

İSTANBUL BİLGİ UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
COMPARATIVE LITERATURE MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAM

HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY IN GEORGE ORWELL'S WORKS

Elif ÖZKAN

114667006

Asst. Prof. Rana TEKCAN

İSTANBUL

2019

HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY IN GEORGE ORWELL'S WORKS  
GEORGE ORWELL'İN ESERLERİNDE HEGEMONYACI ERİLLİK

Elif ÖZKAN

114667006

Dissertation Advisor: Asst. Prof. Ayşe Rana TEKCAN

İstanbul Bilgi University

Jury Member: Prof. Dr. Nazan AKSOY

İstanbul Bilgi University

Jury Member: Prof. Dr. Ayşe ECE

İstanbul University

Date of Approval: 22/01/2019

Total Number of Pages: 60

Keywords (Turkish):

- 1) George Orwell
- 2) Hegemonya
- 3) Erillik
- 4) Marjinal
- 5) Güç Merkezi

Keywords:

- 1) George Orwell
- 2) Hegemony
- 3) Masculinity
- 4) Marginal
- 5) Centre of Power

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend thanks to the many people who so generously contributed to the work presented in this thesis.

Special mention goes to my enthusiastic supervisor, Asst. Prof. Ayşe Rana Tekcan. My MA has been an amazing experience and I thank Mrs. Tekcan wholeheartedly, not only for her tremendous academic support, but also for giving me so many wonderful opportunities. She consistently allowed this paper to be my own work, but steered me in the right the direction whenever she thought I needed it.

I would also like to thank the experts who were involved in this thesis: Prof. Dr. Nazan Aksoy and Prof Dr. Ayşe Ece. Without their passionate participation and input, this dissertation could not have been successfully terminated.

Similarly, profound gratitude goes to Güliz Sak and Yeşim Çetin, who have been truly dedicated supporters. I am particularly indebted to them for their constant faith in my work, and for their support when so generously helping me writing.

Finally, but by no means least, a special thanks to my family. Words cannot express how grateful I am to my mother, father, sister and Özkan. They are the most important people in my world and I dedicate this thesis to them as they provide me with unfailing support and continuous encouragement throughout my years of study and through the process of researching and writing this thesis. This accomplishment would not have been possible without them. Thank you.

Elif Özkan

## ABSTRACT

Femininity and Masculinity studies go hand in hand as interdependent concepts. It is not possible to understand what makes up the female reality without contrasting it to that of its male counterpart. The following thesis analyzes hegemonic masculinity, the idea that men exist at the center of power in society from which women are marginalized in George Orwell's literary works *Coming up for Air*, *Animal Farm* and *1984*. The polarization of men and women are first examined to make clear the differences in various, everyday realities. Next, I argue that this polarization does not leave them on the opposite end of two equal spectrums. Rather, men have a better access to the central concentration of power within society, while women's access to this power is marginalized. This is known as hegemonic masculinity. Chapter One describes it and the very aspects that define it.

Chapter Two examines George Orwell's works in order to better understand what hegemonic masculinity is, how it came to be, and how it continues to be perpetuated. Some of these works serve the purpose of pointing to a direct pushing of hegemonic masculinity, but the overall argument is that a passive acceptance of male superiority has been more than sufficient to maintain men in their positions of power in society. Orwell's oversight of feminist issues, despite his recognized genius, serves to show the complexity of recognizing and changing the current social norm.

Throughout this work we will see elements of the current societal makeup that marginalize women, promote male success, and overall make society what we know it to be. Arguments throughout will highlight negative aspects of this makeup not only for women, but also for men. I will suggest ways of changing this makeup within society, and show ways in which other balances can be healthier for society as a whole.

It is important throughout this work to understand the difference between sex and gender, with sex being a distinction between male and female based on body parts and biology at birth, and gender being a matter of identification. Gender will be repeatedly tied to culture, as a concept that can be most simply described as the way that society sees your "role" or acceptable behavior based on your sex.

Keywords: George Orwell, Hegemony, Masculinity, Marginal, Center of Power



## ÖZET

Kadın ve Erkek Çalışmaları birbirine bağlı iki kavram olarak çok yakın ilişkidirler. Dişil gerçekliđi oluřturanları eril mukabiliyle karřılařtırmadan algılamak neredeyse imkansızdır. Bu tez hegemonyacı erilliđi- George Orwell'in *Bođulmamak için*, *Hayvan Çiftliđi* ve *1984* eserlerinde kadının önem derecesi düşürülürken erkeđin toplumun güç merkezinde var olduđunu- analiz etmektedir. İlk olarak erkeklerin ve kadınların kutuplaşmasını çeřitli günlük gerçekliklerdeki farklılıkları ortaya çıkarmak üzere incelenecektir. Ardından bu kutuplaşmanın onları iki eřit spektrumun karřı ucunda bırakmadıđı savunulacaktır. Daha ziyade, erkekler toplumdaki merkezi güç konsantrasyonuna daha kolay eriřirken kadınlarsa bu güce kısıtlı eriřebilmektedir. Bu hegemonyacı erillik olarak bilinmektedir. Tezin birinci bölümü de hegemonyacı erillik ve onu tanımlayan yönleri açıklamaktadır.

İkinci Bölüm ise George Orwell'in eserlerini hegemonyacı erilliđin ne olduđunu, nasıl oluřtuđunu ve nasıl ölümsüzleřerek devam edeceđini daha iyi anlamak üzere inceleyecektir. Bu çalışmalardan bazıları, hegemonyacı erilliđin doğrudan itildiđine iřaret ederek hizmet eder, ancak genel argüman erkek üstünlüđünün pasif kabulünün, erkekleri toplumdaki güç pozisyonlarında tutmak için fazlasıyla yeterli olduđu yönündedir. Orwell'in, bilinen dehasına rađmen, feminist meseleleri göz ardı etmesi mevcut sosyal normları tanımanın ve deđiřtirmenin karmařıklıđını göstermeye hizmet etmektedir.

Bu çalışma boyunca, kadınları önemsizleřtiren, erkeklerin başarısını teřvik eden ve genel olarak toplumu bildiđimiz haline getiren toplumsal düzenlemenin unsurlarını göreceđiz. Süregelen tartıřmalar bu toplumsal düzenlemenin olumsuz yönlerini sadece kadınlar için deđil erkekler için de vurgulayacaktır. Bu toplumsal düzenlemeyi toplum içinde deđiřtirme yolları bulunacak ve diđer dengelerin, toplum için bir bütün olarak, daha sađlıklı olacađı yollar öne sürülecektir.

Bu çalışma boyunca cinsiyet ve toplumsal cinsiyet arasındaki farkı, cinsiyetin erkek ve kadının biyolojik farklılıkları üzerinden belirlenmesi ve toplumsal cinsiyetin ise bir kimlik tanımlama meselesi olması ađısından anlamak önemlidir. En basit şekliyle toplumun sizi gördüđu "rol" veya cinsiyetinize bađlı kabul edilebilir bir davranıř biçimi olarak tanımlanabilecek toplumsal cinsiyet kavramı sürekli bir şekilde kültürle iliřkilendirilecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: George Orwell, Hegemonya, Erillik, Marjinal, Güç Merkezi

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZET.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
INTRODUCTION.....	2
CHAPTER ONE: MASCULINITY AS NON-FEMINISM.....	10
1.1. Marginalization and Center of Power.....	10
1.2. Hegemonic Masculinity.....	14
CHAPTER TWO: GEORGE ORWELL AND HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY .....	25
2.1. George Orwell in a Nutshell .....	25
2.2. Orwell's Struggle in <i>Coming Up for Air</i> .....	28
2.3. <i>Animal Farm</i> Scrutinized .....	33
2.4. Politically Correct or Not: Analysis of <i>1984</i> .....	40
CONCLUSION.....	48
WORKS CITED.....	51



## INTRODUCTION

Reality is social; reality is whatever people at a given time believe it to be... Truth, on the other hand, is not nearly so accessible as reality... Truth is absolute in that it does exist and... it is the human project to find it so that reality can be based on it. I have made this distinction between reality and truth in order to enable me to say something very simple: that while the system of gender polarity is real, it is not true.

*Our Blood*, Andrea Dworkin

It has been argued by empiricists that gender is socially constructed, or at least, that gender can be understood in relation to the way that society constructs it (*The Inequality Reader* 36). While it is possible that each societal construction of gender is different, we will see numerous examples in different areas of different societies that suggest while different, gender often plays a larger role regardless of race, nationality, or religion. A general reference to “society” in this thesis should be understood as a reference to society throughout the world in general, and not tied to one place in particular. That in each society expectations and norms differ greatly based on gender, and specifically your gender, helps highlight the reality that Dworkin called “gender polarity.” Apart from that gender polarity, biological differences between men and women do prove to be an objective difference. However, biological differences between men and women have played a role in the creation of a gender polarity that is subjective, where gender norms with no logical basis are prescribed due to someone’s sex at birth. Biological gender discrimination can be considered as the first stage to put individuals into a category. Gender refers to information about the individual being of a particular gender and the status and roles arising therefrom. The main factor that determines how individuals can behave in society and which professions they can prefer is their very gender roles.

This thesis is an attempt to analyze the causes and effects of gender polarity from the perspective of hegemonic masculinity studies. To be more precise, this thesis analyzes how a difference in genders is deeply rooted in society, how this effects each gender’s reality in society, and why these differing realities are bad for society as a whole. To begin we start with the rise of feminism in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries and the masculine response to it. Michael S. Kimmel in his *The History of Men* categorized or even divided men’s responses into three ideologies: antifeminist response, masculinist response and pro-feminist response (74). I

will mostly elaborate on pro-feminist response, which can be seen as the male response that supported the feminist movement. With many recognizing the negative impacts of the expectation society placed on men, masculinity became more and more problematic. In this sense hegemonic masculinity, a position in the system of gender relations, explains the current ideology that enables the system to reproduce itself and male domination. From this group emerged pro-feminists “who openly embraced feminist principles as a potential solution to the crisis of masculinity” (82). In Floyd Dell’s 1914 essay titled *Feminism for Men* he stated, “Feminism is going to make it possible for the first time for men to be free.” Accordingly, in *Defense of Women* written by H. L. Mencken, the pro-feminist approach’s possible solution for gender polarity can be seen in the following quote, “Neither sex, without some fertilization by the complementary characters of the other, is capable of the highest reaches of human endeavor” (83). The argument behind this way of thinking can be summed up simply for now, that without a breakdown of the polarity between sexes neither sex has access to the benefits of the other sex’s “pole.”

With this term, Connell says that some men are successful in showing the normal, natural and necessary to have sovereignty over other men and many women; why they try to explain, why some men and women are so willing to contribute to their secondary positions, and how he sees resistance to hegemonic masculinity to achieve gender justice (Levy, 2007: 253). But if all men do not comply with this definition, what is the cause of this complicity, or, as Connell puts it, the continuity of this hegemonic masculinity? Connell states all these as: fancying their satisfaction; displaced aggression; and, most importantly, the fact that most men benefit from women being subject to them. This given masculinity, in other words, is social and historical. Connell explains it as on the following: “My male body does not give me manhood; takes masculinity (or some parts of it) as a social definition” (121). It is, for sure, something socially constructed. Additionally, she defines and explains masculinity in detail with these lines below:

The physical meaning of masculinity is not simple. The length pos and the shape, attitude and movement habits, having certain physical skills and lack of certain skills, one's own body image, the way these are presented to the other people and the way these people respond to it, the person's body to work and work in sexual relations. None of this is in any way the result of XY chromosomes. In fact, it is not the result of what the masculinity debates stand for with great love, the penis.



