This guy had stuck his penis through the bottom of the cubicle and was wanking.
I try not to look at people.
He took a photo of my cleavage.
I pretend to phone someone, or I look in my bag.
Just a guy standing in the bushes exposing himself and wanking.
I’ll always look to see when the last bus is.
One of them past me by the door and said ooo lovely.
I avoid eye contact.
I block it out.

This guy came up behind me and grabbed me between my legs,
like properly grabbed me.
He was trying to rape me.
And this guy just took his pants off.
I tend not to respond.

He did the whole look me up and down thing and said I think Ti Amo?
I don’t really go on the top deck of the bus at night.
He said something like hi how are you doing.
I find myself calling someone quite a bit.
He was following me, clearly following me between train carriages.
I never make eye contact, I just look straight ahead where I’m going.

This really creepy man walking really close behind me
and pretty much breathing down my neck
and whispering things.
Never talk to a man.

He raped me.
I will get a taxi for that walk.
He did a u-turn to try to pick me up. In a semi-trailer.
Basically if I just walk with my eyes closed and my earphones on it’ll be fine.
And one of them just said hi as I walked past.
I consider what I wear more.

He just started talking to me and he wouldn’t leave me alone
and he wouldn’t let me walk past.
He said give us a blow job.

A group of guys one of them pinched my bum when I was going up the stairs.
I wear a lot of black, I feel vulnerable when I wear too much colour.
This guy at the next table looked over and said hey sweet lips!
I walk in the middle of the road a little bit because then no one can jump out.
And then he said, so how do you guys relate to each other, I mean sexual relations.
I’ll stop dead and get my phone out.

I had in the street a group of guys try to stop me and be like hey
you should totally come back to ours.
He tried to grab my ass.  

He was following us, he carried on like a whole block.  
I’ll have my phone in my pocket rather than in my handbag.  
He turned around and went, do you know that you’re beautiful?  
I wear my iPod all the time.  
This guy came up to me said hey, hey sexy.  
I always apologise, always.

Two men walking behind me talking about my behind to each other obviously  
in a very loud voice so I would hear.

And he molested me on the bus on the back seat.
He said hey you know what girl, I like the way you look.
I look at the floor. I never make eye contact with anybody.
And then he was like oh you’re such a frigid cunt.
I just listen to my music.
He was staring at me, drunkenly staring at me.
I have to fight the urge to cover up so people don’t look at me.

They shouted something at me, can’t remember exactly what the words were
but it was something like your ass or something about that.
A guy was wanking in the bushes.

This guy came past and said alright love.
I can deal with it now. I always have a comeback for everything.
He was just like oh hey how are you, do you want to come with me?
I’ll take my phone out or pretend to be doing things.
He was eyeing me up and down and sort of shuffling closer step by step to me.

I start to become really conscious of how I’m walking
and what I’m wearing
and how I’m looking.

So he sat on the corner of the chair
and again, legs akimbo,
whipped it out, had a go.

A guy in a doorway tried to slide his hands down me.
Obviously I’ll be looking away.
He wasn’t looking at my face he was looking at the rest of me.
I’ll call people or pretend that I’m calling people.
He told me that I looked tired.

Stop, check your phone, tie your shoe lace,

He was like get in the car, I want to, I want to.
He used to corner me so I couldn’t get out from my desk.
VII. Embodying Intrusion

For Merleau-Ponty, the bodily-self as ‘I can’ is grounded in a bodily knowledge not always accessible to conscious awareness and yet one revealed through an exploration of our habits. Beginning with an acknowledgment that our living body is: ‘not an object for an “I think”, it is a grouping of lived-through meanings which moves towards its equilibrium’ (2002: 177), exploring the habit bodies of women in public space helps reveal some of the pre-reflective ways they experienced their being-in-the-world. The notebooks asked participants to not only be aware of the times and spaces where men did intrude but also to record their experiences of anticipation – moments where intrusion was expected even when it was not borne out. The notebooks revealed two important points of disjuncture with what participants had claimed in the initial conversations, which combined reveal the impact of men’s intrusion on women’s embodiment. The first, disparity in projected impact, demonstrated how participants were unaware of the levels to which they were restricting their freedom in response to the possibility and actuality of men’s stranger intrusions in public. The second, disparity in projected frequency, was more surprising, with most of the women participating initially believing intrusion happened more often than was evidenced when they began recording it. To help make sense of this we need to move to an exploration of women’s habitual modes of embodiment, marked by an external awareness on the environment and an external perspective on the bodily-self.

‘It’s never really made me augment the way I live:’ Projected impact

For some participants, the very act of reflecting on the way men respond to them in public in the initial conversations raised awareness of how many of the embodied practices they employed in public space operated pre-reflectively. Hannah reflected on the ways in which her experience of being propositioned from the car at 16 was absorbed into the ways she lived her embodiment in public space. In describing the impacts of the experience, Hannah suggested that it was difficult to directly connect impacts to episodes: ‘(I)t’s like you’ve tried to rationalise it in your head, you’ve gone through the process and then it’s just filed away in your brain somewhere. Only for you to discover years later that it happened’ (Hannah). The ways in which the incorporation of men’s intrusion into women’s embodiment operated both on a conscious and unconscious level was described by Viola.

I guess the difficult bit about it is that it’s so ingrained in everything you do that a lot of the time you aren’t really aware that you’re doing it. So there might be times when you’re very aware because you have to go somewhere that’s a bit unsafe or do something that you’re a bit uncomfortable with in public space but then on a day to day basis you do it as well without even thinking (Viola).

