

# Dissenting Voices

---

Volume 7 | Issue 1

---

8-27-2018

## The Hunter vs. The Hunted

Julia Palozzi  
jpal01@u.brockport.edu

---

### Repository Citation

Palozzi, Julia (2018) "The Hunter vs. The Hunted," *Dissenting Voices*: Vol. 7 : Iss. 1 , Article 4.  
Available at: <https://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/dissentingvoices/vol7/iss1/4>

This Opening Voices is brought to you for free and open access by the Women and Gender Studies at Digital Commons @Brockport. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissenting Voices by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @Brockport. For more information, please contact [kmyers@brockport.edu](mailto:kmyers@brockport.edu).



## The Hunter vs. The Hunted

*I share this story to illustrate an example of psychological sexual coercion and the power dynamics that allow such coercion to exist. We must understand that the root of this problem lies in the nature of power between men and women. I do not think that these dynamics are born to us naturally. The biology of men and women has nothing to do with the nature of the power dynamics that can exist between them. This power dynamic is one that has been ingrained into our society through generations of separating the public and private spheres of work.*

### The Hunter vs. The Hunted

The morning after Halloween in 2015, I laid in bed with my boyfriend. The night before I had hosted my first party as a legal drinker. I had put together my costume weeks in advance, taking painstaking detail and care. I was a white-tailed deer, the front of a tan shirt adorned with a white felt circle. My antlers had become the crown jewel of the costume. Having applied papier-mâché over a pair of real deer antlers, I carefully ran an exact-o knife over the hardened plaster of paris mold. I repaired the opened seams with paint, taking hours to properly portray the spectrum of browns that colored my real example. When finished, they leaned heavily on my head. At the last minute my boyfriend decided to be a hunter, showing up to the party in camo and bright orange, toting a fake rifle. Before the night began, I was overjoyed and excited he was finally participating in something I felt was important. There was a sheet dripping with fake blood hanging in my dining room. From the corner, a fog machine steadily provided an

ominous ambiance; the lights were off, and faces were illuminated by candles alone.

I had expected the night to be full of drunken memories to look back on. In reality, I spent my time worried that I was talking to my guy friends too long or looking at them a “certain” way. I prayed as we sat closely, catching up, they would not touch my arm, or playfully hug me as they had done in the past. I spent my time trying, and failing, to interact with the friends my boyfriend had brought. As people dispersed and the alcohol ran dry, I found myself completely sober and miserable, exhausted from the balancing act I kept up in order to please my boyfriend. Before that night, I had failed to put my finger on how he made me feel. I failed to understand why I wasn’t sleeping well, or why I felt restricted when we were in public. Why I was constantly aware of the strangers I was looking at, interacting with, and not wanting to be accused of staring, flirting. Liking some other guy,

texting some other guy,

hooking up with some other guy,

fucking some other guy.

Are you mine?

Tell me you’re mine.

Say you’re my girl.

You’re mine.

You. Are. Mine.

As the night ended, I told him I wanted to end our relationship. I discarded my antlers to my bed as the argument heated up. I backed away, the knobs of my dresser pressing lightly against my back. He took steps towards me, he shouted from above me. Feeling his presence, always much bigger than mine, to be bigger than ever before.

He stopped and turned to leave. After my door closed behind him, I stood frozen with my toes curled into my green carpet. I began to cry and wipe at the white spots smattering my cheeks. Marks meant to show my naivety, but only for one night of pretending. Despite the tears, I finally felt lighter, and more than anything, a sense of relief flooded me.

Just as I began to let relief sweep over me, my bedroom door opened again, and he was back. The darkness of the hallway softened the edges of his large body. He could not accept our break up, he said. Short of falling to his knees, he begged, told me he would change. Told me I was his girl and he needed me. Asked me, accused me, how could I leave him? When he needed me most? When this, that, and the other thing, was going wrong for him

I,

me,

who claimed to love him,  
was supposed to be his girl.  
Please.  
Please.  
Please!  
Please!