The physical meaning of masculinity, the personal history of social practice, through the life line in society (122-3).

*Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept, Gender & Society*

When considering that each group is unable to access the benefits of the other, the discussion soon turns to hegemonic masculinity. With gender polarity creating “naturally” opposite groups, we see what relationship this forms between them. That is to say, what balance of power exists between the two, and the different realities it creates for both in society. Hegemonic masculinity was first studied by Antonio Gramsci and developed by R. W. Connell. Antonio Gramsci defined hegemony as “a contest of meanings in which a ruling class gains consent to the social order by making its power appear normal and natural.” (*A Companion to Gender Studies* 116). Marxist approach can look at and analyze power relationships and hegemonic masculinity may also be examined in the scope of Marxist approach. As it is also closely related to the one who is with power and the other who is without power, in that sense one can attribute this Marxist approach to the problem of hegemonic masculinity with John Stoltenberg’s statement about male supremacy from the article titled *Sexual Objectification and Male Supremacy*:

Male supremacy is the honest term for what is sometimes hedgingly called patriarchy. It is the social system of rigid dichotomization by gender through which people born with penises maintain power in the culture over and against the sex caste of people who were born without penises. Male supremacy is not rooted in any natural order; rather, it has been socially constructed, socially created, especially through a socially constructed belief in what a sex is, how many there are, and who belongs to which.

*Refusing to be A Man 44*

Male matchless quality is the legitimate term for what is now and again called male controlled society. It is the social arrangement of unbending dichotomization by sexual orientation through which individuals brought into the world with penises keep up power in the way of life over and against the sex position of individuals who were conceived without penises. Male matchless quality isn’t established in any characteristic request; rather, it has been socially developed, socially made, particularly through a socially built confidence in what a sex is, what number of there are, and who has a place with which. The specific balance of power between men and women will be further discussed later on. However, it is additionally important to discuss the issue that Stoltenberg pointed out, the singularity or plurality of the term or concept

of masculinity. Stoltenberg argues that there is no one and only masculinity, it must be plural: Masculinities. Masculine characteristics differ from culture to culture, and differ greatly within cultures. However, the polarization of men and women in society often leaves both sexes with a limited extent of expression, and limits what is considered masculine to one pole. In the following quote one can see John Beynon's approach on that issue, "When we link masculinity to culture (itself, obviously, hugely varied) it immediately becomes evident that in terms of enactment masculinity is a diverse, mobile, even unstable construction" (*Masculinities and Culture* 2). When we interface manliness to culture, it promptly ends up apparent that as far as institution manliness is a different, portable, even insecure development. Beynon also gives an example from D. H. G. Morgan to clarify what he is talking about, "What is masculinity (and femininity) is best approached from the standpoint of what men and women do (that is, how they behave) rather than what they are" (7). In other words what is masculinity (or femininity) is best drawn nearer from the point of view of what people do (that is, the manner by which they carry on) as opposed to what they are. With the combination of these two quotes we understand the instability that Beynon described. It is not just masculinity and femininity that have definitions limited to a narrow pole of societal understanding; rather, it is the *behavior* that is considered acceptable for each gender that is limited to extremely narrow definitions. Thus, it isn't simply masculinity and femininity that have definitions restricted to a thin post of societal seeing; rather, the conduct is viewed as satisfactory for every sexual orientation that is constrained to incredibly limit definitions. While we see that limiting the variety of masculinities to one understanding is extremely unrealistic, we also see that the understanding of femininity is often even more limited. The concept of hegemonic masculinity, discussed later on, suggests that part of the limitation placed on femininity is a direct consequence of the power given to the male in the society.

All the implications of male superiority show us that there is no one and only, solid masculinity; there are miscellaneous masculinities which is not only for men but also for women and for all humankind. David S. Gutterman in his article *The Interrogation of Masculinity* supported the plurality in terms of "fluidity of identity" which indicated the possibility of these miscellaneous masculinities as one can see in the following words, "gay/bisexual and pro-feminist men who interrogate and rewrite the cultural scripts of masculinity are often aware of the fluidity of identity" (*The Masculinities Reader* 70). Keeping up an inflexible polarization of sexes does not take into consideration these different types of articulation to be completely drilled such that society endorses of, or can conceptualize inside the shafts of the social structure



they have been instructed. That is to say maintaining a rigid polarization of genders does not allow for these multiple forms of expression to be fully practiced in a way that society approves of, or is able to conceptualize within the poles of the social structure they have been taught.

Further, Judith Kegan Gardiner's *Masculinity Studies and Feminist Theory: New Directions* explains in its introduction, "Second is the consensus that masculinity is not monolithic, not one static thing, but the confluence of multiple process and relationships with variable results for differing individuals, groups, institutions, and societies" (11). So the second one is the agreement that masculinity isn't solid, not one static thing, yet the conjunction of various procedure and associations with variable outcomes for varying people, gatherings, foundations, and social orders. She is much like Kimmel who says in his essay titled *Masculinity as Homophobia*, "Manhood is neither static nor timeless; it is historical. Manhood is not the manifestation of an inner essence, it is socially constructed" (*Feminism and Masculinities* 182). Then she adds from Jardine and Smith and Modleski, "A third area of consensus within feminist and masculinity theories is that both genders can and should cooperate both intellectually and politically, a previously contested point that now seems moot" (12). The third region of accord mentioned, inside women's activist and masculinity hypotheses is that the two sexes can and ought to coordinate both mentally and politically, a recently challenged point that currently appears to be disputable These consensuses show us that feminist and masculine studies can go hand in hand in their way to liberate both of these genders. If we go back to the very beginning of her book, we can see Gardiner's summary on the following, "Masculinity studies can help feminist theories break free from theoretical impasses and that feminist attention to the institutionalizations of power can ensure masculinity studies against superficial celebrations of the mobility of gender" (1). In other words, masculinity studies can enable women's activist hypotheses to break free from hypothetical impasses and that women's activist regard for the regulations of intensity can guarantee manliness contemplates against shallow festivals of the versatility of sexual orientation. Again in the article titled *Men's Responses to Feminism at the Turn of the Century* Michael S. Kimmel supported the relationship between Men's and Women's Studies with the following, "Pro-feminist men believe that their ability to transform masculinity is inspired by and made possible by the women's movement and that the social changes precipitated by the modern feminist movement contain, in both theory and practice, significant and desirable changes for men as well, including a vehicle for the resolution of the contemporary crisis of masculinity" (*The History of Men* 89). Men and women's liberation can be tied together by the mutual need for a

more open societal understanding of what behaviors each gender should be able to participate in. In a word both of the genders' freedom can be integrated by the common requirement for a progressively open societal comprehension of what practices every sex ought to most likely partake in.

Having established that men's and women's accepted behaviors are different, but that they can work together, we can now examine how these expectations are created and perpetuated. There are social and cultural differences that create identity problems in men and women in every culture. Such questions can come to mind: Because I have a penis, do I have to take care of my family, go into the army, and be a father of a child? Alternatively, because I am a woman, do I have to bear a child, take care of my children, and clean the house? These questions have been studied extensively in sociology, along with the identity crises these expectations can create within individuals. Susan D. Witt from the University of Akron explains in her article *Parental Influence on Children's Socialization to Gender Roles* that children are exposed to attitudes and behaviors throughout adolescence that reinforce societal gender roles/behaviors (253). She explains that children learn "what it means to be a boy or a girl" at a very young age (253). Through opportunities, encouragement, discouragement, covert suggestions and other forms of guidance, children are socialized to fit the behavior society sees fit for their gender (253). In other words, in circumstances, consolation, demoralization, undercover proposals and different types of direction, youngsters are associated to fit the conduct society sees fit for their sex. Moreover, failing to fit these roles can result in societal and familial disapproval that can confuse or damage children's sense of self (253). This can explain why older children's stereotypic judgements are more extreme than the judgements of younger children.

Following a period in which society creates expectations for individuals, individuals can further this process by playing into these expectations. One way of doing so is through the development of sexuality, and the way in which we attempt to form it to what others expect of us. John Stoltenberg in his essay titled "How Men Have (A) Sex" says that sexuality does not have a gender; it creates a gender (*Refusing to be a Man* 29). He also underlines people's expectation from men about the act of sex, "If one is a man, he fucks and if he does not fuck, he is not a man" (34). I want to give an example again with Stoltenberg's word game on the following, "Fucking is the sex act, the act in which you act out what sex is supposed to be- and what sex you're supposed to be" (34). Stoltenberg's choice of words are quite subtle explaining the transition between what society expects of you and what you expect of yourself. In the



process of growing up you not only feel the pressure from society to behave as expected; you begin to feel a pressure to prove to yourself that you are able to fit within these norms. Linda L. Lindsey an expert on Gender Studies at Washington University in St. Louis explains in *Gender Roles: A Sociological Perspective* that there are a number of differences in sexual attitudes between men and women (45). She discusses the number of sexual partners considered to be normal over a given time period, what motivates people to have sex, and what form of relationship is important to establish before having sex (45). The end result is that men focused more on pleasure and “conquest” than did females, and less on the emotional aspects of sex (45). It was noted that the factors of race, religion, and ethnicity did not override the gender element in responses (45). This shows the other side of Stoltenberg’s issue. Not only does the act of sex create gender, but your gender influences the way that you view sex.

While we have mentioned how the interaction between one and society is seemingly out of one’s control, a natural phenomenon, it is important to continuously remind ourselves that the expectations of society being passed to us is an active process. Michael S. Kimmel states, “Our behaviours are not simply ‘just human nature,’ ‘because boys will be boys.’ From the materials we find around us in our culture- other people, ideas, objects - we actively create our worlds, our identities. Men both individually and collectively, can change” (*Feminism and Masculinities* 183). He highlights “just human nature” in this quote, drawing on the fact that while the behavior may seem natural and effortless, it is not something we are unable of controlling. This argument essentially states that while we may learn “naturally” to fit the stereotypes of society, these lessons are not in themselves natural, nor are they necessary. This brings us back to Dworkin’s definition of real versus true. While the natural influence of society on who we are is a *real* factor in who we become, it is not *true* in the sense that this is who we must be.

While we have discussed gender polarity and the problem of masculinity, we have yet to discuss why this gender polarization creates such a problem for both sexes. In his essay titled *Masculinity*, Toby Miller quoted Connell’s approach on men and masculinity as the following, “Connell himself argues that male identity is complex and polyvalent, with no singular set of qualities consistently marked as masculine. Masculinity and men’s bodies (symbolically conceived as unitary) are contested sites, fraught with contradictions” (117). Here one can see the intersection of these two approaches. Gramsci’s “contest of meanings” indicate Connell’s “contested sites” or “contradictions on men.” Then comes the contradiction with an example, “the crucial issue for discussing men is power: that everywhere one turns, men seem to be in

power, but everywhere one listens, they seem to feel powerless” (118). This is exactly what gender polarization creates: a narrow understanding of gender that causes a contradiction and personal struggle when it is not able to be reconciled with the complexity of your gender. It is hard to know whether this extent of power enjoyed never seems to feel like enough, or whether this power itself somehow creates this internal feeling of powerlessness. The point, however, is that the contradiction created comes in conflict with the other pole.

