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Introduction

From October 2017 when the accusations against Harvey Weinstein for rape, sexual assault and sexual harassment first went public, through the repealing of the anti-abortion amendment in the Republic of Ireland in May 2018, and on to the recent legalization of abortion in Northern Ireland in November 2019, the women’s movement in Ireland and elsewhere has become newly visible and energized. Young women’s activism in particular can be seen to shape the priorities of this new feminist moment, using digital technologies to create viral platforms where women can communicate and share personal experiences. One example is #Me Too, which exposed women’s experiences of sexual harassment and, by doing so, challenged the stigma and shame often felt by, and attributed to, the victims of this kind of abuse. #Me Too, and #Times Up as well as other online activism specific to Ireland created a kind of hunger for change that was noticeable to me in my teaching practice. My female students seemed to become more outspoken and assertive in class; they expressed beliefs in the right to choose abortion, and anger at the conduct of rape trials, and they engaged actively in public protesting and campaigning. This energy was particularly evident in their creative work, which ranged across genres from immersive performance to soundscapes, movement pieces, slam poetry and monodramas, and which explored their experiences of sexual violence from their early teens onwards. The work expressed their acute awareness of and resistance to the objectification and sexualisation of women, and the associated misogyny, within their culture. It left me reflecting that I had expected women’s lives to be better by now, and that without ever putting the thought into language I had assumed that women of my generation had tolerated nasty behaviour and pushed through
difficulties so that proceeding generations would not have to. Seeing that their experiences were not very different, I felt more than sadness: I felt grief. Watching the work, and discussing it with the students also led me to reflect upon my own responses to sexual harassment, and my failures to challenge unacceptable behaviour. On reading the responses to #Me Too and #Times Up from Germaine Greer and Catherine Millet’s letter in *Le Monde*[^3], I found myself haunted by the question of complicity and by a sense of intergenerational alienation.

#Me Too and #Time’s Up gathered popular international support from women (and men) of all ages, with millions of social media users tweeting or posting on various platforms under those signs. Inevitably, there was also a reaction against the movement by a number of feminists including Germaine Greer, whose commentary was provocative but also often thought provoking. The other intervention that attracted media attention was a letter in *Le Monde* in January 2018 signed by one hundred French feminists, characterizing #Me Too as puritanical, anti-sex, and anti-freedom. In fact, it foregrounded problematic but commonplace assumptions about sexual harassment and violence, reinscribing conventional gender roles and power structures that predominantly serve and protect economically privileged men and women while marginalizing others. Yet together with Greer, they raise the insistent question of freedom, which also concerns this essay. Greer’s commentary interrogated anti-rape activism and proposed Foucauldian-inspired legislative reform that, controversially, appears to minimize rape as ‘bad sex’ and as a domestic peccadillo. However, in doing so she returns to a foundational idea of the feminist movement: that the personal is the political. This idea is shared by radical feminisms including contemporary feminism that eschews neoliberalism, and is an essential underpinning of the #Me Too movement.
In Ireland, the #Me Too movement became headline news in October 2017 when playwright Grace Dyas blogged about an experience with the Artistic Director of the Gate Theatre, Michael Colgan, and then tweeted ‘I’ve been thinking about Michael Colgan lately…’ In doing so, she broke a silence that had persisted for decades, allowing other women and men to speak about their experiences and the behaviour they had witnessed. In response, the Gate Theatre commissioned a report that generated a set of recommendations. Its findings, and the reporting of the story, highlighted the issue of complicity with abuse and also resonated in quite startling ways with the argument put forward by Germaine Greer, discussed below.