I knew he had had a rough life, really rough. I knew in his lifetime that no one had shown him undying love; I knew love was powerful. I relented. I told myself that being tired of this relationship was nothing in comparison to the trauma he had undergone. As he pressed on with accusations, I began to question myself: Was I flirting? Was I staring? How could I claim that I was his “girl” if I was going to leave him? And just like that, with only several pleading lines and one convincing voice crack, I had become his hunter and he the fawn. Yet, our costumes that night had told a different story. Almost as if casting a spell, he had made me a bad guy, a bad girlfriend, and I believed it.

The next morning, he told me he wanted me. I clung to the memory of mere hours before. I could not believe I had almost been freed and then lost my nerve. In that moment, connecting sexually was not what my heart desired. I did not want to have sex with him. He verbally pushed me, telling me how much he wanted me, how badly he needed me. Needed to feel me, needed

to know I was his. He needed something. If I were to withhold it -- despite the fact I did not want this same thing -- did that make me the terrible person he had painted me to be? I wanted to give him what he needed, despite my own needs. I gave in.

### **Wollstonecraft and Rousseau**

Instances such as these would go on between us for another year. What I now can identify as an abusive cycle would turn and turn and turn, and I would end up on my head every time. He would walk away the victim of my cold heart, and I would walk away, feeling the noose around my neck growing taut. That additional year of convincing myself his needs were greater than mine were and using his trauma as a reason to excuse his behavior left me with trauma of my own. Years later, I still wake up in the morning having spent the night streaming nightmares in which he stars.

I share this story to illustrate an example of psychological sexual coercion and the power dynamics that allow such coercion to exist. We must understand that the root of this problem lies in the nature of power between men and women. I do not think that these dynamics are born to us *naturally*. The biology of men and women has nothing to do with the nature of the power

dynamics that can exist between them. This power dynamic is one that has been engrained into our society through generations of separating the public and private spheres of work. Early on, a way of gendering the sexes emerged, leaving women less than men socially, politically, and economically (Garbacik, 2013). The ways in which we raise both boys and girls, under the social constructs of a patriarchal society, leaves a grown woman with a perceived or real lack of power when negotiating intimacy. This allows for acts of leveraging, such as psychological sexual coercion.

What is most troubling about our current societal expectations for men and women is that this current code is reminiscent of expectations of women in the 1700s. In 1762, Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1762) argues in his novel *Emile*, that he has not only found a way to construct and rear the perfect man, Emile, but he has also hypothesized Emile's perfect mate. This mate is one that is subservient, whose first concern is that of her husband and children, and who is not intellectually trained as is her husband. One of the earliest feminist thinkers, Mary Wollstonecraft, famously debates *Emile*. In her book, *The Vindications of the Right of Women*, Wollstonecraft (1792) argues for the equality of men and women in all realms,

including education. And yet the power dynamics as theorized by Rousseau (1762) are the same ones that allow psychological sexual coercion today. How is it that from Wollstonecraft (1792) to today we still find antiquated ideologies prevalent in allowing the abuse, rape, and killing of our women through gender-based violence?

### **Emile and Sophie**

“We have attempted to paint a natural man, let us try and paint a helpmeet for him” (Rousseau, 1762, p. 326). Rousseau (1762) wrote this as he attempted to paint a female partner for his perfectly reared, perfectly strong (and I would assume, perfectly chiseled Emile). Affectionately named Sophie, she is the ideal mate for Emile and is Rousseau's (1762) idea of what a woman should be striving for in life. “Sophie [is] truly a woman as Emile is a man” (Rousseau, 1762, p. 321). Thanks to Rousseau, (1762) we know what it takes to rear the perfect boy from infancy through manhood. We know men should be strong, they should be educated, and we know the exact path to take in order to lead them there. In one of the more bizarre parenting tips, Rousseau (1762) explains that male babies should not get too accustomed to warm baths. Rather, they should gradually be bathed at