The following thesis is provided with the purpose of understanding how gender polarization in society allows for a balance of power between sexes. With this polarization we see how mankind has developed an inequality between sexes, and explain the concept of hegemonic masculinity in an attempt to argue that this is the result of the polarization in society. Literature is examined to better draw out the reader’s understanding of the subject. Having seen how masculinity and femininity create one another by providing a society-made contrast, we will next consider how this leads to a hegemonic masculinity/comes from hegemonic masculinity. Simply put, we understand the ways in which gender polarity has been constructed not as an equal, all-encompassing line. Rather, gender polarity has created a hierarchy with men at the top.

Connell seeks to explain how some men succeed in making it appear normal, natural, and necessary for them to enjoy power over other men and most women; why it is that so many men and women participate willingly in their own oppression; and how resistance to hegemonic masculinity can promote gender justice. Connell posits four types of masculinities, more as positions in relation to one another than as personality types: hegemonic, complicit, subordinated, and marginalized. The hegemonic position is the currently accepted male ideal within a particular culture at a particular time. As such, the hegemonic male is an ideal type (Weber 1946). Connell notes that this image changes over time and place, as well as being subject to contestation within a particular culture.

On the quotation above, sociological explanations for hegemonic masculinity are given in detail. Due to the power provided for men, gender polarity does not simply deteriorate as a result of the pro-feminist approach in masculinity studies. One can call it masculinity studies or men’s studies but the working field of it will never be limited to men. Gender polarity will be disputed not only from the perspective of women, but also men, which will bring ease to what research has done so far. Men’s endeavors for emancipation will be both for themselves and for women who stand up for their sexual desires and preferences. Thus, masculinity studies



bring a breath of fresh air and accompany feminist studies. How feminists assert themselves as women, as not having to be captives, men will assert that no one has to be a captive of what society tells or imposes. There must be many ways for both men and women to be what they want to be or to act how they want to act. There is no characteristics that have to be fit beginning at birth; neither masculine nor feminine is more than a socially created concept, utter illusions. In his article titled *Other Men* John Stoltenberg summarizes this issue with the following, “[I]t’s about how men are not by nature who they are in the world, yet they are in the world as those men; it’s about how the sex-class system is male supremacist and why it’s got to go; it’s about both the possibility and the responsibility for making the world a different place” (*Refusing to be A Man* 169). For this reason, there is a way out: Women and men can work hand in hand without impositions of gender or even sex. They, together, can dispute all conceptions of gender and sex without hesitation. Feminine or masculine attitudes need not be taken for granted simply due to your sex at birth. Nobody has to behave or live in the way that another person wants to. While this idea seems ideal, the following explanation of the balance of power between men and women in society will help to explain why these changes may not be desired by those with the primary power of making them, and help to better understand why this balance has existed as long as it has.

## CHAPTER ONE

### 1.1. Marginalization and Center of Power

Having discussed the formation of different sexes in society and the various differences in reality this creates, we must further develop our understanding of the concepts that make up the topic of hegemonic masculinity. In an article by Tim Carrigan, Bob Connel, and John Lee titled *Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity* it is explained, “‘Hegemony’ then, always refers to a historical situation, a set of circumstances in which power is won and held. The construction of hegemony is not a matter of pushing and pulling between ready-formed groupings but it is partly a matter of the *formation* of those groupings” (*The Masculinity Studies Reader* 114). Hegemonic masculinity is not present without a separation of sexes. The formation of groupings previously discussed is crucial for understanding hegemonic masculinity, which is essentially the name for the phenomenon that maintains these groupings separate. This separation is essentially made up of two basic building blocks: a center of power and a group that is marginalized in their ability to access it. This marginalization cannot exist without a center of power, and vice versa. Applying these general concepts of forced separation specifically through the lens of gender reveals hegemonic masculinity for what it is.

Marginalization refers to the ability (or lack thereof) of people outside of the center of power to communicate and have influence within the center of power. This center of power can be defined simply as those who possess political and economic influence, but it extends further to everyday life within every social class. The Elliott School of International Affairs at The George Washington University partnered with the World Fair Trade Organization (WFTO) to help define marginalization. This study focused not only on what marginalization is, but what it means to be marginalized within a society. According to WFTO, “Marginalization is both a condition and a process that prevents individuals and groups from full participation in social, economic, and political life enjoyed by the wider society” (Alakunova). When referring to this wider society, we see that marginalization is not simply a position of the people who experience it, but rather, that this marginalization exists as a contrast between their social position in relation to that of the average (as well as above-average) groups in society. To be in the margins, then, isn't just a place of the general population who experience it, but instead, that this minimization exists as a complexity between their social position in connection to that of the normal gatherings in society.



Marginalization plays out in many different ways, but possesses elements that allow each occasion to fall under the same umbrella. The Institute of Development and Economic Alternatives (IDEAs) describes how this marginalization looks on a daily basis, stating, “Marginalization refers to the set of processes through which some individuals and groups face systematic disadvantages in their *interactions* with dominant social, political, and economic institutions. The disadvantages arise from class status, social group identity...political affiliation, gender, age and disability” (emphasis added). Marginalization can be seen, therefore, as the position of groups of people in relation to society, but specifically in a way that affects their ability to communicate with those seen as the influential actors of society. For our purposes, we see that marginalization refers to a position from which access to mainstream society is made more difficult, due to the contrast between this position and the center of power and the struggles they face with being able to communicate from their unique position.

... but I believe that man has done this through calculation, actuated by a spirit of pride, a desire for domination which has made him degrade women in her own eyes, and thereby tend to make her a mere vassal. The men of this nation, and the men of all nations, have no just respect for women. They have tyrannized over her deliberately, they have not sinned through ignorance, but theirs is not the knowledge that saves.

*From ‘Conscience and Common Sense’ to ‘Feminism for Men’ 109.*

As men are in the center, they find a right to be the upper hand and marginalize women. That is not the men of a nation, but the “men” that exist in the center as the dominant gender. Thus, they govern the powerless and marginalize women easily in society. “If what we call dominant masculinity appears to be a naturalized relation between maleness and power, then it makes little sense to examine men for the contours of that masculinity’s social construction” (*An Introduction to Female Masculinity: Masculinity Without Men* 356).

While economic and political considerations come to mind primarily, both WFTO’s and IDEAs’ inclusion of social marginalization is extremely important for understanding the center of power. The center of power exists with power in a literal sense, but also within everyday activities that some groups of people are able to enjoy within a different reality than others. These activities can include the ability for men to walk home alone late at night, while women must sometimes take extra precautions. This marginalization can be seen in instances where certain actors of society are taken less seriously when they talk, or provided less social rights (the right to drive, for instance). These differences in everyday reality affect a person’s ability

to enjoy the normal benefits of society or personal life that are enjoyed by others. Political and economic considerations can be seen as an extension of these realities, with these positions in society lacking a link that allows them to communicate effectively with political actors and economic institutions. This may mean that they do not have a representative in government that supports or recognizes their struggles, that they are unable to get a loan on their own, or that they cannot access educational institutions without the permission of their husband. All of these things serve to highlight not only the position marginalized people occupy in society, but also the ability they lack to access the resources needed to successfully leave it.

We have seen what makes someone marginalized, and the lack of access they have to change that position, further serving to define them as marginalized. With this marginalization existing in political, economic, and social life/institutions, and as a contrast between their position and that of the center of power, what defines the center of power? Who decides the limits, and has the ability to draw the borders? Understanding the center of power requires an intimate understanding of the society in question, along with its historical development and current beliefs. The society in question has the ability to impose obligations or limitations on others. These obligations can serve the purpose of putting limits on certain people, thus being a direct way of marginalizing groups (for example, preventing certain groups of people from driving or accessing education). This helps to build a reality that differs from that of those in the center, driving a wedge between the opportunities enjoyed by the opposing groups. If the opposing groups lack a significant link that allows for effective communication, the struggles of one group may become continuously more distant from the center of power's ears. It is additionally important to consider that those in the center of power do not share the same experiences or struggles. Therefore, communication can need not break down based on distance or lack of connection; it is possible for this communication to simply reach actors that are not concerned with, or able to understand, the struggles of another group.

However, society does not have to be quite so direct. Imposition of general policies that do not directly discriminate or affect a given group of people can still serve to marginalize. This can be where political marginalization becomes particularly important. For example, the New Deal era in the United States provided a number of phenomenal opportunities to create wealth. These opportunities were not provided to a specific group of people, nor was a specific group of people excluded. The Roosevelt Institute (Roosevelt is the president responsible for the New Deal) now recognizes that many of the policies of the New Deal, regardless of their intent, served to further segregate African American housing in the United States (Woolner). At a time



when African Americans were heavily underrepresented in political institutions, they did not have a way of communicating the effects these policies were having on their communities with someone who understood, or sympathized with, their struggles. We see here that social, political and economic marginalization go hand in hand. African Americans were not fully considered as a group when formation of these policies were taking place. They then lacked a connection to political institutions that would allow them to communicate their concerns both before and after the imposition of policies. The end result was further economic marginalization for the African American community as they were unable to benefit from a number of the policy's enrichment opportunities.

The center of power in this case would be the mainstream group at the time, mainly older white males. How this group came to be in a position of power, thus recognizing and sympathizing with certain groups over others and allowing for a contrast to be created, is a situation that is unique to each country's history. The perspectives that this group holds on what is important is something that is often difficult, if not impossible, to separate from oneself. For this reason, groups with a common identity often further push their own needs and concerns over others, continuously maintaining themselves at the center.

## 1.2. Hegemonic Masculinity

Hegemonic masculinity refers to the normative ideology that to be a man is to be dominant in society and that the subordination of women is required to maintain such power (Connell & Messer-schmidt, 2005; Mankowski & Maton, 2010). Hegemonic masculinity is created when gender polarity results in marginalization from the center of power for one sex in comparison to the other. Briefly what is domineering is in the center while the rest is of minor importance or in other words “marginalized”. Women are always portrayed in the margins as men is vice versa. Developed in the 1980s (Carrigan et al. 1985) to provide a relational and socially constructed conception of men and masculinities, the term hegemonic masculinity describes the hierarchical interaction between multiple masculinities and explains how some men make it appear normal and necessary that they dominate most women and other men (Connell 1987). Thus, men are the dominant group of the society because it is how it has been imposed for years throughout the history. On the following quote one can see a distinctive explanation of gender by Richard Howson with the help of Connell’s theory:

Thus, gender is no longer viewed as two autonomously homogenous categories but, rather, as configurations of practice within social relations that operate, not just between men, but also between men and women and between women and women at any one historical moment. In other words, gender is relational (see also Kimmel 1987: 122) and, as such, it cannot assume a certain practice from which its interests and identity develop, except in contrast to some other (Connell 1995: 68).