*Reporting Sexual Harassment: The Problem of Credibility*

Kelly and Radford⁵ argue that asymmetric notions of credibility and the limits of representation result in resistance to believing women’s experiences of sexual harassment, especially those that stop short of physical violence. They use the phrase ‘nothing really happened’ (19) to illustrate the minimization of women’s experience, pointing out that the victims repeatedly use this phrase themselves. ‘On one level all these women were clear that something had happened—they told their stories for that reason, including what the impacts of these encounters were. They were saying “nothing” happened because they know that their perceptions of “something” are unlikely to be validated’ (20). More recent scholarship on rape and the law⁶ reflects ongoing public tendencies to doubt the credibility of accusers, alongside the persistence of popular myths about rape. The insistence that verbal harassment, unwanted touching, and street harassment are ‘nothing’ invalidates the victim’s perception and experience in favour of that of the perpetrator. Threats thus become harmless flirtation, and stalking is refigured as a compliment to the beauty of the victim. Victims of explicit and enacted violence are also thereby silenced, by the sense of personal and public shame that
often attaches to the victim of sexual assault rather than the perpetrator. While there are many reasons why this is so, one significant factor is surely the victim’s brutal encounter with her (or his) own vulnerability and the potential of others to use that vulnerability to deny her agency and physical integrity. Vulnerability is often constructed as shameful, as synonymous with weakness, and is strongly associated with femininity even though – as Butler argues – it is an ontological human quality.\footnote{7}

Therefore one of the most powerful and disruptive aspects of #Me Too is its unequivocal response to sexual violence across a spectrum of behaviour from unwelcome comments and touch, to rape. It asserts that something did happen, and that none of this behaviour is acceptable. By declaring this publicly and with large numbers of women lending their own stories to the movement, it also asserts that the victims should not be ashamed or silent, because the problem is systemic rather than personal.\footnote{8} Or to rephrase: the personal is the political, and the individual experience multiplied by thousands and millions of incidents, is evidence of systemic attitudes and behaviours. By exchanging their experiences, victims also overcome any possible reluctance to appear vulnerable, since the scale of the issue situates vulnerability as a quality shared by many others of different genders.

\textit{Greer’s Critique of the Movement}

Germaine Greer was working on two books in 2017: \textit{On Rape} and \textit{On Rage} were both published in September 2018. Earlier that year she debated #Me Too and #Time’s Up with Mehdi Hasan on Al Jazeera television, recorded in the Oxford Union, where she is introduced as a ‘writer, thinker, and legendary feminist’. She had already argued that #Me Too would make no difference. Ever the contrarian, she criticized the trials of Bill Cosby and Weinstein and the legislation being passed in various countries as futile, saying that the prosecution of
Cosby, ‘in his 80s, after 60 years of doing what he’s been doing’ is not a ‘victory’. Her recommendation that women should ‘slap down’ men who harass them ignored the very real material constraints of financial dependence, job insecurity, physical size, and so on that limit the way an individual can respond to abuse. Her interviews in advance of her book *On Rape* make the following assertions: that not all rape is violent; a lot of rape is just ‘bad sex’; the burden of proof and the penalties for rape should be lowered, to improve the conviction rate; most rape is domestic, and women are made unreasonably fearful of it. She says, ‘of all the crimes in which injuries are sustained, rape is the least impressive. People get hurt all the time, it’s mad to pretend to a woman that a penis walking down the street is more dangerous than a knife.’

It is easier to dismiss the letter to *Le Monde* than to dismiss Greer, because in her frequently enraging and outrageous statements there is some truth, and some of what she has to say is important to interrogate and take forward. Her lecture at the Hay Festival on the subject of rape offers a detailed and passionate denunciation of the ‘Belfast Rape Trial’ for its treatment of the victim, and also offers a strong critique of rape myths. Her analysis of rape law and prosecutorial practices sits easily within feminist discourses, apart from her suggestion that lenient penalties in exchange for lightening the burden of proof would address the very real difficulty of proving or disproving consent. This issue of consent becomes almost impossible to prove in cases of marital and intimate partner rape. One powerful and convincing element in her argument is that most rape is domestic in setting, occurring between intimate partners or spouses. Although Greer is provocative in saying that most rape is only ‘bad sex’, she explains this as the selfish, unloving forcing of intercourse upon the ‘exhausted wife’ who does not resist but endures: and to endure or comply is not to consent. And she points out that in many horrifyingly violent rapes the courts have accepted
compliance in the face of physical violence and death threats as consent.