“every bearable degree” of hot and cold so that in time, “[they] shalt scarcely feel this [varying temperatures] of the air” (p. 26). The reader, now steadfast in their trust of Rousseau’s tips for new parents, moves into his ideals on the roles of women. Although they are not subjected to cold baths, Sophie has been “made to please and be in subjection to the man” (p. 322). The ideas that Rousseau (1762) lays out for what men should expect, and what woman should aspire to, were theorized hundreds of years ago. Although admittedly not as pronounced and bold as Rousseau’s original beliefs (1762), we can identify his ideals for men and women in society today. Rousseau (1762) writes:

Men and women are made for each other, but their mutual dependence differs in degree; man is dependent on woman through his desires; woman is dependent on man through her desires and also through her needs; he could do without her better than she can do without him. She cannot fulfill her purpose in life without his aid, without his goodwill, without his respect; she is dependent on our feelings, on the price we put on her virtue, and the opinion we have of her charms and her deserts (p. 328).

My focus on this passage lies on the way in which Rousseau (1762), when describing what he believes is the natural way between sexes, puts women at the

mercy of men. Most importantly, he attributes woman’s worth to what men believe of their “virtue,” “charms,” and “deserts” (p. 328).

Rousseau (1762) also remarks, in order to keep men, women must fulfill their man’s desires. And because the man is far less in need of her than she is of him, she better be damn good at it. In turn, if a woman *does not* fulfill her husband’s every desire, she will then lose all that his aid, goodwill, respects, and feelings fulfill in her (Rousseau, 1762, p. 328). In this passage alone Rousseau (1762) tells women that not only is their worth dependent on the views of men, but without the positive view of a man, they are helpless as they are incapable of depending on themselves for fulfillment.

Dependence is an important piece to understand in Rousseau’s (1762) theory because it is the key to men having their every whim and desire fulfilled. How does he ensure this dependence? To ensure that women rely heavily on their husbands, Rousseau (1762) paints women as inferior to men. This includes the obvious physicality: “Far from being ashamed of her weakness, she is proud of it; her soft muscles offer no resistance, she professes she cannot lift the lightest weight; she should be ashamed of being strong” (Rousseau, 1762, p. 323). With these words,

Rousseau (1762) encourages women to be proud of their frailty. He goes further in stating that women are also morally inferior to men (Rousseau, 1762). This moral inferiority demands that a woman assures her husband, as well as “his friends and neighbours, ... [of] her fidelity; she must be modest, devoted and retiring” (Rousseau, 1762, p. 325). She must convince her entire social circle of her fidelity because, “she alone can win the father’s love for his children and convince him that they are indeed his own” (Rousseau, 1762, p. 324). *Without this love, where would the woman be?*

In response to *Emile*, Wollstonecraft (1792) comes to the defense of Sophie, criticizing a fate in which she is nothing more than a “helpmate.” Wollstonecraft (1792) wastes no time as she begins the chapter titled, “Animadversions on Some of the Writers Who Have Rendered Women Objects of Pity, Bordering on Contempt” (p. 105). Her opening line, “I shall begin with Rousseau” (Wollstonecraft, 1792, p. 105), sets the stage for her vehement disagreement with the author. Throughout the argument, she exposes pitfalls in Rousseau’s (1762) logic, rendering his depiction of the sexes as inaccurate. Overall, Wollstonecraft (1792) argues against the core of

Rousseau’s (1762) thesis that women are *by nature* the inferior sex:

Modesty, temperance, and self-denial are the sobering off-spring of reason; when sensibility is nurtured at the expense of understanding ... but give their activity of mind a wider range, and nobler passions and motives which govern their appetites and sentiments (Wollstonecraft, p. 110).