### “Challenging Hegemonic Masculinity”

A Cultural History, Michael Kimmel says that “manhood is ... not the manifestation of an inner essence; it’s socially constructed” (3). What is called socially constructed here is gender obviously. Most of the empiricist accept that gender is socially constructed while sex is biological. People are born with their organs and they are classified accordingly. Yet, the demeanors take form based on the society that people raise. Depending on the biological sex, society expects people look and behave a certain way. If you are a man, you are meant to be masculine, or if you are a woman, you are meant to be feminine. Thus, no one could possibly claim that he is a man and he should behave manly or vice versa, yet reality is quite different. Brod summarises that “[w]hile women have been obscured from our vision by being too much in the background, men have been obscured by being too much in the foreground” (40–1). Men



are, then, invisible by product of their very ubiquity in history and theory; as Sally Robinson asserts in *Marked Men* (2000). Here, again, on the following quotation, one can clearly see the social impositions on men: "... the identification with, or in Lacanian terms, misrecognition of nationally accepted forms of masculinity (such as empire builders, self-made man, or frontiersmen) allows individuals to flee their individuality, i.e. the burden of taking responsibility by constructing their own identity" (Horclacher, Chapter 1)

In Merriam-Webster Dictionary hegemony is defined as the following, "the social, cultural, ideological, or economic influence exerted by a dominant group." Hegemony as a word can sound as if it is something positive for the powerful actors of society, or those that possess the natural characteristics to fit the definition. For a given group of people, hegemony provides a number of positive benefits, with one benefit being that the positives provided come to them naturally as members of the group. Despite these positive characteristics for the few, hegemony has its own negative connotations that come along with a group that naturally falls outside of the hegemony. With the word "exert," one can interpret this concept of hegemony as something to be promoted for others to adopt, if not directly pushed upon them. This definition also suggests a difference in two groups: one that possesses something that helps to maintain them as an influential group in society, and others that lack this direct trait but must work to conform to it. Fitting within these definitions given to you by society (or more accurately in this case, "exerted" onto you by the members of the hegemonic group) can be seen as a form of performance. One group sees the behavior of the hegemony as somehow correct and natural, with the other groups being responsible for "playing the part" in order to fit with the group with social power. The definition of hegemonic masculinity from Kimmel, in his own words:

The hegemonic definition of manhood is a man in power, a man with power, and a man of power. We equate manhood with being strong, successful, capable, reliable, in control. The very definitions of manhood we have developed in our culture maintain the power that some men have over other men and that men have over women...Whatever the variations by race, class, age, ethnicity or sexual orientation being a man means 'not being like women.' This notion of anti-femininity lies at the heart of contemporary and historical conceptions of manhood, so that masculinity defined more by what one is not rather than who one is.

*The History of Men: Essays in the History of American and British Masculinities 184-185*

While there are individual differences in male gender role socialization, this specific masculinity works to position men in a space of power, thus, it is often the ideal form of masculinity that men are socialized to achieve. (Beasley, 2008; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). To demonstrate hegemonic masculinity, men are expected to adhere to a strict set of prescribed masculine gender roles that work to promote male dominance through a subordination and overall distrust of femininity (Malamuth, Sockloskie, Koss, & Tanaka, 1991). So, men who maintain a strict adherence to masculine gender role norms react to gender-relevant stress through aggressive behavior. This is likely because men who experience such stress feel that they need to reassert their masculinity through behaviors that subordinate others. The desire for dominance and power is central to hegemonic masculinity and refers to men's need to control others in order to achieve status according to oneself, as well as in society as a whole (Levant et al., 2010). Obtaining and maintaining status and power in society and in interpersonal interactions involves the objectification or dehumanization of others, particularly women, and a need to control others and hold power. This involves a distrust of others and a willingness to manipulate them (Levant et al., 2010; Malamuth et al., 1995; Zurbriggen, 2010). Further, men who have internalized and adhere to this particular masculine norm are more likely to take extreme measures (e.g., violence and aggression) in order to maintain their dominance in society.

The distinction between subordinate masculinities and marginalized masculinities is based on the difference between the social relations that define them. Subordinate masculinities are linked uniquely to cathectic relations structured around sex. These relations, while fundamentally internal to the gender structure, have been labelled as deviant and, thereby, expelled from the hegemonic worldview. On the other hand, marginalized masculinities develop within and through other social relations, such as those structured around the concepts of race, class and ethnicity. These relations exist and operate exogenously to the gender structure but are, nevertheless, always already interacting with gender (Connell 1995: 80).

#### “Challenging Hegemonic Masculinity”

As Richard Howson stated in his article above, marginalized masculinity is related to the difference in social relations. According to the social relations, gender is created and one called powerless has become marginalized. Power is the source of masculinity. What is masculine is powerful and what is powerful is somehow related to masculinity. Here, we begin to see the



issue of the balance of power between the male and female poles of society. Only men with power truly become a man, while men without power just stay within their own personal dilemma. This leads to great problems in people's lives. Yet, what is more tragic is that the depiction of men which is obtained with the differences between men and women. Here is the definition of men "not being like women" which is the most critical part of the power problem in men. Women are seen as powerless. Thus, men have to be powerful just to be different from them. It is the man who manages to achieve this or fails to achieve this, while women are excluded entirely from an occasion that allows them to participate. Men shouldn't be like women; women cannot be like men. Consequently, hegemonic masculinity comes to the stage and your being "who" is not important for the society anymore while your being "what" is crucial. Men's power is drawn from their contrast from women. The more power they are able to acquire, the more they differ from their female counterparts. The more power they acquire, the more women are marginalized in relation, simply fitting the role of the powerless contrast.

Two aspects of this excellent description of hegemonic masculinity emerge as significant. First, it is possible to see the axiomatic position that hegemonic masculinity has assumed within the literature as both the symbolic representative of the legitimate masculine ideal, as well as the focus for the critique of masculinity. In other words, to understand gender in the contemporary situation, it is imperative to know how hegemonic masculinity operates. Second, hegemonic masculinity is not imposed upon the gender order exogenously but, rather, as emerging from and through the socio-cultural milieu itself.

#### "Challenging Hegemonic Masculinity"

As stated above, hegemonic masculinity is considered with an ideal masculine character. That is why one person should understand it with the counterparts living in the same socio-cultural background. The theory of the different enjoyment of power across genders can be seen in everyday life. Women play the role of feminine given by the society while men play their masculine roles, again given by society. Each gender heterogeneously performs what is imposed, within the power they are entitled to. Women play the vulnerable while men are able to be daring. Women are in the house while men are out. Women are associated with the domestic tasks and child rearing while men are associated with the office and economic responsibilities. According to Merriam-Webster, to be masculine means "having qualities appropriate to or usually associated with a man." Hegemonic masculinity, then, refers to male traits that are somehow "exerted" onto the rest of society, expected of society, or in other ways

valued by society in a manner that typically results in them remaining comfortably within the center of power, or at least having considerable access to it. Because hegemony is related to powerful groups exercising influence on other groups, it does not provide its benefits to men without any consequences for the rest of society. Rather, it combines with gender roles and masculinity to form an influence of men *over* women. This chain of power has not been disguised over time; rather, it has been celebrated as a healthy social norm. This is seen from the very start of a child's life when they begin to play with feminine or masculine toys, and extends to the words we use to describe women versus men. While it would be more socially desirable for a girl to be pretty, sweet, and a good cook, men would be more likely to be desired if they are strong, intelligent, and assertive. While a woman taking charge of a situation in a classroom may be considered bossy, a male acting in a similar way might be described a strong leader. The difference in power ascribed to men and women can be seen in the gender roles that are expected of them within society. The fact that men's roles come with power places them at the center of power of society. The fact that these roles often overshadow or limit feminine roles is an example of marginalization. The resulting polarization, with one pole possessing a considerable amount of power in relation to the other, is an example of hegemony.

The fact that the hegemony is created and perpetuated based on gender is what is known as hegemonic masculinity. Here on the following quote one can see the description of equality and inequality dualism in terms of gender and power relationship: "In general terms, greater class equality tends to favor greater gender equality and vice versa, in that differences in resources become reduced, including by gender. At a general level, more gender equal, or less gender unequal, societies tend to be more equal in class terms" (Introduction: International Studies on Men, Masculinities, and Gender Equality 458). On the following quotation, it can be clearly seen that Connell emphasized the importance of social relations while considering masculinity:

It is through a similar recognition by Connell of the importance of social relations upon practice that masculinity, which is a form of practice, can be conceived as multiplicity. This argument sits at the core of masculinities theory whose theoretical underpinnings are given by the theory of practice's inter-related concepts of situation and hegemony, which also emphasize its dynamic and hierarchical nature. Thus, gender at any particular historical moment can only represent the configurations of practice emergent from the milieu of social relations that incorporate and organize power. As such, it is defined as '[the]



place in gender relations, the practices through which men and women engage that place in gender, and the effects of these practices in bodily experience, personality and culture' (Connell 1995: 71).

#### “Challenging Hegemonic Masculinity”

The way society views each gender and thus expects things of and for them can be seen in the very way we describe each gender. Society is the power deciding what men and women need to do. Women are always depicted as the ones remained in the background while men are depicted as the ones lead. A study by the Harvard Business Review focused on the way we refer to successful men and women differently, based on what is expected of them by society. The study found that men's performance reviews contained more positive words than women's, despite the overall score of the review being the same (Smith). The particularly shocking point, however, was not that men's were more positive than women's. The bigger issue was that the positive traits focused on for women were much more likely to speak to their individual traits, rather than those valuable to the workplace. For example, men were commonly described as analytical, versatile, articulate, and logical (Smith). In the same reviews, the positive traits for women were compassionate, enthusiastic, energetic, and organized (Smith). While these traits can be equally positive for the workplace, they do not hold the same positive connotations for work capabilities. While men's reviews focused on physical and mental traits, none of the women's traits touched on mental capabilities. This is quite distinctive that men and women are classified according to their gender-based characteristics. This helps to point out the difference in how men and women are viewed in society, and the power that is associated with men. While the men and women were equally successful in the study (they held the same position at work and received the same score on their performance review), men were praised for their work abilities while women were recognized for their individual, non-work-related traits (Smith). This is the combination of gender polarization and a hegemony between the two poles. Hegemony is the concept that this power balance between poles is not dormant, it does not sit quietly in the corner of the room; rather, this power can be exercised over other groups in order to drive the way that society functions.

It is literally interesting to consider that hegemonic masculinity, or the idea that you have a certain inherent power as a male, can be exercised between men as well. Hegemonic masculinity is not a concept that the average person considers on a daily basis. As all humans are raised in a culture, the culture itself affects how people behave and live. We all live as we have been raised. Thus, being raised to believe that something is owed to you, or that you have an inherent right to “take what is yours” can very well be practiced between different groups of men. As stated in the journal *Hegemonic Masculinity: A Theoretical Overview*, “Raewyn Connell’s concept of hegemonic masculinity...serves as an analytical instrument to identify those attitudes and practices among men that perpetuate gender inequality, involving both men’s domination over women and the power of some men over other (often minority groups of) men” (Jewkes). Therefore, this gender inequality paves the way for a domination or hegemony both between men and women, and between men, depending on the situation. R. W. Connell in his article titled *The History of Masculinity* states that there is no way to put the history of masculinity into a linear order. Instead, all of these attitudes and masculinities are incorporated into one, depicted in the following quotation:

The history of masculinity, it should be abundantly clear, is not linear. There is no master line of development...no simple shift from ‘traditional’ to ‘modern.’ Rather we see, in the world created by the European empires, complex structures of gender relations in which dominant, subordinated and marginalized masculinities are in constant interaction, changing the conditions for each other’s existence and transforming themselves as they do.

*The Masculinity Studies Reader 254*

This shows the complexity within masculinity as a general concept, and that the variations of masculinities are capable of coming into conflict. The unique situation that exists between men and women, however, is that only men are raised by society as a whole to have an attitude of conquest, or this capability of combining and transforming masculinities. While individuals can be raised by individual families to believe otherwise, society as a whole promotes the dominance of men over women. The result is that these attitudes in opposing men come into conflict as their differing masculinities do, with the victor undecided. With men and women, the expectation is that men will do as they please while women should be submissive to these demands. In a way, society has decided who they *desire* to be the victor, whether that is always the case or not.