Both Hannah and Viola are articulating here how many participants incorporated bodily strategies to resist, avoid or manage men’s intrusion into their very being-in-the-world with the result that the work they were doing became hidden, embodied to the point of naturalisation. This becomes particularly evident in an account given by Claire where, within the space of the initial conversation, she realised how an episode of a men’s stranger intrusion had worked to alter her behaviour in such a way that the
episode itself had been buried and the change in her behaviour was subsequently framed in terms of her spontaneous choice. After talking about how she used to walk through a London park at three in the morning after a night out, something she would no longer do, Claire claimed nothing had happened to make her change her behaviour.

I really don’t know what it was that changed, there was no incident or anything like that. I think it was just slowly thinking I need to change my behaviours, I don’t remember a determining factor where it was like “right that’s it now” or anything that happened to a friend or anything like that. I think it’s just, I don’t know (Claire).

Later in the conversation however, Claire remembered that in fact there was a particular incident that altered her behaviour, that what she experienced as a free choice to act was situated within a context of men’s intrusion.

Actually thinking about it after saying nothing happened actually something did happen where I was walking through the [London park] at about 10:30 and it was dark and I was aware that someone was walking kind of at the same pace but slightly behind me. And there was a road crossing so I stopped and he stopped and he asked me what time it was and I said “I don’t know, I haven’t got the time” because I was aware that if I looked down he could have done something, so I just said “no, no I don’t have the time sorry”. And then just as I was about to set off again and the road was clear he kept asking, “excuse me, excuse me, excuse me” and I thought, “no I’m not having this, because he’s already asked me the one question, there can’t be anything more pressing than this” and I just kept going. And I think just as he started to follow me a car came and it meant that he couldn’t follow me so I went even quicker down the road. And there was something in that that made me think this is really silly, there’s no one around and it’s pitch black and it’s so badly lit that I can’t keep walking through here. So I’d stick to the main road (Claire).

Merleau-Ponty’s (2002) conceptualisation of the habit body, combined with the findings presented already about early encounters with men’s intrusion, helps to explicate this mechanism of forgetting as a form of self-defence. For Merleau-Ponty, habitual practices are greater than the sum of their parts. An analogy of his framework is suggested by Nick Crossley (2001): when we learn as a child to withdraw our hands from a hot object we do not thereby learn to retract our hands from hot objects; we learn not to touch hot objects in the first place. What is acquired through habituation is not solely a direct mechanical response to a particular practical situation, as seen in Merleau-Ponty’s example of a typist who ‘incorporates the key-bank space into his bodily space’ (Merleau-Ponty, 2002: 167), but also an embodied principle of responding to similar situations. For Merleau-Ponty: ‘the subject does not weld together individual movements and individual stimuli but acquires the power to respond with a certain type of solution to situations of a certain general form’ (2002: 165). This is the meaning behind Gail Weiss’ (2010) claim that habit enables us to inhabit our world: enabling the unfamiliar to be transformed into the familiar so that we can orientate ourselves quickly within experientially similar contexts. Habit is thus not simply about the fact that we employ routine behaviours in our daily lives; it represents how the bodily-self takes up and takes on meanings – how we make ‘the’ world, ‘our’ world. Exploring habit in this way helps to understand the processes informing how episodes of men’s intrusion become embodied: the general principle of ‘walking through a park at night is unsafe’ is taken in as a form of bodily knowledge, a way of living female embodiment. This builds on Ann Cahill’s (2001) argument that the threat of rape plays a central role in shaping distinctly feminine bodies, finding that it is not solely feminine bodily comportment which is in part
constructed here, but also our habitual ways of being in, and making sense of, our world. It is also not only the threat of rape which plays this role, but the culmination of messages received as part of growing up that men’s intrusion is inevitable and women’s bodies are the source. The ways in which, in this sense, habit operated as a form of self-protection was identified by Cathrin, who raised a concern that participating in the notebook process may undo the ways in which forgetting operates as a form of coping.

(My) worry about partaking in the study was that I would become more conscious of [men’s stranger intrusion] and it would affect me. Because these coping mechanisms, conscious or unconscious, they’re working so I don’t get angry anymore or, not much. I don’t want to say not at all but I don’t get as angry as I used to, where it would just stick with me and really hurt and I just don’t want to feel like that now (Cathrin).

There is a tension here, in that there are both benefits (identified by Cathrin) and limitations (identified by Claire) in the burying of particular episodes that forms a key part of the process of habituation. The benefits are that through habituating a particular mode of embodiment in response to the possibility of men’s intrusion, experiences of intrusion no longer have the impact they did during adolescence. By including the possibility of men’s intrusion into a projected intentional arc, we thus include it into our being-in-the-world. The disorientation and confusion seen in women’s early encounters, resulting from our geworfenheit or ‘thrownness’ (Heidegger, 1996), is mostly evaded. It is only different or unexpected forms of intrusion (or of intrusive men) that are experienced as having an impact, with the rest lived as ordinary and expected. The limitations of embodying intrusion, conversely, are seen in how it can construct women’s ‘safety work’ as an act of choice, minimising or hiding the impact of men’s practices. Reviewing Claire’s account, it is evident how the ways in which the embodied principle acquired through habituation (a principle that restricts her freedom of movement), is reconfigured as being in fact an expression of her freedom – in this case Claire’s freely made decision, developed over time, to slowly change her behaviours.