The Case of the Gate Theatre

The relevance of Greer’s comments to the shocking yet widely known information about bullying and harassment at the Gate Theatre, emerges in newspaper articles and interviews with the perpetrator Michael Colgan, and some of his victims. Colgan ran the Gate Theatre for more than thirty years, creating a financially and artistically successful institution with an international reputation. However, he was also allowed to sit on the Board of the theatre, meaning that there was no credible complaints procedure, and his success meant that he had influence and power to help or damage the careers of new and established artists. The accusations against him were of bullying and harassment within the team of Gate employees, and of the misuse of his power in his dealings with independent theatre artists. By the time the allegations became public, Colgan had retired. In a newspaper article for the Irish Independent he reflected that he had made mistakes, but insisted he had not committed any ‘sex crimes’, and he apologised for causing distress to others by his ‘politically incorrect’ comments.¹¹

The women who worked with Colgan describe overt sexual harassment: comments on their hair, bodies, and clothes; comments about his sexual prowess; questions about their own intimate lives; verbal humiliation; unwanted touching, including in one instance a slap on the buttocks in front of other (male) professionals, done to humiliate; tirades of public verbal abuse that could last an hour, amongst other behaviours. Despite this, the women’s comments on social media and in the mainstream press reflect their instinct to minimize the abuse. After describing clear instances of workplace harassment including assault, Ciara Smyth writes, ‘[t]he worst thing for me now is still feeling like I am overreacting. I was slow to write
anything down because of that feeling. I imagine other girls and women had far worse experiences.\textsuperscript{12} Another woman says the list of behaviours ‘may read as pretty inconsequential’ but for an individual it was ‘highly destructive, completely demeaning and frankly devastating’.\textsuperscript{13} In fact, the behaviour she describes is truly shocking.

Without excusing Colgan’s behaviour, or the Gate Theatre for its lack of oversight, the wider context for the abuse as reported by Gaye Cunningham is an arts industry where bullying is common. In a survey of 283 theatre workers in 2016, Irish Equity found that 57\% of respondents reported being bullied at work, but 74\% did not report it, with 62\% of them saying they did not report for fear that it would jeopardise future work opportunities.\textsuperscript{14} Within the Gate Theatre itself, the \textit{Gender Counts} report from Waking the Feminists identified that theatre as having low levels of female participation at compared to other organizations sampled. ‘In the key categories of Director and Author, the Gate Theatre records female representation of 8\% and 6\% in these roles respectively … Looking at the role of Author, the Gate has the lowest level of female participation in the entire sample (6\%).’\textsuperscript{15}

The women employed at the Gate Theatre describe classic patterns associated with domestic violence, where Colgan would alternate between kindness and nastiness. Ciara Smyth describes how he would share rare material that he knew interested her as a playwright: ‘It was very confusing. Michael had an incredible ability to make you feel so important in one moment and then like dirt in the next.’\textsuperscript{16} One woman says that she thought she liked him, but now she realizes that she didn’t. A number of those raising complaints say that when they protested to Colgan about his behaviour he would accuse them of lacking a sense of humour, or of being overly politically correct. While the women’s reaction to their experiences at the Gate largely supports the findings of Kelly and Radford, Colgan’s own statements and
reported statements resonate with Greer’s analysis of rape as a domestic crime. In both his article in the *Irish Independent* and his interview with Gaye Cunningham for the Gate’s review, he repeats the idea that ‘… it was a small workplace with no hierarchies or structure and he considered that he and the six women there were a team. He believed they were like a family and sometimes if they had a row they had a row and solved it like a family … and yes, he blurred the lines’.  

Colgan’s invocation of family relationships and structures in his justification of sexual harassment and bullying resonates with Greer’s argument about sexual violence as a domestic issue. Her intervention with that point is crucial to the #Me Too movement and contemporary feminist activism, which reflect the complex power relationships that underpin sexual harassment and discredit the argument that it is merely politically incorrect flirtation. By invoking the domestic space both Colgan and Greer differently foreground the way the sexual violence and the threat of sexual violence act to limit women’s agency in the public space, and consign them to the (far more hazardous) private space of the home and family. Underpinning the question of agency is the matter of freedom, and the question of what freedom means, particularly in the face of sexual threat and the fear it provokes.