Gender roles, as debated for decades, are also performative. Women play the role of feminine given by the society while men play their masculine roles, again given by society. Each gender heterogeneously performs what is imposed. Women play the vulnerable while men are always daring. Women are in the house while men are out. Women are always associated with the domestic things meanwhile men are always associated with outside. On the following, it is distinctively seen: "...where biology says 'what' society says 'how'. Certainly, the biological facts of maleness and femaleness are central to the matter; human reproduction is a major part of what defines the sex/gender system. But all kinds of questions can be raised about nature of the relation between biology and the social" (114). All in all, whatever society or biology says, women are always powerless during men are powerful. As hegemony is related to power and when it is combined with the masculinity which is always related to the performance of power, there comes kind of a chain of power. This chain of power, throughout the history, seemed something affirmative and was always in demand. In a society being a man is always something privileged because it is the symbol of power. However, this condition of having power bring its drawbacks. Being powerful or having power can cause many negative consequences. It is also not only between men and women. It can also be between more powerful man and a less powerful one.

The performance of power, as I touched on above, carries drawbacks of its own. To exemplify it, we can look at stereotypical examples of everyday life. When you depict a father in a family, what comes to your mind? When you imagine the role of a father figure for your family, what do you see? While it varies between individual families, what is known and common about being a father is the bread-wining position. In a study by the Pew Research Center, 72% of men and 71% of women said that a man must be able to provide financially for a family in order to be a good partner. In comparison, only 39% of women and 25% of men said the same about female partners (Parker). Thus, we can deduce that fathers are typically the partner expected to make money and provide for the family. The other depiction of a father can be that they are never supposed to cry or show emotion. Jack O. Balswick is an author who received his PhD at the University of Iowa. He explains in his article *The Inexpressive Male: A Tragedy of American Society* that growing up "boys are taught that expressiveness is inconsistent with masculinity. Inexpressive males come in two varieties: the cowboy who, although he does have feelings...does not or cannot express them; and the playboy who is a non-feeling man void of even unexpressed emotional feelings...[this] can be highly dysfunctional to their...relationships" (363). Peter Jackson further explains in *The Cultural*

*Politics of Masculinity: Towards a Social Geography* that, “learning to be a man often means learning to speak for others in the supposedly neutral and impartial language of reason, rather than speaking for ourselves in ways that reveal our emotions and feelings from which we have been progressively alienated since childhood.” (201). This avoidance of emotional expression not only serves to avoid talking about important elements of self, but also robs our relationships of a crucial element for understanding one another. Mr. Jackson explains that this is additionally damaging because of the way that it plays out only for one side of society, and not for the other, making it additionally hard to understand from the feminine perspective. He explains, “Cultural politics...is concerned above all with the social construction and political significance of *difference*” (201). Through this medium, we create artificial barriers for emotional understanding and well-being.

Fathers, in that sense, are also seen as the figurehead that must look after the child/children and their wife. While others have time to be weak in given moments, the father figure is seen as the rock of the family, always remaining strong as the figure head to set an example for others. A study of 108 Colombian families controlled for age and education and found that only gender determined how parents viewed their role in relation to their children and society, with men more likely than women to say that their role was to be an authoritative figure (Giunta). Authoritative can be seen in relation to the kids and to the wife. The result is that men carry an internal expectance that they will be the decisive figure in the family and relationship. This carries negative connotations for other members of the family, as they are expected to be submissive in a number of intimate contexts. It can also be negative for men, as they are expected to be strong on all occasions. The result is negative for two reasons:

- 1) It draws the contrast between men and women that allows for a power struggle between the two.
- 2) This power struggle is not founded on equal principles. Either men exert their dominance, or they fail to. There is no possibility of female dominance offered by the societal narrative.

As explained above, all these impositions are restrictive for both of the genders. There is almost no way out from the struggle of not being marginalized. If a man was not strong enough, they would get marginalized from society, and unfortunately there is literally no opportunity for women to be in the run of power. There is even no place for women in this hegemonic world. Both Gramsci and Connell discoursed on hegemony or more specifically, hegemonic masculinity. What or who is dominant or dominates is hegemonic, indeed. Even if it looks that



men are in the regarding position, they have many negative consequences not only in their private lives but also in their work lives.

In this sense, both Gramsci and Connell view hegemony as having an exclusionary nature. However, the complexity of Gramsci's theory of hegemony, as illustrated in the 'Tripartite model of hegemony', shows that exclusion operates only in the regressive forms of detached and dominative hegemony. In the theory of practice, where hegemony is interpreted and articulated simply in its dominative form, the regressive cycle predominates and ensures that the hegemonic group, in the final analysis, dominates all other groups.

#### "Challenging Hegemonic Masculinity"

On the quotation above one can see the mixture of Gramsci and Connell's theories. They both considers hegemony as something dominant. Even among men there is this hegemonic position according to their status in society. To exemplify: Many of the expectations of what a father must be all at once are not realistic for any human being. Imposing such roles on a gender without knowing the character or the life conditions is just absurd and ruthless. Because of this, I have highlighted the drawbacks and issues of hegemonic masculinity not only for women but also for men. Here on the following quote one can see the drawbacks of being dominant in terms of each gender:

The argument that hegemony and, therefore, hegemonic masculinity represents a negativity about gender has in the recent past assumed an axiomatic status in the literature on masculinities, and has also infiltrated into the broader debate about social justice in gender. Nevertheless, at its core sit two crucial yet problematic conceptual positions. Hegemonic masculinity is interpreted as a dominant and dominating ideal type of masculinity whose efficacy ensures the continuity of a legitimated closure around a particular gender order. But even more significant for the question of social justice is that, while conceiving of hegemonic masculinity in this way it is based on an interpretation of hegemony drawn from Gramsci, its underpinning logic fails to elaborate the full complexity of Gramsci's theory of hegemony and, as a consequence, reduces the possibilities for social justice to the demise of hegemony.

#### "Challenging Hegemonic Masculinity"

It is also important to remember that powerful groups can influence how others behave, both women and men, with the overall point being that this puts society as a whole in a negative position. Despite being an abstraction, hegemonic masculinity can practicably be put to use in interventions. This requires that careful attention be paid to the mechanisms that the theory that encompasses hegemonic masculinity identifies as being central to men's domination of women. That's why hegemonic masculinity is toxic for all, with the negative implications for women simply being much more direct and out of their hands. When considering the negative implications that this structure has for men, it is important to remember that many of these negative implications come as drawbacks in relation to *power*. Negative implications extending from submission must of course be regarded in a different light, as women experience drawbacks not from power, but from a lack of it. In the following quotation it is obviously seen that hegemonic masculinity cannot even exist without the existence of women: "But the overwhelmingly important reason is that most men benefit from the subordination of women, and hegemonic masculinity is centrally connected with the institutionalization of men's dominance over women. It would hardly be an exaggeration to say that hegemonic masculinity is hegemonic so far as it embodies a successful strategy in relation to women" (113). Women have to exist for hegemonic masculinity seeing that men are never able to impose or show power on them.



## CHAPTER TWO

### 2.1. George Orwell in a Nutshell

Under the pseudonym George Orwell, he left many enlightening works to the world of readers and his name was Eric Arthur Blair, born on the 25th of June 1903 to a wealthy family in the British part of India. Although his family at one time possessed a significant amount of wealth, this did not extend to Orwell's generation. He was, however, well off by general standards of the day.

His young life was spent in India due to his father working there. His mother was a French origin. Upon returning to England, he started studying at Eton College. Rather than being a university student, he preferred to take the Indian Civil Service exams and became a policeman in Burma in 1921. His very first novel, *Burmese Days*, was inspired by his mission in Burma and was published in New York in 1934. Burma had a strong effect on the young Orwell, as he obtained tattoos that were common in rural areas of Burma and began to sport his signature moustache, typical of English officers in the region. He would later say that he felt guilty of his role in the English mission in Burma, and began to look at other social issues that he had not previously considered as a result.

Upon returning to London, Orwell received advice from an old tutor on how to become a successful writer. He began to "write what he knew," which for Orwell meant going out and finding things that interested him. The East End of London quickly became his interest, with a focus on the poverty present there. He even had a period of time where he embodied that class of people, dressing like them and refusing to adhere to the social norms of the class he was born into. His literary aspirations continuously developed as Orwell travelled, during experiences in a number of cities, living situations, and careers. This development is well embodied by "Why I Write," which describes how he would like to make political writing into an art. As a journalist for BBC, his political inclinations are described by the following:

An anarchist in the late 1920s, by the 1930s he had begun to consider himself a socialist. In 1936, he was commissioned to write an account of poverty among unemployed miners in northern England, which resulted in 'The Road to Wigan Pier' (1937). Late in 1936, Orwell travelled to Spain to fight for the Republicans against Franco's Nationalists. He was forced to flee in fear of his life from Soviet-

backed communists who were suppressing revolutionary socialist dissenters.

The experience turned him into a lifelong anti-Stalinist.

These developments and focus on literature would later define Orwell, who began to write increasingly heated articles and literature focusing on the various social and political issues of the day. He is a realistic writer who is aware of the situation of the lower level of society. He is a social democrat who directs his criticisms against war, totalitarian governments, and imperialism. In fact, Orwell had a better understanding of the society than his contemporaries did while he belonged to the left. Accordingly, his works are influenced by his political ideology.

Since Orwell believes “one of the dominant facts in English life during the past three-quarters of a century has been the decay of ability in the ruling class” and since all the peace and serenity of prewar England depends on the leisure of the few and the labor of the many, he admires the working, lower-middle and middle-class aspects of the prewar world but attacks the upper-middle and upper-class characteristics.

*Orwell: Life and Art*

The quotation above stated by Meyers can clearly show Orwell’s intention of writing. He, indeed, approaches his novels in the sense of being a philosopher of human nature and human conditions. He discovers various ways to express political ideas and messages in his fictional works as in the fable of *Animal Farm* and dystopian satire of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. In almost all his novels, Orwell portrays men who are in a state of marginalization from social life because of the existence of various socio-economic and political issues. Global war risks of the 1930s and onwards are a means for expressing how men feel isolated and marginalized in the middle of historical and social changes. He, somehow, implies that such mental states are a result of psychoanalytical evaluations of great world events. *Coming Up for Air*, which was Orwell’s first attempt to comment on the political situation in a novel published before World War II, alerts readers about arising external hazards of war (Meyers 1991: 17). This demonstrates that he warns all humanity about an approaching apocalyptic future full of technological dangers.

The devastating downfall that threatens Orwell at school also threatens Bowling in *Coming Up for Air*; and the fearful oppression by one’s fellows recurs in *Animal Farm*. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, he shows the ways of holding on to power which has touched the past significantly. But in *Coming up for Air*, Orwell pays less attention to political complexities in



the relation between past and present. Orwell lived at the time of two wars and consequently depression and disappointment have become two principle themes of Orwell's writings. Orwell is aware of the effect and power of the past on the present. These legacies live on today, with Orwell now being best known for his titles *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, with both being powerful political statements on social life within different societies. The powerful sense of approaching and then actual disaster that dominated Orwell's life and mind in the thirties and forties is, quite naturally, expressed in the books he wrote during the last twenty years of his life. On the following quotation Meyers, again, demonstrates the inner world of Orwell on his own words:

Orwell writes in "Such, Such Were the Joys" that, even while at home, "my early childhood had not been altogether happy...One ought to love one's father, but I knew very well that I merely disliked my own father, whom I had barely seen before I was eight and who appeared to me simply as a gruff-voiced elderly man forever saying 'Don't.' Not to expose your true feelings to an adult seems to be instinctive from the age of seven or eight onwards. I do not believe that I ever felt love for any mature person, except my mother, and even her I did not trust."