The idea that Wollstonecraft (1792) proposes is that women have been nurtured to be inferior as they have not been given the same access to knowledge and opportunity as men. If women were granted this access, then they would in fact be equivalent to men intellectually, and thus, have the same value as men. She prods Rousseau (1762), “but all sacred rights of humanity are violated by insisting on blind obedience; or, the most sacred rights belong *only* to man” (Wollstonecraft, 1792, p. 111). She questions Rousseau (1762) here, wondering, are women no longer considered human? She also evokes the response of women with this statement, the underlying text asking, ‘how does it feel to not be considered part of humanity?’ Wollstonecraft (1792) exposes the fact that men have something to gain from women “naturally” being inferior, but that men end up sacrificing something much larger. “Beauty, he [Rousseau] declares,

will not be valued, or even seen after a couple has lived six months together” (Wollstonecraft, 1792, p. 117). Wollstonecraft (1792) concludes that Sophie cannot truly be a mate to Emile if the partners cannot connect with one another intellectually. By rendering women helpless, Wollstonecraft (1792) believed that you are bringing not only a detriment to women, but also to the men they are partnered with. In her counter to Rousseau (1762), she not only made the case for women, but also their male counterparts by questioning, “Why does he say that a girl should be educated for her husband with the same care as for an eastern haram?” (Wollstonecraft, 1792, p. 117).

Wollstonecraft’s (1792) inversion of Rousseau’s (1762) argument was a powerful start in dethroning the ruling views on sex. What was not accounted for was the lethargic nature of change and the institutions that have kept old systems in place. Rousseau (1762) showed us that the sum of a woman’s parts is dependent on the view of the man. This view is thus contingent on how well his desires have been fulfilled. It could require a woman’s entire life to adequately and properly fulfill her husband’s desire. While this might seem anachronistic compared to gender relations in 2018, I recall the Halloween

night I spent attempting to fulfill the desires of my own boyfriend, and the next morning, again fulfilling his sexual desires when I felt I had failed him otherwise. How has the man’s view changed? How could someone like me, raised with all the opportunity and education in the world, still fail to recognize the gendered trap I had fallen into?

### **Gender and Situated Coercion**

How do psychological sexual coercion tactics have the ability to wield power? Why doesn’t a woman just say “no”? In order to understand the power of psychological sexual coercion, we must first understand how sex and intimacy is situated within gender. A deep unconsciousness to gender must also be exposed in order to understand the power of coercion. Unlike Rousseau (1762), who very explicitly laid out roles for men and women, most of us were not given a rule book on gender. Rather, we learned from the world around us. In her 2013 book, *Gender & Sexuality For Beginners*, Jaimee Garbaik (2013) writes about the construction of gender. She concludes that not only is gender constructed within your home, it is also constructed by those you interact with such as extended family and teachers. Gender is constructed by the other



children you see, what they wear, and how they act; it is constructed by the media's portrayal of men and women, and everything from job titles to outfit choices. She writes, "From noticing who inhabits which roles in a household, to pronoun usage, clothing, hairstyles, and gender-"appropriate" behavior, we begin to note gender coding around us very early on" (Garbaik, 2013, p. 75). We are given roles as male and female, but the parts we play are not presented as such, they are presented as *nature*. Garbacik (2013) warns:

So while today people often think of color-coding and gender markers in clothing and toys as simply suiting boys' and girls' personalities and preferences, they were once a way to actively enforce the gender archetypes that now are coming into question once again (p. 75).

Because a gendered society is regarded as the "natural" expression of boys and girls, this gendering goes unnoticed. These ideas in turn become engrained within us. This deep-seeded, and yet unconscious knowing, means we play the parts we believe are expected of our genders.

The unconscious acting of gender is something that feminist theorist Judith Butler has built a substantial body of work on. In her book, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*

written in 1990, Butler addresses this unconscious gendering with her theory of gender performativity. This theory considers the unconsciousness to gender, as we live in a world in which we are not given any other choice. The ideas of being "masculine" and "feminine" are not inherent to gender and perhaps are not truly authentic to our identity. Butler (1990) argues that this performativity comes from "gender fables [that] establish and circulate the misnomer of natural facts" (p. XI). Feminine and masculine cannot be applied to assigned *sex* as they can be to *gender*. From there, *gender* does not naturally operate on a binary as society and culture has constructed it. This binary gender then takes on meaning as we apply it to "the body" which, "appears as a passive medium on which cultural meanings are inscribed" (Butler, 1999, p. 8). This cultural inscription of the body through gender means that the body itself now becomes part of the hierarchy in which masculine (men) are valued over feminine (females). These *bodies* have been inherently pitted against one another as opposites and the hierarchy of value dictates that one should dominate the other.