This reframing is most acutely seen in an account given by Jacqueline in her notebook. Two men who work in Jacqueline’s building repeatedly stared at and commented on her when she used the downstairs café. Jacqueline was married to an abusive man who had strangled her to the point where she was hospitalised for several months. It is in relation to her ex-husband’s violence that Jacqueline experiences the intrusion from the two unknown men, claiming ‘(i)t would take more than this to take away my hard won freedom – so now I choose to eat in my office’ (Jacqueline). Jacqueline’s freedom here, as Claire’s agency above, is situated by the continuum of men’s intrusive practices. Jacqueline is not free to eat in her work café without being observed, but as this is less constraining than living with a dangerous man – limiting her ‘space for action’ (Jeffner, 2000) but not her entire ‘life space’ (Lundgren, 1998) – this limitation is experienced as an expression of freedom in that it is self-imposed. That the continuum of men’s intrusion is a context situating freedom and agency, however, is hidden through the process of habituation.

‘The other forty-nine’: Projected frequency

Another key finding in terms of habituation was the disparity in projected frequency noted earlier. For almost 90 per cent (n=26) of the woman participating in the notebook process, the experience of men’s intrusion during the period of recording
was significantly less than anticipated. In her follow up meeting, Charlie spoke about how she found the notebook process ‘initially difficult as oddly it seemed the incidences of street harassment seemed much fewer than usual’. This was also reported by Lisa: ‘(i)n typical fashion, nothing happened to me after I was given the book’. Experiencing a similar disjuncture between projected and experienced instances of intrusion during the notebook process, Sophia linked the disparity to the impact of her earlier encounters with men’s intrusion.

(A)ctually, when I focus on it, unpleasant and unwanted attention came a lot less often then I first made it out to be. I’m not really sure exactly why either, but I think what might have had an impact is that I started getting uninvited attention when I was so young that it has had a lasting impression and instilled a ‘weariness’ in me. I dwell on any experience I have had, making it feel like it happens all the time when in actual fact it was a handful of specific moments which led to this discomfort. When I think about it, this experience has made me more aware that actually, overall, I don’t get half as much unwanted attention as I thought (Sophia).

Alice spoke in the initial conversation about how she ‘can’t leave the house without feeling constantly like I’m being bombarded by all these men’. Revisiting this sentiment after completing her notebook, Alice also noted a distinct change.

I think it was a feeling that didn’t actually manifest as much as I thought it would. I feel scared and aware of myself and wary of men but whether, does that come to fruition? Not really to the same extent. Certainly not on a level I would describe as bombardment… but it feels like that because the threat level is technically, the threat is always there (Alice).

Gail reported after participating in the notebook stage: ‘that the frequency may not be once a week, it’s nearer one in every fifty journeys for me. But that’s enough to change my attitude, perception and behaviour on the other forty-nine’. This illustrates the power of the embodied principle, demonstrating that what is learnt through habituation is not simply a mechanical response to stimulus. Claire, who had mentioned in her initial conversation that her experience of being in public space was weighed down by ‘something about always knowing who’s around you and how you’re behaving and being alert and a constant feeling of being observed’, had a similar revelation after participating in the notebook process.

I thought in a way this is just going to make me really aware of everything and I’m going to end up filling a notebook with stuff and then I carried on with my business and didn’t really pick up on much stuff… I think it’s the feeling. I don’t think you’re constantly observed but I think it’s the feeling that you are. There’s that awareness in how you position yourself. There’s definitely a feeling there that someone could be watching me (Claire).

Abbey, after stating in our initial conversation that she would ‘notice at least one or two people staring everyday’, also found this was not something borne out when she had her research notebook to record intrusions.

I think it was interesting that I don’t get as many comments or as much staring as I thought I was getting because I think I maybe even said when we first talked that it would be weird if a day went by without this kind of interaction happening, but actually it doesn’t happen every single day, or I might get some looks but nothing that would make me adapt my behaviour, that only happens every couple of days. So I
Alice, Gail, Claire and Abbey link the disparity they experienced in projected frequency with the continuum of men’s intrusive practices as a context situating their freedom and action. What is evident is the anticipation; that the possibility of men’s intrusion is itself a living reality, even in the physical absence of an intrusive man. Where Merleau-Ponty’s (2002) ‘habit body’ enables us to project into an anticipated world, a fissure was found here between anticipation of men’s intrusion and its actualisation. As in the earlier discussion of the impact of the gaze (see Chapter Five) Sartre’s ontology of the body can also be useful here, particularly in how, as outlined by Dermot Moran, for Sartre: ‘I experience how the other sees me, even in the physical absence of the other’ (Moran, 2011: 14). Sartre’s insights can be developed further for this project through using Merleau-Ponty’s notion of the process of habituation based on acquiring a general principle. It may be, returning to Claire’s account given earlier, that the principle she embodied was not (or was not only) that ‘walking through a park at night is unsafe’ or that ‘unknown men will intrude’. These lessons combine with what was taken in as part of growing up, namely that; such intrusion is ordinary, her body is the source, and the ways she enacts her embodiment can be used as a barrier. This takes a particular toll on the experience of being in the bodily-self as the continual work of anticipating the responses of an unknown other results in a perpetually disrupted interior world, similar to that seen in the discussion of calls to ‘cheer up’. In addition to this, participants described two ways in which externality in public space was privileged, firstly in holding an external awareness (of environment and others) and secondly in maintaining an external perspective (on the bodily-self).