*Orwell: Life and Art*

As a man who was lack of love or even the belief that he has ever been loved by his mother, he always chose to show pessimistic side of himself. Orwell died when an artery burst in his lungs in January of 1950, at the young age of 46. He left behind him a legacy of works, criticisms, and opinions that make him one of the most influential writers of the twentieth century.

## 2.2. Orwell's Struggle in *Coming Up for Air*

*Coming Up for Air* starts with an epigraph of a popular song "He's dead, but he won't lie down" (*Coming Up for Air* 3). The cover portrays a drowning man trying to save himself and breathe again. The protagonist of this novel is a man trying to reach a world where he can find the space and peace to breathe.

At the very beginning of the novel the reader meets the first person narrator, the protagonist named George Bowling, also known as "Fatty Bowling." He is a married insurance salesman who could not find happiness in his marital life with two children. Throughout the novel we see a man craving to go back to his childhood village, Lower Binfield. The story unfolds in 1938 just before the upcoming war, which makes Mr. Bowling recall the agonizing memories before the first World War. In the end, he is devastated in disappointment, as he discovers that the village he waited so long to see is not as he remembered.

In the novel we constantly see stereotyping of genders. Here is the one that George Bowling describes the interests of women indicating his mother with his own words while generalizing the human beings in the end as fixed like molds: "I never remember her when she wasn't cooking. When you look back over a long period you seem to see human beings always fixed in some special place and some characteristic attitude" (48). In addition to that, he also describes her mother's approach on the things that men want: "According to mother, everything that a boy wants to do was dangerous. Swimming was dangerous, climbing trees was dangerous, and so were sliding, snowballing, hanging on behind carts, ... even fishing" (52). There is also a part in the novel, which is quite short but remarkable that shows the saddening reality of stereotyping, as one can see on the following: "Mother never said grace: it had to be someone of the male sex" (53). When it comes to father figure, here George describes his father and accordingly his own habits as on the following: "Father had never read a book in his life, except the Bible and Smile's Self Help, and I did not of my own accord read a good book till much later. I'm not sorry it happened that way. I read the things I wanted to read..." (91)

As an author who infused political intents into his works, George Orwell created many works representing the political problems of the era that he was living in. In the same way in his *Coming up for Air*, it can be clearly seen in the moments that the protagonist himself was used as a way of showing some kind of political inclinations by constantly reminding himself of the war. It is evidently seen that Orwell does not only portray the distinction between sexes but also the class distinction at those times. For example, "there was a big social distinction



between the shopkeepers' sons and the sons of labourers and farm-hands, but the local boys didn't usually pay much attention to it till they were about sixteen" (57). This class distinction shows the reality of the society and makes a statement about the way that Orwell saw it. Everybody plays the role that has been given by the society. If somebody is a son of a laborer, they have their own style of living while if somebody is a local boy, they have their own way of living. Here in terms of class distinction, what makes someone powerful is money. So, the money is the means of power. The man with money is powerful while the man without money is powerless. What makes a man a laborer is his lack of money, which is again somehow related to his relationship with society. Overall, Orwell starts out strong with his ability to draw the lines between the center of power and those at the margins.

The society additionally classifies people based on physical appearance. Everything that does not fit into the patterns is ready to be criticized which causes a big internal conflict for the individuals. All these patterns are related to power. Power can be achieved according to the position occupied in society. On the following quote one can see the internal conflict of a fat man living in a society that imposed some characteristics on men- even classified as fat ones:

I'm not altogether fat... I'm vulgar, I'm insensitive, and I fit in with my environment... In almost all circumstances I'd manage to make a living- always a living and never a fortune- and never even in war, revolution, plague and famine I'd back myself to stay alive longer than most people... I'm fat, but I'm thin inside. Has it ever struck you that there's a thin man inside every fat man, just as they say there's a statue inside every block of stone? (20)

This is quite subtle to show the inner feelings of a fat man with his own words. Regardless of how the fat man is viewed by his society, he has a distinct way of viewing himself that comes into conflict with society's definition. The fat man feels marginalized not by his capabilities, but by his way of looking. As previously mentioned, this allows for one group of men to come into conflict with another, leading to the determination of the center of power that only men compete for.

However, what really matters in terms of this study is how Orwell portrayed the protagonist as a man. In *A Cultural History*, Michael Kimmel says that "manhood is... not the manifestation of an inner essence; it's socially constructed" (3). Thus, the beginning will be with the protagonist George Bowling and the reality of his being "a social construct." To start with the very first pages, here Mr. George Bowling feathered his own nest by betting on a horse and stated the following, "A good husband and a father would have spent it on a dress for Hilda

(that's my wife) and boots for the kids. But I'd been a good husband and father for fifteen years and I was beginning to be fed up with it" (5). As one can clearly see from the quote above, some masculine attitudes that are demanded of him as a father have become more of a nuisance than a blessing. These attitudes are socially constructed with the role of a father, and a husband, and as he fed up with those, he may decide to act differently and react against the roles imposed on him. Regardless of what he chooses to do, he has identified what society *expects* of him in this situation as a man, husband, and father. The depiction of the character and his recognition of these societal roles set the stage for Orwell's true opinions on men and women, as we are able to gain the understanding not from the characters themselves, but the way in which Orwell thinks naturally to present them. In doing so, Orwell begins to draw a clear line between men and women that leaves a lasting impression.

Later on, it can also be seen that Orwell portrays women as existing in a vacuum. George describes his wife while depicting the way he views her existence, "As for wars, earthquakes, plagues, famines and revolutions, she pays no attention to them...in fact she'll probably rather enjoy the feeling of security" (7). The mind set of Mr. Bowling goes beyond what he thinks of his wife. Further, it describes the position he sees her occupying as a result of what society expects of her. This is a typical portrayal of women from the perspective of men at those times. All these are somehow socially constructed both for men, and women: the given roles of two opposing sexes. Furthermore, one can also see how George Bowling defines his own mother in the following quotation, "When you saw her cooking you knew that she was in a world where she belonged among things she really understood... and unlike him used to read novelettes as well as newspapers, she was unbelievably ignorant" (49). On the contrary, Mr. Bowling portrays his father like, "The shop was Father's business, it was the man's work" while he portrays his mother like "Her job, 'the woman's work,' was to look after the house and the meals and the laundry and the children" (50). While the woman was depicted as someone belonging to the kitchen, the man belongs to the workplace. It can be inferred from all these passages above, in the novel one can have a clear view of patriarchy and hegemony in the family unit as something natural. Society wants it that way, and that's more than enough reason to live that way.

Ivett Császár describes Orwell's attitude in *Orwell and Women's Issues – a Shadow over the Champion of Decency* as one that "celebrate[s] male virtues, enforce[s] male values and describe[s] the world of men" (40). He explains that while Orwell championed many political issues of the day, pushing for reform and progressive values, his stance on what space



women should occupy in society was shockingly narrow (40). He explains that Orwell often uses the phrase “common man,” but not as a substitute for people, as one might think (40). Rather, “common man” was meant to exclude the common woman (40). This is a phenomenal depiction of hegemonic masculinity, as Császár explains that to Orwell the human norm was masculine, with women occupying whatever space remained on the fringes of society (40). Császár explains that while Orwell was often praised for his masculinity, with many critics noticing it and explaining that it isn’t “necessarily a bad thing,” these critics failed to notice the ways in which his masculinity did not keep to itself (41). Rather, this masculinity was often presented in a manner that put it in direct conflict with femininity and feminist values (41). The way that men are described in *Coming Up For Air* is not itself the problem; the problem arises when these masculine traits are depicted as inherently superior to any possible feminine trait. These descriptions serve to draw a contrast between men and women, with Orwell’s continuous attitude being one that would put men at the center of that contrast, and women at the margins.

Along these lines, there is also a moment that the protagonist George as a kid went fishing and contemplated on what it meant to be a man. “I was a boy at last. It’s a kind of strong, rank feeling, a feeling of knowing everything and fearing nothing... Thank God I’m a man, because no woman ever has that feeling” (66). This masculine attitude shows not only the superiority of male traits to female traits, but further, links these traits explicitly to gender. Years later that hobby of going fishing turned into a disgrace for George in his wife’s opinion, “The idea of wasting that much money on a thing like that... ten shillings for those silly fishing-rods! It’s disgraceful. And fancy you going fishing at your age! A great big grown-up man like you. Don’t be such a baby, George” (89). Again, we see that a contrast between what is acceptable behavior for men and women is created. A contrast of this nature is much more subtle and indirectly harmful than the depictions of females as empty or ignorant. However, all this contrast must do is further support the idea that the contrast exists; the attitude of Orwell throughout his works makes clear that when men and women differ, it is the male traits that are superior.

The distinction between the two sexes that Orwell believed in can be seen in other ways as well. Rebekah Reuben from the Critical & Creative Arts Publication describes Orwell’s view of women in *Coming Up for Air* by focusing on the way in which Orwell describes female utility. She explains how Orwell describes Katie Simmons and Elsie Waters, both members of Orwell’s “treasured” past. Both of these women are described as having had a positive influence on George’s life. Katie looked after him when he was growing up, yet is later described as “a

wrinkled-up hag of a woman” (Reuben). Elsie was George’s first sexual experience, which he views as a positive experience. Let’s have a look at Mr Bowling describing Elsie in the following quotation: “She was really deeply feminine, very gentle, very submissive, the kind that would always do what a man told her, though she was not either small or weak” (107). He describes her later as looking slutty, which further enforced his relief in being a man. He states, “It made me feel downright glad that I’m a man. No man ever goes to pieces quite so completely as that” (Reuben). The author argues that these are more than mean comments (Reuben). Rather, these comments show that these women were nothing more than tools for George to get where he was going (Reuben). Once their utility is up, he is incapable of seeing them as positive parts of his past, but rather, as items he no longer has any use for. This further serves to place the male as the central focus, with females being items placed at the margins for men’s occasional use.



### 2.3. *Animal Farm* Scrutinized

According to Orwell's own words, *Animal Farm* tells a story meant to reflect events that led up to the Russian Revolution of 1917 and later the Stalinist period of the Soviet Union. Orwell is known for being extremely critical of Stalin, which many attribute to his experiences in the Spanish Civil War. The book's time period makes it ever the more interesting, written during the time period when the UK and Western world had a wartime alliance with Stalin. As a criticism of the Soviet Union, it became extremely successful in the years following the end of World War II, as the world experienced a shift into the Cold War mentality. Munir Ahmed Al-Aghberi summarizes *Animal Farm* in his article as on the following:

It draws a precise realistic picture of power relations and establishments that almost shape the structure of every modern state with certain degrees of intensity and variability in accordance with the particularity of each regime. Arguably, each regime in the modern world gets its modified version of the *Animal Farm* where the democratic interface hides beneath a complex system of economic and political exploitation.