This unconscious acting of gender was studied in men's ability to self-report sexually aggressive and coercive

behaviors. In the study, “Discrepant Responding across Self-report Measures of Men's Coercive and Aggressive Sexual Strategies”, Strang, Peterson, Hill, and Heiman (2013) found men were largely unable to define their own behaviors that were sexually aggressive and coercive. The study explored the consistency of men's responses with two distinct, but similar, measures of sexual coercion and aggression (Strang et al., 2013). In both cases, participants' responses were largely inconsistent across two measures (Strang et al., 2013). Because the men could not adequately report said behaviors, it is clear they did not fully understand that they were themselves perpetrators. Barrie Levy (2008) corroborates this lack of understanding in citing accounts of professionals responding to gender-based violence:

In their daily work lawyers, advocates and counselors who see men and/or boys charged with acquaintance rape, intimate partner violence, or other violence against women observe perpetrators shock and disbelief that anyone thinks they have done something illegal or wrong (p. 28).

Where does this lack of knowledge, this shock, come from? It is obvious here that some men do not understand the crimes they committed. They have been taught to operate in a way that

perpetuates gender-based violence, and yet this way of operation is unconscious in its gendering behavior.

Legal scholar and feminist theorist Catharine MacKinnon (1989) is outspoken on the topic of coercion and female sexuality, taking extreme stances on things such as sex work and pornography. In her 1989 book, *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State*, she argues that sexuality does not exist on its own:

...a feminist theory of sexuality that seeks to understand women's situation in order to change it must first identify and criticize the construct 'sexuality' as a construct that has circumscribed and defined experience as well as theory. This requires capturing it *in the world*, in its situated social meanings, as it is being constructed in life on a daily basis (p. 417).

Rousseau (1762) provided us with plenty of theory, but how has this theory helped to construct sexuality in the world? Gender becomes the building blocks for sexuality as it is situated in the world. What we see is that the construction of gender in our modern day is not unlike the theory that Rousseau (1762) provided us with when he gave us Emile and Sophie, “The man should be strong and active; the woman should be weak and passive; the one must have both the power and the will; it is enough that the other offers little

resistance” (Rousseau, 1762, p. 322). Both the construction of Emile and Sophie, as the ideal boy and girl, is instrumental to the survival of psychological sexual coercion.

This idea that women should fulfill men’s desires in order to be whole and loved is disconcerting, but it pales in comparison to the ideals that society expects of boys. Jackson Katz has devoted his work as a feminist to the study of hyper-masculinity within culture. In his and Earp’s documentary, *Tough Guise: Violence, Media & the Crisis in Masculinity* (1999), he unpacks a culture that has created a narrow view of masculinity. He states, “The culture in general tells boys that you become real men through power and control. That respect is linked to physical strength and the threat of violence and the ability to scare people” (Katz & Earp, 1999). From this view of masculinity, Katz believes “Violence isn’t so much a deviation as it is an accepted norm” (Katz & Earp, 1999). Just as girls are taught the traits valued in grown women, boys are taught what traits are valued in grown men. These values are ones that they would hope to recreate in order to be “accepted within their peer groups” (Katz & Earp, 1999) and to become successful adult males. There becomes a very dangerous “flip side to submissive

femininity” in which, “masculinity is defined by power, control, dominance and sometimes violence” (Katz & Earp, 1999). With culture both defining and perpetuating this “narrow manhood,” we can make an unsettling connection within the expectations of boys and men. Men are praised for their strength and conditioned to think that it is their largest asset. They are also conditioned to think of women as sexual objects, and that the actual *woman* is a means to the end, having sex with her. For men to connect these ideals means that a man will use any means possible, including leveraging his strength, in order to have what he believes is already his. This connection then plays out within intimacy in many forms including psychological sexual coercion.