The right amount of panic: External awareness
Exploring participants’ habitual bodily practices in public space revealed how these two interlinked yet individually powerful mechanisms intersected to encourage a particular modality of embodiment. The first, external awareness, relates to what Coy (2009) terms experiential templates of risk. Here, conceptions of risk combine with a female fear (Gordon & Riger, 1989) of stranger perpetrated sexual violence, to encourage a habitual attitude towards the world – Heidegger’s (1996) concept of ‘attunement’ – marked by vigilance; manifesting in the maintenance of an external awareness when occupying public space. The second mechanism, external perspective, differs from external awareness in being not a consciousness of the environment but rather a consciousness of one’s own embodiment. ‘Perspective’ here is used in the sense of being ‘a particular attitude towards or way of regarding something’ (“Perspective”, 2001), thus where external awareness can be seen as an attunement towards the world, external perspective is an attunement towards our embodiment. This works alongside, but is distinct from, Foucault’s (1979) concept of ‘panoptic surveillance’, which has been usefully employed by feminists to theorise an internalisation for women of the gaze of men (Bartky, 1990; Bordo, 1989). External perspective does not refer only to a consciousness of how one’s bodily self is perceived by (male) others, though it can include this. It represents, rather, a bodily attitude reminiscent again of Fanon’s (2008) epidermalisation; a mood lived through the body ‘tuning’ us into our being-in-the-world.
During the initial conversations, the conscious level of ‘safety work’ women conducted in public spaces was immediately apparent, with many participants easily able to give lists of strategies adopted in public space in response to the possibility and actuality of men’s intrusive practices. One of the most commonly repeated strategies was focused on scanning public space and identifying points of safety, as seen in the accounts of Lucy and Ginger.

I usually try to sit next to women, at least nearby women unless it’s the middle of the day and I feel confident to not but say late at night and the carriage is empty and there’s somebody sitting on one end of it, I’ll make sure I’ll sit at the other end, otherwise they might think there’s any reason to talk to me. A lot of times it’s unnecessary because they’re probably just as tired as I am. But just to be on the safe side, I’ll make sure that I’m not on the same one. Other times I’ve actually waited for the person to get on the train. And then at the last minute I actually haven’t gotten on the train myself, because I thought that they were paying too much attention to me and it’s safer if I just skip this train. I have actually changed trains in the middle, when I’m on the train and I know somebody’s there who I would rather not be in the same carriage with, I get off in the station and I change for the next one that’s coming. Even if it makes me late for something (Ginger).

I try not to look at people, like I look at them to see where they are and who they are but not look at them in the eye. I look straight ahead I think. And a lot of the time if I’m walking late at night I carry my keys between my hand so I can stab… and try to stand quite big as though I’m tough and can handle myself. And don’t really respond to people, if someone says something either, sometimes what I try to do is be quite polite but stop the interaction quickly, because I don’t want to make them angry as well. So I’ve got to be polite but not too polite that they want to continue talking to me. And walk very fast, look like I know what I’m doing… sometimes I’ll pretend to talk on the phone, if no one’s awake or it’s really late… I would prefer to sit next to a woman than sit next to a man. And I’ll stand up if there’s no where to sit on my own a lot of the time. I don’t really go on the top deck of the bus at night if I’m on my own, I stay downstairs. And I always make sure, it’s really weird but if someone gets off at the same stop as me, I always think they’re following me. So I try and stop or maybe that’s when I pretend to phone someone, or I look in my bag so then, they’ll go in front and can’t follow me (Lucy).

What emerged here was the ways in which both women’s strategies of resistance and strategies of coping called on them to maintain an external awareness in public spaces. This awareness was not only of unknown men, but also of points of safety such as other women, or points of unsafety such as particular contexts on public transport (on the top deck of a bus in the evening for example). These reference points are not set; they differ between women and can change for the same woman at different points, based on experiential histories. Clare spoke about the change she experienced after she was almost mugged by a girl gang.

(F)or a while after that when I walked down the road I’d be running away from women and I’d be looking for the men. And that was the bizarrest sensation ever. I’d be walking back from my flat and it’d be at night and I’d see some women and I’d see a man and I’d think oh the man’s just over there. So the point of safety had changed which was the bizarrest thing ever (Clare).

While what represented safety for Ginger, Lucy and Clare differed, all were scanning their external environment to find these points. Evident across these accounts is the way in which when avoiding or minimising the possibility of men’s stranger intrusion conflicted with women’s freedom, priority is given to the former. For Ginger, she
would prefer to be late than be in the same carriage as a man she has identified as possibly intrusive. For Lucy, she would hang back after disembarking from a bus rather than begin immediately to head to her destination. This constant scanning and adapting own movements in response to anticipated and experienced intrusion is seen in the account of Jane, a committed runner, who constructed a map of anticipated intrusion.

I figured it out, my route around London I planned through experience very carefully, like from coming back to going out I’d change it, there was this one road that coming back was always busy with deliveries because it was about 7.30, always go through the square because that’s full of bankers and they’re not going to say something. I used to go past [a nightclub] but then I learnt don’t do that, that’s bad, but if you go past Barbican and the NHS building it’s ok. But then I had to change that because construction got up that street so that got bad. I had every street on my run planned out to avoid it as much as possible. I knew which roads. Now I just get on a treadmill and watch television. No more following. No more grabbing (Jane).

For Jane, paying to run indoors became preferable to the possibility and reality of men’s intrusion in public spaces. The context of such a decision is characterised by Schepple and Bart (1983) as a geography of fear and limitation, where in order to lessen the former, we may need to raise the latter. Again, as seen in the earlier accounts of Claire and Jacqueline, men’s intrusion is seen as a key context situating women’s freedom and agency.

Measuring the ways in which (or indeed if) a habituated external awareness in public spaces works to decrease the amount of intrusion women experience is difficult. Such embodiment will rarely be experienced as ‘capable’ in terms of acting as a barrier to men’s intrusion as the vast majority of ‘safety work’ is pre-emptive. Sue Wise and Liz Stanley (1987) highlight this, claiming that: ‘the amount that sexual harassment is thwarted is a social invisibility – we can’t see that women have skillfully and successfully assessed and dealt with a complicated social situation because success here is an “absence” of a predicted outcome’ (Wise & Stanley, 1987: 171). This ‘absence’, however, may be made visible in studies that show men are more likely to be victims of crime in public space – the ‘crime paradox’. The paradox can be explored through the issue of what is counted; suggesting that such studies count ‘crimes’ men are more likely to experience in public space (such as physical fights), but fail to tap into experiences such as those considered here. There may be, however, an additional reading that affirms the power of women’s modes of embodiment to act on (male) others.