*Freedom*

#Me Too, #Times Up, Greer, and Millet *et al.*, all open the question of freedom. The *Le Monde* letter declares the freedom to move and act in the world, a freedom which carries with it risks and responsibilities. The freedom proposed by #MeToo shares this vision: to be able to move and act in the world, which it sees as posited on freedom from sexual threat and intimidation. Critics of #Me Too seem to discount this threat, and argue for a freedom to act rather than a freedom *from* harassment. They argue that too many accusations are being made
about unimportant actions, which should not be experienced as threat. Like Greer, who proposes that women should clout men who bother them, they seem to position themselves as speaking for strong and resilient women who do not have to appeal to men or the law for protection. And, of course, the law does not provide protection, at least not for all women equally, and not in a way that is cognizant of women’s freedom as active agents. These competing definitions of freedom underpin differing conceptions of the female subject. While the argument that there is ‘freedom from’ and ‘freedom to’ holds some attractions, sexual threat (and the threat of sexual threat, which is not the same thing), significantly circumscribes the freedom of girls and women, in all kinds of ways. Women are trained from childhood in all aspects of their embodied behaviours to avoid anything that might draw unwelcome attention from men: the way they sit, move, speak, play, laugh, and so on. This is rarely discussed in terms of freedom. So lived freedom is always embodied, however it is conceived as a philosophical concept, culturally and historically shaped.

The *Le Monde* letter concludes with a defiant statement that women are not reducible to their bodies. But Grosz’s work on materialism and Butler’s on the calling into being of the human subject quickly contradict this. Grosz proposes that freedom ‘is the condition of, or capacity for, action in life’. This is separate from the liberationist understanding of freedom as emancipation from an oppressive system or from unjust constraints or limitations. Instead of freedom from (certain kinds of oppression), the individual has freedom to (take action, exercise agency). Grosz asks, ‘Is feminist theory best served through its traditional focus on women’s attainment of freedom from patriarchal, racist, colonialist, and heteronormative constraints? Or by exploring what the female – or feminist – subject is and is capable of making and doing?’ (141) In her essay, Grosz takes Bergson’s concept of freedom because she thinks Bergson might be ‘more consonant with a feminism of difference’ (142). As she
traces this conception of freedom and relates it to the formation of the subject, she is not
dismissive of ‘freedom from’. In fact, freedom from certain kinds of oppression is the
baseline above which the potentialities of freedom to can emerge. But fear and vulnerability
inhibit this.

_Fear, Vulnerability, and Freedom_

Sara Ahmed draws the emotion of fear into her discussion of freedom. Of fear, she writes that
it is an embodied experience that ‘creates fear on the surface of bodies’.

While all bodies feel fear, it is ‘felt differently by different bodies’ and those bodies are shaped in relation to
space and mobility (68). Citing Elizabeth Stanko, Ahmed argues that narratives of fear
indicate to women that their safest space in the home, and that public space is dangerous, or
at least it is dangerous if the woman is alone. This in turn creates narratives of feminine
vulnerability, with vulnerability understood as weakness and susceptibility to harm from
others. While this is in opposition to recent work on vulnerability by Butler, Gilson, and
Athanasiou who posit it as an ontological human quality, it is an insistent message in the
interpellation of the female subject in Western culture. Fear, Ahmed argues, is a response to
the awareness of vulnerability rather than actual vulnerability; and it ‘restricts the body’s
mobility; it contains some bodies so that they shrink and take up less space’ (69). The
shrunken fearful body signals its vulnerability affectively to other bodies, and to itself.