Keeping gender in mind, this is a situation where a woman is not just being coerced by her partner but is one in which she must go against what she feels makes her female. This “femaleness” is her identity. Just as the man followed what he believed society expected of him, the woman is compelled to do the same. We transpose the act of sexual intimacy beyond pleasure or procreation into a social sphere where identities are negotiated and possibly betrayed. As MacKinnon (1989) points out, we must take into

consideration the social meaning of this sexual interaction. If a woman does not consent to the act, what is she losing? Will she lose what Rousseau (1762) believes she needs to thrive: the aid, goodwill, respect of a man? Will she lose her financial stability? Will she lose her life (Levy, 2008)? There are real and perceived losses a woman will undergo if she does not consent to this act and she is coerced into intimacy beyond the pleading words of a partner. Because one must consider outside factors, the woman now becomes “willing” to go through with whatever intimate act her partner requests. And yet, does she truly have will in this case? We claim that as humans we have free will and yet the actual act of coercion is taking away that will. She no longer possesses her own autonomy as she is coerced by the words of her partner AND by the code of her gender. She is not able to define her true feelings because she is told and shown from birth to be passive, be weak, be quiet, be slim, be small, be subservient, be *ladylike*. She is told to put the man before herself. She is told it is her duty to prove herself to the man. To go against this covenant of ladylike behavior means she is no longer a woman as society defines her. She may no longer be a woman as her male partner defines her. And so, as everyone

has already defined her, the answer ‘no’ was never hers to give.

### **Sex and The Patriarchy**

Why can we not educate men on sexually aggressive and coercive behaviors in order to stop it from happening? Although a comprehensive sex education should be available to all adolescents, I believe this is only a start to fixing a deeper problem. Feminist theory concludes:

Rape and the threat of rape are tools used in our society to keep woman in their place. This fear keeps women in traditional sex roles, which are subordinate to men’s. The social, economic and political separation of the genders has encouraged rape, which is viewed as an act of domination of men over women (Carroll, 2015, p. 448).

I have laid out how psychological sexual coercion is also deeply rooted in power held over another, and this power is one that exists in all spheres of a patriarchal society. From her book, *Sexual Politics*, Kate Millett (1970) writes, “[Sex] is set so deeply within the larger context of human affairs that it serves as a charged microcosm of the variety of attitudes and values to which culture subscribes” (p. 191). Similar to MacKinnon (1989), Millett (1970) believes that intimacy is something that

cannot necessarily be separated from the world beyond your bedroom door. So, if an imbalance in power exists outside of intimacy, is it possible to eliminate the leveraging of power sexually without eliminating it publicly? Could education effectively disrupt an invisible system engrained in us from our first Barbie doll or toy truck?

This approach, one that would utilize education to reform psychological sexual coercion, is nothing new to the feminist movement. In fact, it is a staple of liberal feminism throughout time. Feminists with these ideals strive not to change the overarching system, but rather, to fit women into it equally (Tong, 2018). In this way, a proper sex education would be the solution that allows women to fit into intimacy as equal partners to men. Wollstonecraft (1792) believed that education was the key to women's equality. Her stance, shared in the *Vindications of the Right of Woman*, was simple, "Men and woman must be educated, in a great degree, by the opinions and manners of the society they live in" (Wollstonecraft, 1792, p. 77). Wollstonecraft (1792) believed that once women had been given the right to an education, they would gain an instantaneous equality with their male counterparts. Then theorists such as Rousseau (1762) would be eating their

words while women became revered chemists, scholars, and mathematicians, won awards, supported their families, et cetera, et cetera. What Wollstonecraft (1792) did not consider is that "gaining the right" cannot conquer patriarchy. Within feminist movements over the years, this issue has resurfaced several times. Liberal feminists in favor of reform-based policies for gender equality are adamant in opening doors with things such as equal education, the right to vote, and equal pay. We know these movements are necessary, and these are the first steps, but where do we go after reform goals have been met? How do we give girls equal opportunities within classrooms? How do we represent female voices equally in government? How do women become CEOs and make their way into male-dominated fields such as computer science? The door we have now opened floods us with another set of what seems like insurmountable issues that detain the equality of the sexes.