If participants such as Jane, Clare, Lucy and Ginger have their awareness focused externally, identifying (on what is sometimes a pre-reflective level) points of safety at the same time as limiting their movements in spaces they identify as unsafe, then it may not be that men are more targeted to be victims of crime in public space. It may be that women are skilfully navigating public spaces, disrupting opportunities for victimisation by assessing the environment and individual men whilst attempting to predict their intentions and practices. This process was conceptualised by Katielou as the impossible task of evaluating the ‘right amount of panic’.

I’m used to being, well, we’re used to being, I suppose it’s conflicting messages isn’t it, it’s take care of yourself and you’re being a silly woman… you have to do just the right amount of panicking don’t you (Katielou).
In attempting to gauge what ‘the right amount of panic’ was in a given situation, participants relied on the interplay between their awareness of the external environment and on their pre-constructed templates of risk to conduct an escalation calculation. The operations of this calculation were mostly hidden, conducted often without conscious awareness and grounded in the possibility of intrusion, with women trying to pre-empt and thus prevent unknown men’s behaviours. It was revealed, however, quite powerfully, when the projected escalation of a particular man (or group of men) was not borne out by their actions.

I left a club late at night and I was just going to go home and find a taxi and I was sitting down and this guy was like ‘are you alright?’ And I said ‘yeah I’m fine.’ But thinking ‘why are you asking me that? That’s a bit dodgy, I’ll carry on walking.’ And then this other guy just came out of the shadows of a doorway and just grabbed me, was just holding onto me and I was like ‘what are you doing!’ I just didn’t know what to do and was trying to be really indignant and going ‘let go of me now’ because I really didn’t know how to react. But at that point I wasn’t on edge I don’t think so I feel like I should have been more ready, should have had my keys. And then I felt bad because he wouldn’t let go of me, this really tall guy and the other guy who’d asked me if I was alright came running down the road and yelled “let go of her now”, so he let go of me and I ran away. But then I felt really bad because initially I’d thought the first guy was evil but he was actually just checking if I was ok (Lucy).

I was much younger, maybe 17, 18 and living back home in Germany I was again just walking home, I wasn’t far from where I lived, and this was in the evening, maybe 10 or 11 o’clock at night and this car slowed down behind me and followed me for a little bit and then overtook me and stopped, and this guy got out so again I started shouting at him, “what do you want! Get back in your car!” And he just looked at me, really taken aback, and just pointed at the cigarette machine next to where I was standing, like I’m just trying to get some fags. Which is obviously super embarrassing (Viola).

The accounts of both Lucy and Viola show the impossibility of ‘the right amount of panic’; a Catch-22 where ‘(y)ou don’t really know till something happens and then if nothing happens then it’s automatically too much panic’ (Katielou). Josina describes her anger at being judged for actions understood by a male stranger as motivated by laziness rather than fear.

I guess risk perception is different from actually, like times when I actually thought I was in a really risky situation and I had no idea, and there are times when I’m being cautious and I’m not. One time I got on this bus and I sat down, and it was two stops later and I pressed the bell to get off, and the guy next to me, who I was sitting next to, he laughed and I looked at him like, not like please tell me what’s on your mind but like what the fuck? What’s wrong with you? And then he said “oh I’m sorry it’s just quite funny that you, why did you bother getting on the bus it was only two stops?” And I was getting off the bus but I wanted to say something so I said “look you’re not a woman travelling on your own in the middle of the night. You’ve got no idea.” And he apologised, he was clearly just a bit cocky… I just thought you know I’m thinking so much in detail about how to get home safely on my own and you’re judging me, you’ve got no idea (Josina).

The Catch-22 of ‘the right about of panic’ combines with what was seen earlier in this chapter where, during the process of growing up, participants had learnt to doubt their own sense making of men’s intrusion. The result is that the times where participants did successfully manage intrusive situations are discounted. This was evident in how,
contrary to suggestions in the literature, many participants in this study mentioned feeling relatively safe most of the time in public spaces, such as Theodora.

I actually personally feel quite safe. The area where I live it’s not, people say it’s a bad area but I’ve never felt unsafe walking around it. Maybe that’s because that’s where I grew up. But I’ve always felt quite safe to be honest. I mean I tend to, yeah, as a general rule I feel quite safe… I’ve never felt like I couldn’t walk home alone if I’ve needed to or wanted to (Theodora).

Such descriptions appear as the unproblematic reflections of an embodied agent, however, Theodora then goes on to describe the range of restrictions she has taken into her habit body to create and maintain this feeling of safety.

(S)top, check your phone, tie your shoelace, anything like that. Always in a doorway though if you’re tying your shoelace, don’t get on the ground. Never. I would never, if I can, if I want someone to get past me I try to get my back to a wall. If you sort of stop and stand with your back to a wall and look at them I never want to do that because I think it might cause a confrontation but if you stand and sort of kneel down to tie your shoelace or something like that then it’s a reason to stop if you see what I mean (Theodora).

It is here that the limits of the dominant narratives available to speak of men’s intrusion in public spaces, being a binary of either pleasurable compliment (sexual) or frightening threat (harassment) hide the impacts on women’s freedom. The most common outcome, as seen in Theodora’s account above, was to habituate a limited freedom but reconfigure this as an expression of agency through forgetting its founding situation; the continuum of men’s intrusive practices.

