?

**Your topic's description:** Essay

**Your desired style of citation:** Harvard Referencing

**Your educational level:** Guaranteed 2:2 Standard

**Referencing Style:** Harvard Referencing

**Number of page:** 8

**Words:** 2000

**Is the institution of heterosexuality detrimental for women?**

**[Writer Name]**

**[Institute Name]**

## **Is the institution of heterosexuality detrimental for women?**

### **Introduction**

Participate in the Lesbian and Gay Pride is very important for feminist, bisexual and heterosexual to show their solidarity on the one hand the struggles lesbians and gays, and secondly to criticize the heterosexual norm. People question any ideology that claims that heterosexuality is natural. They refuse amalgam and reproduction / sexuality, the idea of complementarily between the sexes and the idea of spontaneous desire towards the opposite sex. Some consider heterosexuality as a social and historical construction takes different forms in different cultural, religious, political, economic societies (Chrys, 2008). Indeed, for some people, heterosexuality is not just a sexual practice, but above all an institution of production and reproduction of class domination of men over women class. Its function is to control all women. It allows men to appropriate the labour of women, children, women, women's bodies, women themselves (women, girls, sisters, mothers ...). As such, it is one of the cornerstones of patriarchy.

### **Discussion**

Heterosexuality is based on the hierarchy of masculine and feminine genders. It works as a standard, imposing a single model of life in society, that of relationships, marriage, procreation, family. Women in high stress to heterosexuality and motherhood who base their social recognition of women. Think how heterosexuality as a free choice when measuring the extent of the constraints of heterosexuality facing women? As it is not possible to live fully, freely other models of life, people cannot talk about choice. For some, one of the biggest constraints to

heterosexuality lies in obscuring the possibility lesbian. As long as women are not free to be lesbians, no woman will be free. It is therefore crucial to fight against lesbophobia. The lesbians suffer a double oppression: that of being a woman and of being a lesbian. Prohibited all their "privileges" of heterosexual, such as access to certain professions, the opportunity to talk about their intimacy, to walk hand in hand, etc imposed a systematic invisibility of their lives, their practices, their identities.

Visibility causes violent repression: beatings, murder, rape, contempt, hatred, psychiatric confinement. People analyze lesbophobia as related to the suppression of women's autonomy. The oppressive heterosexual institution also in a different way other women: stigmatization of bisexual; singles, of heterosexuals who do not conform to the model of the couple and / or monogamy pressure to find a man or keep; need to please as aesthetic criteria imposed by men (Chrys, 2008).

In analysis of the institution of heterosexuality, women's bodies, sexuality and minds are shaped by physical coercion, brutality and restriction of access to knowledge and endorsement of heterosexuality. Heterosexuality itself is seen as the cornerstone of patriarchy (Mary, 1995). The heterosexual institution of female sexuality and reproduction guarantees male control of women and their labour power both in the domestic arena and beyond. As in radical feminist analysis of heterosexuality's role in securing the global institution of patriarchy, questions of how class, race and cultural difference affect the meaning and materiality of patriarchal practices are not addressed. Social practices are interpreted only in terms of their role in the reproduction of heterosexuality as the basis of patriarchy. In the process, the cultural specificity of particular practices is rendered invisible. For example, few postcolonial feminists now would accept interpretations of arranged marriages, purdah and the veil as simple expressions of patriarchal

power. Their functions are much more complex and context-specific. To read them simply as forms of oppression is to negate both possible positive meanings and the possibility of resistance and transformation which might be undertaken from within the patriarchal order.

During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, heterosexuality and family went hand in hand in the practices, representations and legislation. Represented by marriage in the Napoleonic Code (1804), this association was a real pillar of the legal system, whose influence was exercised hegemonic way in many areas of society and whose links were not a question. This close relationship between heterosexuality and family law is expressed through the central legal criterion difference between the sexes; they are organized to the hierarchical and complementary. In this context, the husband was considered the head of the family and exercised his authority as he heard of his wife and children, as the legal holder of the "paternal power".

Some would try to counteract this programming the elites, presenting a paradigm based on intuition, their experience and observation. There is an understanding that they would have loved to have when they were teens. Some consider love and heterosexual marriage is the way designed to find fulfillment, transcendence and ultimately God (Mary, 1995). This explains why they are so obsessed with it. In addition, the heterosexual family is essential to properly rise a new generation and is therefore, be essential to society.

Heterosexuality belongs to the cycle of life and is therefore not a "sexual preference." It is centred on seduction, marriage, and family (parenting). Most heterosexual marriage and require the family to fulfil their destiny. Marriage is a sacred union in which a man and a woman become "one" with love. A child is an expression of this unity. Marriage is updated when the male spirit in the form of love has woman.

The heterosexual love reflects God's love for creation (nature). Man passes the love of God (spirit) to the woman, who is creation. He plants his seed that is his mind. It nourishes and creates a new human being. Men want power, women want love. Heterosexual marriage is the exchange of the two. Women need to experience the power of love. Men need to be able to express their love. The exchange of female power against the love of man lies in the heart of the heterosexual relationship. The court involves gaining the trust of the woman to give up its power. The man has a vision of life together. Women like trusting. A woman gives her husband the power and he used to love. This is reflected in the sexual act. With a perfect abandonment comes perfect love (Mary, 1995). This dynamic never ends. The husband runs but he tries to win the approval of his wife. But if a man repeals the contract does not involve with love, it loses its power.

Contrary to what some said, the woman needs to be possessed by the love of a man. Similarly man has the fundamental psychological need to possess a woman by her love.