“Orwell's *Animal Farm*: Ideological State Apparatuses and the Crisis of the Modern State”

The plot of *Animal Farm* contains two young pigs, Snowball and Napoleon, who organize the farm for a Rebellion against their human owners. They push the farmers off of the farm, and rename it “Animal Farm.” They begin to educate the younger animals on the Seven Commandments of Animalism, where all animals are seen as equals. Following an attempt to take back the farm by a group of various farmers, Snowball becomes very popular for his role in fending off the attack. Differences in opinion on the future of the farm begin to lead to a break in leadership, however. Napoleon runs Snowball off the farm, changes the leadership to be more authoritarian, and begins to lash out at anyone he believes to sympathize with Snowball. John Meyers explicitly describes why Orwell gave those names to the animals as on the following:

The carefully chosen animals' names are both realistic and highly suggestive of their owners' personality and role in the novel. The imperious Major (Marx-Lenin) is military, dominant and senior (in public school slang); the rather stupid and self-sacrificing Boxer (the proletariat), who is contrasted to the cynical Benjamin and the indifferent and unenthusiastic cat, is named after the Chinese revolutionaries who drove out foreign exploiters and were themselves crushed; Mollie (the White Russians) suggests folly, and her retrogressive defection for vanity and luxury is a paradigm of the entire revolution; Moses (the Russian Orthodox and later the Catholic Church) brings divine law to man; Squealer (a living Pravda) is onomatopoeic for a voluble pig; and Whymper, the pigs' agent, suggests a toady.

*Orwell: Life and Art*

Accordingly, on the following quotation from *Animal Farm*, one can see the exercise of control or influence over someone or something, or the state of being so controlled related to the all intentionally given names to the animals:

One Sunday morning Squealer announced that the hens... must surrender their eggs... When the hens heard this, they raised a terrible outcry... resembling a rebellion... Napoleon acted swiftly and ruthlessly. He ordered the hens' rations to be stopped... The dogs saw to it that these orders were carried out. For five days the hens held out, then they capitulated and went back to their nesting boxes (51).

The book closes with the animals becoming more and more humanistic, meant to draw attention to the ways they are behaving that resemble political attitudes detested by Orwell. Napoleon changes the way in which the revolution is remembered, lies about what was done with a sick workhorse (selling him rather than healing him in order to make money for the inner circle of leadership), and works the animals hard. Rather than making upgrades to the farm that had been previously discussed, such as running water and electricity, Napoleon pushes an attitude of preferring a simple life. The book ends with animals beginning to walk upright, wear human clothes, and form alliances with farms nearby. The slogan of the farm is changed from "All animals are equal" to "All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others." The end of the book is particularly striking as the very things that were detested at the initial formation of *Animal Farm* are now openly practiced, such as wearing clothes, walking upright, and drinking alcohol. The difference between man and animal is no longer clear, and a moment



of reflection on the type of leadership and life that is now practiced by the animal's dawns on the reader. Here's an example taken from the novel: "Napoleon then led them back to the store-shed and served out a double ration of corn to everybody, with two biscuits for each dog" (13). This shows how the animals become very much like humans and how they dominate over the powerless. Orwell makes his hatred of communism clear to the reader. *Animal Farm* can be seen as a criticism of the contrast between what communism says and what communism does. While communism and the *Animal Farm* both claim that all are equal, Orwell is arguing that in both some are more equal than others.

Critiques of *Animal Farm* have been both positive and negative, focusing on the elements of political comparisons and talking about the changing attitudes of the animals and the propaganda that allows the few to rule the many. Attempting to take a feminist or lack-of-feminist attitude can be hard, as the political message seems to shadow other themes of the book. It is also noteworthy that Orwell's voice comes across very differently than usual in this particular novel. Harold Bloom is a highly regarded literary critic in the United States. He is a professor of humanities at Yale University, and has written more than twenty books of literary criticism. He says of Orwell's *Animal Farm* that, "George Orwell...wrote sympathetically about human beings only when he presented them as animals. The truth can be tested by comparing *Animal Farm* to *Nineteen Eighty-Four*; Napoleon (Stalin) is preferable to the torturer O'Brien, perhaps because even a whip-wielding boar is more tolerated by Orwell than a sadistic human" (1). Bloom continues to compare characters across the two books, noting that while Orwell was known for loving individual people and wanting the best for the world, he was also well known for detesting mankind as a mass (1). With characters coming across differently in *Animal Farm* than his other novels, we seem to get an overall more positive picture of Orwell's world. While sexes play out in *Animal Farm* just like any of his other novels, writing about animals can change the way sex is important, as well. Susan McHugh explains, for example, that animals are viewed differently by the human brain as things that are and have always been of and for the human (*Animal Farm's Lessons for Literary (and) Human Studies* 24). She explains that animals exist in our minds for and because of us, and that this drives the way we think about their lives in literary works (24).

The terrible irony, of course, is that the people of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* have neither freedom nor happiness. The omnipotence of the Church and State is defended by the Grand Inquisitor (and repeated by O'Brien) who maintains that men are terribly weak and unable to choose between good and evil: "man is

weaker and baser by nature than Thou hast believed him! . . . By showing him so much respect, Thou didst, as it were, cease to feel for him, for Thou didst ask too much from him. . . There will be thousands of millions of happy babes, and a hundred thousand sufferers who have taken upon themselves the curse of the knowledge of good and evil” (28).

In the novel the pigs are being described, including Napoleon, Snowball, and Squealer. The only pigs that are mentioned are male pigs and nothing is said of any female pigs on the farm (Orwell 6). This is, unfortunately, the realistic portrayal of the world. Only males rule the human world and only male animals can rule the animal farm. A critic eye would notice and dislike this, as it shows a patriarchal society and that females are not regarded the same as men on the farm, or even mentioned for that matter. Moreover, one of the only times the hens are mentioned is when Napoleon declares that they must surrender 400 eggs a week. The hens are only mentioned here to serve as a means of income (Orwell 31). A critic eye would dislike this, as it objectifies the female chickens greatly, as their only purpose is to provide something to the men on the farm. Mollie is a character in *Animal Farm* that represents females as a token minority. In the book she is only there as a "pretty face" so to say and abandons animalism soon after its rise. She is shown as weak and cowardly in the book, often skipping out on work (Orwell 18). A critic eye, again, would dislike this, as it portrays one of the few female characters as a cowardly and lazy character, caring for themselves only. At the end of the book, a female pig is mentioned "While his favorite sow appeared in the watered silk dress which Mrs. Jones had been used to wear on Sundays,". This is the first time a female pig is mentioned in the entire book (Orwell 53). One can criticize this because it shows a female being objectified as if they were a belonging. It shows that the pigs are in an entirely patriarchal society with little thought of female role in it

With the difference in how sex naturally comes to mind for humans versus animals being considered, we can next analyze some of the messages Orwell emphasizes throughout the novel. *Animal Farm* ends with the farm living by the theory that “All animals are equal, but some are more equal than others.” Considering this first without considering sex, this can be a powerful tool for drawing out marginalization in society, as previously discussed. In any hegemonic culture equality along a linear spectrum results in some being closer to the center of power than others. While all are equal, some are “more equal” than others. As all of the commandments are replaced with the phrase "All animals are equal, but some are more equal than others". This is changed due to the pigs becoming just like men and therefore ruling over the other animals



(Orwell 52). From a critical point of view this can be interpreted to mean "All humans are equal, but men are more equal than others". This is exactly what one should try to rid society of. This stereotype has been around for centuries and is very close to changing in today's modern era.

In his Preface to the Ukrainian edition of 1947, Orwell describes the creative impulse of his barnyard bolshevism: I saw a little boy, perhaps ten years old, driving a huge cart-horse along a narrow path, whipping it whenever it tried to turn. It struck me that if only such animals became aware of their strength we should have no power over them, and that men exploit animals in much the same way as the rich exploit the proletariat. I proceeded to analyze Marx's theory from the animals' point of view. And he also states that 'For the past ten years,' that is, since the Spanish Civil War, 'I have been convinced that the destruction of the Soviet myth was essential if we wanted a revival of the Socialist movement' (III, pp. 405– 6).

*George Orwell*

What is literally striking about this acknowledgment by Orwell is that he repeatedly overlooks sex/gender when disliking the concept of some being more equal than others. Returning to Császár, we recall that Orwell's definition of the common man was meant to exclude women (*Orwell and Women's Issues – a Shadow over the Champion of Decency* 40). Potentially the most striking part of *Animal Farm*, then, is not what Orwell says about sex. Rather, it is that a hatred of some being more equal than others managed to overlook feminist issues throughout Orwell's other works. In Orwell's *Animal Farm*, we see how Mollie is depicted and her characters conveys a message of inferior female. "The stupidest questions of all were asked by Mollie, the white mare. The very first question she asked Snowball was: "Will there still be sugar after the Rebellion?" (6) He continues "As winter drew on, Mollie became more and more troublesome. She was late for work every morning and excused herself by saying that she had overslept, and she complained of mysterious pains, although her appetite was excellent. On every kind of pretext she would run away from work and go to the drinking pool, where she would stand foolishly gazing at her own reflection in the water" (14).

Finally, Orwell stresses the need for the finish of all awkward and abhorrence exercises of the incredible powers on earth. Clover's contemplations are a call for harmony and security in the age of the worldwide crisis. Because Clover and most of the other animals think that “they had come to a time when no one dared speak his mind, when fierce, growling dogs roamed everywhere, and when you had to watch your comrades torn to pieces after confessing to shocking crimes” (76). Thus, what they essentially need is to express their thoughts, wishes and needs. By the Seven Commandments of Animalism, Orwell points out that the rules are supposed to maintain order for peace within Animal Farm. Here, Animalism is an allegorical mirror of the Soviet Union, particularly before and after the World Wars, as well as the evolution of the views of Russian revolutionaries and government’s attitude towards practicing them. By depicting corrupt leadership as a defect in revolution, this novel also demonstrates how (potential) ignorance and indifference appeared during a revolution in the modern world. Even though there is a political message most of the time here, it should not be forgotten that animals are reflected as psychologically depressed and oppressed from these political cases as one can see in the following quotation:

If she could have spoken her thoughts, it would have been to say that this was not what they had aimed at when they had set themselves years ago to work for the overthrow of the human race. These scenes of terror and slaughter were not what they had looked forward to on that night when old Major first stirred them to rebellion. If she herself had had any picture of the future, it had been of a society of animals set free from hunger and the whip, all equal, each working according to his capacity, the strong protecting the weak (75-76).

The novel closes with the farm animals being crushed and the pigs and their neighbors becoming accustomed, signifying that they all resembled each other. Orwell portrays how the animals are disturbed by the social changes in Animal Farm as: Twelve voices were shouting in anger, and they were all alike. No question, now, what had happened to the faces of the pigs. The creatures looked from pig to man, and from man to pig, and from pig to man again, but already it was impossible to say which was which (120). Orwell’s use of animals is a means of criticizing the changing living circumstances and events in the Stalin era before World War II. In *Animal Farm*, George Orwell has a humorous writing style in which the characters are considered animals to satirize Russian Regime of the time. These animals represent the people of the Soviet Union—and basically all people living on earth—and they are formed in a society which pursue the ideal of equality.



Conclusively, *Animal Farm* is actually the 20th century's iconic story that sums up the tragicomic crisis of the modern state. Whether Mr. Jones rule or gets deposed, the pigs must be symbolically there ready with multiple plans to cope with the animal's threatening organization. The actual ruler is not the one who appears occasionally to deliver a speech or attend a ceremony but the clique that tell the herd what every utterance means. Finally, to the bewildered herd it is the interpretation of what they hear and read that matters rather than the discourse itself.