‘Don’t be in your body, watch your body’\(^{10}\) External perspective

Throughout the research process, participants spoke about not only being aware of who is looking, but of how you look to them; an external perspective on the bodily-self and the adoption of specific bodily traits to limit or prevent intrusion. Beauvoir outlined a similar process during women’s adolescence, which she termed ‘erotic transcendence’.

She becomes an object; and she grasps herself as object; she is surprised to discover this new aspect of her being: it seems to her that she has been doubled; instead of coinciding exactly with her self, here she is existing outside of her self (Beauvoir, 2011: 360. Emphasis in original).

Key here is this notion of being doubled, representing an ambiguous embodiment. The awareness of our bodily-self is not located internally, in an experience of the body as capacity and expression, but externally in the body image. The body is not lived as the self, instead the self is experienced as distinct from and yet tied to the body; a body that both is and is not herself. Here female embodiment is lived as split and contradictory; an experiential tension also found in Del Busso and Reavey’s (2011) account of young women’s embodied experiences in everyday life. The body is our living body still ‘ours’ in terms of being singled out, but it is not lived as the original locus of our intentionality – it is not lived as ‘us’. In addition, given what has been seen previously in this chapter, this ambiguity itself is doubled in that, through men’s intrusion, women learn their female embodiment is not only the source of their freedom, but also the source of its constraint.
The impacts of this awareness of the body from outside, a bodily-self consciousness, have already been seen in the discussion of the gaze. Exploring the role of the external perspective in the habitualised embodiments of participants expands the finding that public space represented for many women an experiential, though not always external, feeling of the gaze, in that women anticipated more intrusion than men actualised. It is not only the potentiality (and actuality) of the male gaze, but also the enactment of a modality of embodiment holding an external perspective towards the body that created Claire’s initial feeling of constant observation.

The most common way that an external perspective was revealed in women’s accounts was through identifying a division between safe and unsafe clothing. Sophie, Bea and Delilah described in detail the ways in which for them, appearance could be strategic.

I used to wear, when I was about 17, 18, I used to go to clubs and wear short skirts and high heels and loads of make-up and all that stuff. And then I came to university in London when I was 18 and without being conscious I think over that year my dress sense really changed, and I started like going out with all the fresher and that in my normal short skirts or whatever but I used to really hate the feeling of getting on the tube in a short skirt and the attention I would get whilst in those sort of clothes. And slowly and slowly, and I’m talking about 7 years ago now? I just stopped dressing like that, but instead of finding an alternative way of dressing that I was kind of comfortable with, I basically have been hiding myself for the last 6, 7 years, basically ever since I came to London. And I’m not, having come to that realisation, I’m not very happy about it (Sophie).

(I)t's mainly for me just that having to think about what you wear when you go out, that definitely, definitely changes. Like leopard print, definitely. Every time I wear it. It’s weird. It definitely makes a big impact. I think maybe some people aren’t aware of the impact it has on the choices they make every day but I think I am aware of it. Like if I’m going to get the night bus, it sounds so extreme, but I won’t go out wearing a dress, I’ll wear jeans just because it’s safer and in the back of your mind you’re probably thinking at least I can run away if I don’t wear a skirt and high heels. It’s ridiculous. But even, I walk to school at about 1 o clock every day and there’s usually a few stragglers on the streets, people who aren’t in work, and even at midday when it’s not a particularly dangerous environment, I’m thinking, don’t wear a low cut top, wear a scarf just in case you need to wrap it around. And it sounds so extreme but it’s not something that’s at the forefront of your mind, but it’s always there (Bea).

I dress with scarves and things to just cover, take the focus away from (my breasts)… also I now stay away from the colour red ever since I wore red one day and everyone just kept commenting, oh you with the tight red dress. And I just thought it’s not necessarily tight, it’s knee length, it’s got shoulders, it’s not a provocative dress, but because it was red and you should be a wallflower basically. So I steer clear of red which is such a shame because I love it, so I wear hot pink or burgundy, things that are similar to red but I always think a bit, ooo, think twice about wearing red. Yeah. I never really think that much about it but it does affect the way you carry yourself (Delilah).

For each woman here, a safety discourse combined with how the body was lived. An experiential template of risk thus moved from being a mapping of the external environment to a mapping of the body as seen from outside. This reveals how part of the general principle learnt through habituation is that women’s body is itself a ‘risk’, what for Susie Orbach is ‘the kind of foreboding women have always carried in relation to their bodies’ (Orbach, 1978: 12). The ways in which participants framed the process of identifying, through early encounters, men’s intrusion as grounded in
their female embodiment, is evident in the ways in which this external perspective often saw markers of femininity as unsafe. For Sophie, Bea and Delilah above, this meant adjusting their clothing to ensure nothing would reveal too much of their breasts or their legs. For Louise and Gail, this resulted in an embodied practice of safety based on hiding the ‘woman’ signifier of their long hair.

I have a hat for when I get cold but I’ll tuck my hair into my hat because I know long blonde hair tends to attract attention. If it’s raining I’ll get my umbrella and have it as a stick just in case I get threatened. Sometimes I take a key and I have the sharp part in between my fingers just in case someone attacks me (Louise).

I’d tie my hair up for some reason, I’d think if I tied my hair up and scowled I just wouldn’t look like anyone someone would want to talk to… I’d just try to look like I didn’t want anyone to talk to me. I think it’s quite easy to disappear (Gail).