This phenomenon heterosexualization is part of a legal system older, who has reinforced the effects through the regulation of unions, parentage and adoption forms. For example, only children born within marriage are considered legitimate until 1987, benefiting the entire rights related to their parentage. To protect and preserve the family within the family lineage, illegitimate children had only incomplete parentage and children "illegitimate", ie those born outside of marriage but whose at least one of the parents was already married when designing, no rights. In addition, the presumption of paternity established automatically paternity of a child born within a married couple on the husband of the woman who gave birth. This provision is still in force, ensured the maintenance of heritage in the paternal line at the time of its inception and

later allowed the father has certain responsibilities towards the child, but it also preserves a certain appearance marital fidelity (Richard, 2007).

The legal institution of adoption also reveals the significance of the law heterosexual hegemony and patriarchal domination, while it has always been presented as a form of legal relationship not arising out of the alleged sexual reproduction legal parents. Designed to allow individuals could not have children to pass on their heritage, it is indeed addressed at the outset only individuals who wanted to adopt key individuals. However, from the 1940s, it began to affect the adoption of abandoned children and youth was then open to requests (married) couples (Richard, 2007).

Significantly laws organizing the adoption, such as those relating to marriage, did not specify anything about sex couples concerned, presuming heterosexuality their relationships. Under law, heterosexual partners wishing to join or start a family thus constituted an implied and obvious marriage or adoption (Deborah, 2003). This situation is also inscribed in a context where sexuality, especially for women, is conceived not only for reproductive purposes legally and within marriage, which was the only possible framework in which a family. This meant it was founded in reproductive complementarity of the sexes, considered synonymous with heterosexuality. Therefore, it was difficult to think legally separate the dimensions marital, parental and (hetero) sexual family. By way of confirmation, he also had to wait for the homosexual demands on the couple and the family that some political parties feel the need to make gender differences in access to marriage condition and / or adoption (Henry, 2012).

Indeed, if there is a visible and / or increased salience of certain sexual and relational norms, they allow themselves to be easily grasped through sexual orientation or social model underpinned by it. This explanation also includes the risk of essential standards which, by definition, are

dynamic, and idealize homosexuality almost naturally considered. Thus, people do not share the opinion of some critics when they say that "the access of gays and lesbians couples to forms of legal recognition is problematic insofar as it reinforces the" compulsory heterosexuality, "because it is modeled on a conservative ideology of marriage that excludes relationships that do not correspond to this model, which then have a weak legal protection ". Admittedly, the opening of civil marriage and adoption to same-sex couples include risk prioritization and standardization, but these are not the actual or perceived sexual orientation of those considered as dominant, if not a form of moral conservatism that crosses the distinction between homosexuality and heterosexuality (Henry, 2012). Moreover, a heterosexual person living in multiple sexual partners or follower of sadomasochistic rituals probably meets the same obstacles as his counterpart homosexuals. Therefore, it seems urgent to forge a new concept to describe these phenomena, which are separate from hetero-normatively and for limiting the latter to standards that are really at stake sexual orientation.

## **Conclusion**

The heterosexual institution is the eroticization of male power and female submission. Women's sexuality is constructed by and for men. In this framework, lesbian sexuality is not even thinking! The feminist movement, as it does not problematizes heterosexuality, participates in the invisibility of lesbians. This also prevents bisexual or heterosexual feminists question their lesbophobia integrated and their subordination to men in intimate relationships with them. Attack heterosexual institution and seek practical subversion and resistance to male domination is work to be done in our thoughts and feminist commitments. As feminists fight for women's autonomy,



it seems essential to combat heterosexism and struggle for recognition and visibility of lesbians. Since 1960, the marriage rate has declined by one third, the fertility rate was almost halved, and the divorce rate has more than doubled. More than half of all the firstborn are designed out of wedlock. More than a third of children live apart from their biological father.

Social pathology (the destabilization) is the goal of the elite. It says to young men and women that are heterosexual roles "stereotypes" while homosexuality is "natural." Feminists deliberately alienate women to their husbands. Laws against domestic violence are designed to kill the family. They prevent people from exercising leadership and authority is actually ardently desired by women. In conclusion, the illuminate destabilize society by advancing a "New World Order". Psychic development is deliberately stopped at the stage of seduction pornography. Women are deliberately starved of love, bombarded with pornographic images, manipulated and distracted. Which was sold as the "sexual liberation" is in fact the slavery to instincts. Heterosexuals need of marriage and children to fulfil their divine destiny. Instead of serving God and their families, women are little soldiers enlisted in the New World Order, and men are emasculated or cast adrift. Destabilization of society under the guise of feminism is an assault on right divine to be human. It goes to the heart of the relationship between God and his creation, and the relationship of humanity to God.

## References

- Chrys, Ingraham, (2008) *White Weddings: Romancing Heterosexuality in Popular Culture*, Edition 2, Publisher Taylor & Francis, 79-85
- Deborah, Cameron, (2003) *Language and Sexuality*, Edition 8, Publisher Cambridge University Press, 45-51
- Henry, Abelove, (2012), *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*, Publisher Routledge, 235-241
- Heterosexual Politics*, Publisher Taylor & Francis, 49-51
- Mary, Maynard, (1995) *(Hétéro) sexual Politics, Feminist Perspectives on the Past and Present*
- Richard, Guy, (2007) *Culture, Society and Sexuality: A Reader*, Edition 2, Publisher Taylor & Francis, 235-241