What is beyond the door of sex education as a solution to equality in sexual intimacy? What lies beyond the door is Rousseau (1762), reaching from the past in order to construct men and women of today. Without first deconstructing archaic gender roles, and uneven power dynamics that follows

them, we can never fully eliminate the power of psychological sexual coercion.

### **A History That is Not Over**

So where do I stand currently in relation to my own story? When trying to consider my current state, my mind has betrayed me by suddenly moving backwards. My memories firing in images.

I sit at my spot at the table  
Place my plate in front of me  
I hold court over the  
Left side  
Back to the kitchen  
My father moves past me; he sits in his  
spot at the table. The head of the table.  
No one sits at this spot, but I never  
consider this because I am too busy on  
the left side of the table, my back to  
the kitchen.

The sun shines deep into the summer  
evening. Buffet style, my aunts lay out  
the meal they have spent hours making  
for us. My family is a hungry conga  
line, moving from one dish to the next,  
deciding how to compose their plates.  
The sun begins to disappear, my aunts  
and female cousins stand from the  
table  
Methodically,  
clear plates,  
wash plates,  
wrap scraps,

soak kettles,  
and then there is dessert.

There is a history here that cannot be ignored as we tell our narratives. There is a way of life that has been accepted, “women [as] relatives, only registered as existing in relation to men” (Ahmed, 2017, p. 216). Not only is my spot at the table relative to my father’s as it is positioned, it is relative as it is considered in my existence. That Halloween night is not only a night on its own, it is a culmination of a lifetime of memories. It is a lifetime of our seats being relative to our fathers, brothers, boyfriends, lovers, and husbands. Bosses, co-workers, and male family members. Strangers, on the street, the hope we will make it home safe. It is my school-aged mother, forced into skirts and dresses. It is her illegal abortion. My kin that could not find homes inside her. It is my grandmother, a waitress raising six kids by herself. My great-grandmother raising my mother when my grandmother could not. That night is not a night on its own but rather a lineage, a history, a lifetime of the oppression of women. When asked where I stand now, I stand as a woman. Proud of who I am. I stand, ready to fight for those who came before me, and those who will come after me. “I am not

willing to get over histories that are not over” (Ahmed, p. 262).

### References

- AHMED, S. (2017). *Living a feminist life*. Durham, NC: Duke University.
- BUTLER, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- CARROLL, J. (2015). *Sexuality now: Embracing diversity*. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
- GARBACIK, J. (2013). *Gender and sexuality for beginners*. Danbury, CT: For Beginners LLC.
- LEVY, B. (2008). *Woman and violence*. Berkeley, CA: Seal Press.
- KATZ, J. & EARP, J. (1999). Jhally, S. (Director). *Tough guise: Violence, media & the crisis in masculinity*. Media Education Foundation.
- MACKINNON, C. (1989). Sexuality. W. Kolmar & F. Bartkowski (Eds.), *Feminist theory: A reader* (pp. 415-428). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- MILLET, K. (1970). Theory of sexual politics from sexual politics. In W. Kolmar & F. Bartkowski (Eds.), *Feminist theory: A reader* (pp. 190-192). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- ROUSSEAU, J. J. (1762). *Emile*. London, England: Everyman’s Library.
- STRANG, E., PETERSON, Z. D., HILL, Y. N., & HEIMAN, J. R. (2012). Discrepant responding across self-report measures of men’s coercive and aggressive sexual strategies. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 50(5), 458-469, DOI: [10.1080/00224499.2011.646393](https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2011.646393)
- TONG, R. (2018.) *Feminist thought: A more comprehensive introduction*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- WOLLSTONECRAFT, M. (1792). *A vindication of the rights of woman: With strictures on political and moral subjects*. London, UK: J. Johnson.