Gail’s additional strategy of what Goffman (1990) describes as ‘impression management’ or what Esther Madriz (1997) termed ‘hardening the target’, conceptualised by many participants employing this strategy as ‘bitch face, where I look unapproachable’ (Luella), reveals the contradictory modalities discussed by Young (2005). For Young (2005) this is based in how women are frequently put in the position of experiencing their bodily-self as both object and subject, with the mechanisms of objectification recognising our subjectivity at the same time as diminishing it. There are more contradictions revealed here, however, in that – similar to the impossible task of deciphering ‘the right amount of panic’ – women spoke of the difficulty in adjusting their bodily strategies in such a way as to meet often opposing means for the same end; to deflect men’s intrusion. Participants thus attempted to balance: the need to look tough or unapproachable with the desire to not be told to cheer up; the necessity to be polite enough to not escalate an encounter but not so friendly as to be seen as encouraging the interaction; wanting to be evaluated as attractive enough to avoid insults on their appearance by men in public but not so attractive as to become a target; and wanting to disappear or be invisible at the same time as wanting to be seen and experiencing discomfort in wanting this. These strategies were encapsulated by Claire as ‘don’t get an A star get a B’. Recalling Beauvoir’s ambiguity, the positions of subject and object are thus experienced by women as parallel and simultaneous, leading to an embodiment marked by contradiction, tension and unease. The contradictions of femininity become apparent, a balancing act lived through our embodiment.

(Y)ou’re being attractive but not too attractive. Risqué but not too risqué. Wear a skirt but preferably one you can run in. Don’t go down that alleyway, don’t put your headphones in. I wouldn’t dare walk down the street with headphones on. So yeah I think you’re constantly being vigilant. And I also think you’re kind of looking to see who’s looking at you. Without necessarily, intellectually wanting to do that. And there really is a tension between the two (Clare).

The external perspective is thus a modality of embodiment where the body is lived as both self and not self (Young, 2005). Maintaining an external perspective on the bodily-self in public space leads to an increased awareness of the body image and an experience of discomfort and unsafety in the materiality of the body.

I become really aware of my body I think, and I feel like, I feel bigger and more conspicuous… it’s vulnerability in feeling consciousness and conspicuousness about my body, that’s what I feel like. And that’s what I mean about feeling like big… I feel
like legs and hips, I feel like that part of me I feel much more conspicuous about (Rosalyn).

It is, it’s that feeling of self-consciousness. You should be allowed to sit on a train at half seven in the morning and just be like, “ahhhhh”, and not have to be thinking about anything that you don’t want to. The problem is that the gaze can disturb you, it can penetrate you. As can a comment, all of this stuff, but the gaze penetrates in a way that, it’s really hard to express (Sophie).

You’re being judged. You’re an object. You just become massively aware of yourself and think oh God this is so uncomfortable. And it’s just relief if you get past them and they don’t say anything (Shelley).

This bodily-self consciousness, Rosalyn’s feeling of being ‘hips and legs’, Sophie’s feeling of being penetrated, encourages a fleeing from the bodily-self. As seen in the earlier discussion of the gaze, and explicitly understood by Rosalyn above, there is a particular vulnerability that comes with the acknowledgement of ourselves as a body that can be seen, and that can be hurt. In gendering this vulnerability, Beauvoir suggests that for the category ‘woman’: ‘her whole body is experienced as embarrassment’ (Beauvoir, 2011: 356). Given that men’s intrusion has encouraged a relationship to the body marked by tension and discomfort: ‘her body is suspect to her, she scrutinises it with anxiety’ (ibid). There is thus an undercurrent of shame in the ways in which women spoke about the experience of living the materiality of their body, particularly in relation to its ‘femaleness’. In order to manage vulnerability, anxiety and suspicion, many women adopted a mode of bodily alienation as strategy, holding their body at a distance and enabling a mode of embodiment that was experienced as keeping the self safe.

‘I’d never really thought of my body as me’:* Bodily alienation

Using Beauvoir to conceptualise this mode of bodily alienation facilitates an exploration of the role of ambiguity in both women’s embodiments and situated agency. The modalities of embodiment women enact are situated in, and through, men’s intrusion. Men’s intrusion stimulates bodily alienation: necessitating an external perspective on the embodied self, alongside maintaining an external awareness of others and the environment, at the same time as experiencing the uncertainty of one’s ability to make sense of one’s own experience. Here, however, women may actively choose to take up an alienated mode to their bodies, a mode of embodiment that over time becomes habituated, in order to maintain a sense of self as solid and safe. The strategy of bodily alienation is an active coping mechanism, however it arises out of the particularities of a situation in which the routineness of men’s intrusion has encouraged an ambiguous embodiment.

In this conceptualisation of bodily alienation as a form of coping borne out of women’s situation, the differences between Beauvoir and Sartre are evident – highlighting again how Beauvoir’s conceptualisation of the situated body-subject offers unique, and often untapped, insight for modern feminist questions. Mobilising Beauvoirian theory in this way in fact enables a critique of how Sartre posited women’s bodily alienation as a conduct of bad faith. In Being and Nothingness (2007) Sartre gives two famous examples of bad faith: an example for men’s bad faith using a young man ‘playing at’ being a waiter and, interestingly, an example for women given in relation to the practices of men. Sartre watches a young woman on a first date attempting to avoid a man’s advances: he holds her hands in his and the woman
leaves her hand there, ‘neither consenting nor resisting’ (Sartre, 2007: 79), without noticing. Sartre views this as the woman’s attempt to flee from her freedom, alienating her body and through this delaying the moment when she must choose either to acknowledge and reject his advances, or accept them. Using this study as the point of departure, what in Sartre is an act of bad faith can be reconceptualised as an expression of her situated freedom. Sartre may be describing a moment experienced by the young woman as intrusive. Caught by the need to not escalate the man’s behaviour by either encouraging or challenging his behaviour (what is seen by Sartre as consenting or resisting), and unable to physically remove the bodily-self, the young woman protects herself by enacting a mode of embodiment whereby she lives ‘herself as not being her own body’ (ibid). This act of ‘bad faith’ becomes a type of resistance, seen in Beauvoir’s claim that under patriarchy the woman ‘is too divided internally to enter into combat with the world; she confines herself to escaping reality or to contesting it symbolically’ (Beauvoir, 2011: 376). This way of understanding the woman’s actions may have been missed by Sartre but would be familiar to many women, and was found throughout participant accounts. The poetic transcript woven between the chapters here demonstrates the frequency with which participants’ strategic response to men’s intrusion was to distance the self from the body and the world. The extract below demonstrates how this type of response fell mainly into three interlinked categories, a version of which is seen in the example given by Sartre: you’re not here; I’m not here; and/or this is not happening – a process Viola termed creating ‘the world you want to be in’.