Within this discourse of fear and vulnerability, with its objective of placing limitations on
women’s mobility and access to the world outside the domestic space, it is important to
interrogate the security of that domestic space. Statistically, the domestic space is not a safe
space for women. On the contrary, it is the space in which they are most likely to experience
emotional abuse and physical attack. Furthermore, victims are least likely to report attacks
that take place in that forum and are most likely to be disbelieved when they do report.
Ahmed quotes from Hanmer and Saunders who wrote in 1984: ‘Women’s sense of security in public places [including the workplace] is profoundly shaped by our inability to secure an undisputed right to occupy that space. The curtailing of movement is a not infrequent response to violent and threatening encounters in public’. The persistence of women’s anxiety about public space is shaped by the dominance of discourses that set freedom (access to the public world, freedom to act) against security (freedom from harassment). These discourses express patriarchal imperatives of heteronormative gender binaries, and use humiliation and violence to punish women who transgress those divisions. Limiting confident access to public space has clear implications for the freedom of the individual subject: physical freedom; economic freedom; freedom to socialize, form relationships, and engage with others in a multitude of ways. This suggests that ‘freedom to’ is not readily disentangled from ‘freedom from’. The argument that the body can be touched, threatened, or harmed without effect on the mind is similarly interrogated by Ahmed’s work on affect and emotion. Studies of affect, like Butler’s work on vulnerability or on the performativity of gender, suggest deep and abiding effects of emotional and intellectual forces on the materialization of the body. As Laura Kipnis puts it, what happens to the body happens to the person; the self cannot be extracted from the body.

Conclusions: Activism and Resistance

Fear, of further harassment or ostracism, of feeling foolish for over-reacting, or feeling shame for ‘inviting’ harassment, and knowing that your experience may be disbelieved, all contribute to women’s passive endurance of harassment and misogynistic behaviour. But in 2015 with #Waking the Feminists, and 2017 with #Me Too, women organized visible and active resistance in Ireland and beyond. This also fed other online liberationist movements
like those for marriage equality, abortion legislation, and reform of rape trials. These are optimistic, grassroots campaigns, arising from the public sphere, and demonstrating continuity with earlier decades of the women’s movement. They indicate freedom to innovate and invent, and the capacity to take action. They return to a core tenet of feminism: that the personal is the political.

Writing on young women’s engagement with Web 2.0 technologies, scholars like Harris and Keller\(^\text{23}\) presciently describe the conditions for the emergence of feminist online activism. Harris notices a shift away from state-oriented feminism towards the transitory, heterogeneous and personal (475). Keller notes girls’ engagement with the online world ‘in part because of the unregulated nature of online space that nonetheless remains a public way to connect with peer communities and express personal interests outside of adult intervention’ (434). Harris notes that ‘individual and grassroots practices have come to the fore’ in a neoliberal context that emphasizes individual choice and action (478). While the online space may facilitate the spreading of ideas, experiences, and resistant movement, activism seems capable of translating itself from the virtual into the actual world. Online activism seems to be contiguous with the creative learning environment: my students’ work spoke to their confidence that personal experience is publicly and politically valuable.

I consider my own position in this debate, and my own lifelong tendency to deal with unwelcome sexual attention by refusing to acknowledge it. I do not describe my experiences as traumatizing; rather, they made me angry; and my friends and I dealt with this behaviour by warning each other and laughing together, bonding as an all-female group against the harasser and thus engaging in mutual support. This is still a tactic that girls and women use, and #Me Too is arguably a more public and therefore more activist digital version of it. At the time, sexual comments, verbal aggression or unwelcome touching seemed to me the price
of the freedom to live and work and pursue opportunities that earlier generations of women had struggled for. The harassment expressed disapproval and rage at young women’s freedom, clothes, and noise and lack of deference, so I understood my independence as defiant, and oppositional. I suspect that valuing one particular kind of freedom over another underpins the criticisms of some older feminists towards contemporary feminist activism, fed by a sense that young women do not fully comprehend how much the women’s movement has fought for and won.

I didn’t post under #Me Too, although I admire the movement. I wanted to say ‘nothing really happened’, even if that sanctioned the negation of my own experience. Harassment is almost always clearly intended to humiliate and bully rather than to seduce; and I believed that distress just rewards the harasser, so it is important to hide your fear. #Me Too, and the memories it provoked, and the work of my students, leads me to reconsider. Not exhibiting any emotion rewards the abuser by allowing him (or her) to continue unrebuked, and naming unacceptable behaviour is in fact essential to feminist and social progress; if it does nothing else, it protects those who come next. Watching students recognize and identify unethical and unacceptable abuses of power, and speak their truth, is a reminder that the ‘classroom remains the most radical space of possibility in the academy’.
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