He said hey you know what girl, I like the way you look.
I look at the floor. I never make eye contact with anybody.
And then he was like oh you’re such a frigid cunt.
I just listen to my music.
He was staring at me, drunkenly staring at me.
I have to fight the urge to cover up so people don’t look at me.

They shouted something at me, can’t remember exactly what the words were but it was something like your ass or something about that.
A guy was wanking in the bushes.

This guy came past and said alright love.
I can deal with it now. I always have a comeback for everything.
He was just like oh hey how are you, do you want to come with me?
I’ll take my phone out or pretend to be doing things.
He was eyeing me up and down and sort of shuffling closer step by step to me.

I start to become really conscious of how I’m walking
and what I’m wearing
and how I’m looking.

So he sat on the corner of the chair
and again, legs akimbo,
whipped it out, had a go.

Rather than being seen as acts of bad faith then, the ways participants spoke about resolving the paradox of living the bodily-self as subject and object in a context of men’s intrusion as ordinary, was through habitualising a particular relationship to their embodiment, where the body is held at a distance. There is a subtle difference here from notions of dissociation and disembodiment. Dissociation, linked to a psychological framework, suggests a detachment from the body and/or the self and/or
the environment. The accounts of participants, however, show connection to all three – women are aware of the environment (including the intrusive man), aware of their embodied self in that environment, and making particular decisions situated by this awareness. Disembodiment is a closer, though slightly different concept, whereby the self is not experienced as embodied – this again has ties to a psychological framework where the neural and sensory mechanisms underlying the internal representations of the body, termed by Merleau-Ponty (2002) as the ‘body schema’, can be disrupted, leading to an experience of the self as outside of the body. Such a response to sexual violence is seen in Jan Jordan’s (2008) account of the resistance strategies of the women raped in Auckland by Malcolm Rewa. The mental processes described by some of the women surviving Rewa’s attacks provided a means of withholding something of themselves where ‘(h)é may have control of their bodies, however, he could not control their mind, their spirit’ (Jordan, 2008: 549). Jordan links this to some of the process found with women in prostitution (Jordan, 1991; McLeod, 1982), connecting to Maddy Coy’s (2009) work with young women in prostitution. Using Merleau-Ponty’s (2002) ‘habit body’ alongside Bourdieu’s (1998) concept of habitus, Coy (2009) reports a consequence of (dis)embodiment in women’s narratives of living in local authority care as well as in selling sex. Developing Coy’s (2009) findings in contexts of ordinary intrusions, the accounts of participants suggest a departure from the concept of disembodiment, where the self is experienced as outside of the body, towards the concept of bodily alienation; the experience of the body as not the self, it is a thing, an object. Beauvoir’s account of bodily alienation holds the ambiguity of our living body: experienced as an obscure alien thing, separate to the self in some way (Arp, 1995), at the same time as experienced as the self. The experience of men’s intrusion is both the recognition of our subjectivity (there is, after all, no point ‘objectifying’ a box or a suitcase: an object can not be made aware of its ‘thingness’) at the same time as a depletion of it – Tuerkheimer’s ‘curious paradox of being both object and subject’ (1997: 186).

Applying a Beauvoirian framework to the operations of alienation thus allows for the ambiguity and contradictions of women’s living experience under patriarchy: the experience of the body as both the self and not the self. As a concept, it can also extend to women’s relationship with their environment in a way disembodiment and dissociation cannot. As seen in Viola’s claim that: ‘you need to find a version of the world you can be in’; alienation as strategy can extend to the environment, with women blocking out intrusion or pretending it isn’t happening: rupturing the bodily-self’s entanglement in the world and returning to that feeling of being water in a glass. Habitually enacting a mode of embodiment whereby the body and world is alienated has a self-protective element in that individual experiences no longer have the force they did in girlhood. As seen earlier in this chapter, girlhood was when women first experienced the transition from the body, self and world as interdependent, to experiencing the body as a separate, and vulnerable, object, situated in rather than of the world. The findings of this study suggest that such processes are evoked by women everyday and everynight (Smith, 1987), developing out of experiences with ordinary, routine intrusion as part of growing up, and habituated into a mode of embodiment marked by alienation. Here, however, this transition is claimed for ourselves, alienating the body and the environment through an act of will, and through this helping to reassert the sense of embodied selfhood diminished through men’s intrusion. This is where the ways in which Beauvoir conceptualises sex and gender as enmeshed in a living body, rather than the idea of a biological body existing outside
of its social meaning, joins with her understanding of our embodied self as always in the mode of ‘becoming’, to open up the possibilities for bringing the body back. It is here that we will turn in conclusion – to the potential of restoring a modality of embodiment which is lived as a united bodily-self, and the implications for theory and practice.
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