Journal of English Language and Literature. Volume 9. No. 2.

The quotation above can be taken as an essential summary of how we are supposed to read *Animal Farm*. It is exactly a literal depiction of modern era. As I told before, what the most striking point of this novel is how successfully Orwell interprets reality of his world and carelessly overlooks women as a whole.

## 2.4. Politically Correct or Not: Analysis of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*

Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* describes a classic dystopian society taking place in the not-so-distant future. In this very future, members of society are closely monitored by the state. They are monitored even to the extent of mind control, which limits how they can think and the words available to describe their feelings. Vocabulary is narrowed to encourage more mainstream thought, limit the ability to describe words in ways that the State would not agree with, and limit behavior. The manner of reasoning is even limited, with "doublethink," the process of changing language so that contradictions are accepted within the language, essential to ensuring that the party in power's contradictions are not questioned. The result is a society in which not only is thought regulated, but is made remarkably similar throughout society.

He wondered vaguely whether in the abolished past it had been a normal experience to lie in bed like this, in the cool of a summer evening, a man and a woman with no clothes on, making love when they choose, talking of what they chose, not feeling any compulsion to get up, simply lying there and listening to peaceful sounds outside. Surely there could never have been a time when that seemed ordinary (165).

The quote above is a depiction of a couple together and happy which is obviously seen something almost impossible in such a society. A woman and a man together maybe after a sexual intercourse experiencing a summer breeze in a happy moment is something described as something ordinary that could never be seen. This portrays the reader that there is no possibility for ordinary things in this society anymore. There is something more powerful than anything else which controls even the relationship between two sexes. Thus, gender plays an important role in George Orwell's classic novel, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. More specifically, gender plays into the success of the Party, which attempts to neutralize the relevance of gender. Although the Party tries to make gender irrelevant in its dystopian society, many scholars and feminists have attacked Orwell's treatment of sexual politics and gender relations, with their arguments mainly focusing on the portrayal of Julia. As Winston explains, the aim of the Party "was to remove all pleasure from sexual act. Not love so much as eroticism was the enemy, inside marriage as well as outside it" (65). All marriages had to be approved by the Party, and "the only recognized purpose of marriage was to beget children for the service of the Party. Sexual intercourse was to be looked on as a slightly disgusting minor operation, like having an enema" (65). Newsinger continues by explaining the importance of the Anti-Sex League to the Party's



“apparatus of control over Oceania’s population and has... as its undeclared purpose the elimination of all pleasure from the sexual act”. In this society, gender is seen as a non-issue, and there are even experimental plants where babies are produced without the use of the mother’s womb, eliminating the necessity of sex. When Winston is interrogated by O’Brien, he explains that the Party is going to eradicate the sex instinct. “Procreation will be an annual formality like the renewal of a ration card,” O’Brien proclaims, “We shall abolish the orgasm” (267).

The inversion of gender roles between Julia and Winston goes further than this somewhat fanciful interpretation. Consider their behavior in the rented room above Mr. Charrington’s shop. The idea of the man as breadwinner and the woman as homemaker is directly reversed. It is Julia who is the literal breadwinner, bringing proper white bread, not our stuff to the haven they believe they have created (147). As to the haven itself, Winston is the one who finds it, rents it, and suggests it as their regular haunt, thereby becoming the literal homemaker. Of course, this is a simplified interpretation of their actions in the rented room. Julia’s insistence that she is going to be a woman whilst they are together in the room does nothing to undermine the power she holds over Winston (149). In fact, the make-up and scent seem only to increase his desire for and trust in her, leading him to be naked in her presence for the first time (149). It seems that assertiveness does not necessarily equal masculinity in Nineteen Eighty-Four. While it is possible to suggest that the apparent inversion of gender roles that were prevalent in the 1940s (with many of the women who had worked in factories during the war returning to their roles in the home) is a part of Orwell’s nightmare, it is difficult to deny Winston’s emasculation alongside Julia’s assertiveness.

This leads to a number of themes within the novel that could be seen as feminist ideals, or to promote feminist ways of thought. For example, literature in *The Netherlands* describes the themes present in Orwell’s work that seem to be way before their time. Many of these themes allude to struggles that feminists will later face, and some suggest that Orwell was first to recognize these feminist struggles. In *The Not-Yet of Gender Equality*, Jennifer Aardema explains that Orwell’s dystopia shows how people can be controlled and marginalized if they are not allowed to have a language or a history of their own (20). The author explains that the re-writing of women’s history and lack of access to non-bias information became an important topic in the 1960s and 1970s (21). George Orwell, however, mentioned this topic in relation to women (and men) nearly twenty-years prior (21).

Aardema further explains that Orwell's society depicts men and women as dressing, acting, and being viewed the same, an ideal that some sectors of feminism strive towards (21-22). Women do not wear makeup, and like men, have short haircuts. This, however, is where she begins to explain why Orwell's work is far from feminist. Aardema writes that *1984* remains male-centered. She explains, "The most prominent evidence of this is that all the women in the novel are primarily seen and defined in their relation to men and their biological, primordial role...one of the most important characteristics of female stereotyping" (22-23). Women within Orwell's work are still primarily defined as their societal gender roles, whether that be as someone's mother, wife, or lover (23). A society that makes all people act, look, and think the same, but continues to define women by the men they are related to, has clearly failed to understand the concepts his book could possibly be seen as supporting. Rather, it shows that this was not Orwell's initial or actual intent. This further serves to show that while Orwell was ahead of his time in many of the ways that he thought, he was not yet understanding of, or sympathetic to, the feminist cause. In *1984*, when the 3<sup>rd</sup> person narrator first mentions Julia as a representative of the women with negative connotations.

He did not know her name, but he knew that she worked in the Fiction Department. Presumably—since he had sometimes seen her with oily hands and carrying a spanner—she had some mechanical job on one of the novel-writing-machines. She was a bold-looking girl, of about twenty-seven, with thick dark hair, a freckled face and swift, athletic movements. A narrow scarlet sash, emblem of the Junior Anti-Sex League, was wound several times round the waist of her overalls, just tightly enough to bring out the shapeliness of her hips. ... He disliked nearly all women, and especially the young and pretty ones (11-2).

Even though Orwell used the words "impressions", how women are depicted are misogynistic and two dimensional. Moreover, the mother figures in George Orwell's *1984* is mostly kind, yet passive. "Orwell's...portrayal of (mother figures) ...[is] admirable, moral, protective, but basically passive, or even merely helpless against the forces of society' (Eckstein 50). They have no insights- they are anticipated to only have children and do chores. "Orwell's denigration of women now increasingly consists of his portrayal of women (especially mother-figures) in an overtly very positive...light: admirable, moral, protective, but...passive or even merely helpless against the forces of society.'" (Eckstein 50). The perception of women in general in *1984*, viewed both by men and themselves, is that they are not regarded by males and viewed as not intelligent and easily controlled. Women are not



considered as intellectually equals to men. The idea of the woman as not more than a vessel for creating children and a body to work for the Party is not equally applied to men, who are presumably allowed to experience sexual pleasure without being accused of “sexcrime” (319). In Winston’s rejection of the authority of Big Brother, and his desire for Julia’s promiscuity almost as a separate being from her, he incidentally rejects the ingrained notion of patriarchy. It is arguable that his deference to Julia’s greater experience in the art of having affairs comes not only from his own lack of experience, but from a subconscious desire to invert the dominant man/submissive woman ideal that is so much a part of the Party’s control.

In order to be making a feminist statement, Orwell would have to at least change the light in which these gender roles are presented. Aardan explains that this is not the case. “All women in *1984* are represented as passive, not intelligent, and easy to manipulate.” (23). Orwell’s main character’s feelings toward women can be summed up with a direct quote, “it was always the women...who were the most bigoted adherents of the Party, the swallows of slogans, the amateur spies and nosers-out of unorthodoxy.” (Orwell 8). While this quote is striking about women in general, it is how Orwell’s protagonist describes a woman he is actually fond of that exposes Orwell’s failure to escape the backwards thinking of the day. According to the protagonist she is “a rebel from the waist downwards,” incapable of revolting for a greater cause and instead simple enough that she only understands her own needs that she can hopefully satisfy through revolt. (Orwell 122). According to Aardan, the weaker that women are the more justified Orwell’s characters seem to feel in treating them brutally (24). Again, the man is placed at the center of power. Women are placed in surrounding roles as tools to be utilized. As their inferior description suggests, it is for the man to decide how they should be best used.

Many feminist critics believe that this irrelevance of gender is one of the many ways in which the novel undermines women. Orwell has also come under attack for the novel’s portrayal of Julia in particular, and for its masculinism, in general. Daphne Patai, author of *The Orwell Mystique – A Study in Male Ideology* further describes this narrative. According to Patai, female readers of Orwell are often excluded from the narrative, with Orwell directly appealing to the type of person who would agree with his judgement of women as inferior (17). Orwell once even gave a book review that stated, “One of the surest signs of his genius is that women dislike his books” (18).

Specifically relating to *1984*, Patai writes, “Women figure in this paradigm primarily as a category of human beings in contrast to which men can experience a sense of centrality and superiority” (17). In that sense female figure in this worldview basically as a category of human creatures in differentiate to which men can involve a sense of centrality and prevalence. The very social order in *1984*, according to Patai, is one in which human beings are polarized based on sex roles and gender, further legitimizing and displaying male acts of dominance that further push women to the margins of society outside the confines of the novel (17). With Patai’s interpretation of the hidden messages present in *1984*, we see much of the previous discussion on hegemonic masculinity. Not only do we see where the center exists, but we see how it is perpetuated, who is pushed to the margins, and the effects that it has on both genders (as well as society as a whole). The author explains that his later novels get increasingly driven by despair. He argues that this is the result of the “considerable price” paid for an unquestioned adherence to the concept of manhood, recognizing that it takes a toll on both sexes in society (17).

In the ramifications of Party doctrine she had not the faintest interest. Whenever he began to talk of the principles of Ingsoc, doublethink... she became bored and confused and said she never paid any attention to that kind of thing... If he persisted in talking of such subjects, she had a disconcerting habit of falling asleep... Talking to her, he realized how easy it was to present and appearance of orthodoxy while having no grasp whatever of what orthodoxy meant... they simply swallowed everything, and what they swallowed did them no harm, because it left no residue behind, just as a grain of corn will pass undigested through the body of a bird (156).

The quote above is a clear example of Winston’s idea about Julia. Julia’s understanding of doublethink or Party doctrine is quite deficient. She lacks of interest in such manly issues and as a man, Winston is the authority who is definitely able to criticize her. Julia is portrayed as a highly little intellect woman and Winston did not like Julia initially. “He disliked nearly all women, and especially the young and pretty ones. It was always the women, and above all the young ones, who were the most bigoted adherents of the Party, the swallows of slogans, the amateur spies and nosers-out of unorthodoxy. But this particular girl gave him the impression of being more dangerous than most.” Another example can be where Winston feels bizarre after seeing a woman with makeup: “He had never before seen or imagined a woman of the Party with cosmetics on her face. The improvement in her face was startling” (164). A woman



wearing make-up is kind of interesting for Winston in such a society. He has never seen and even imagined such a thing before.

Furthermore, the sexism of the Party, and presumably Ingsoc as a whole, is apparent from that single sentence on the following: "The definition given of the Newspeak word 'goodsex' is normal intercourse between man and wife without physical pleasure on the part of the woman" (319). Thus, the idea of the woman as not more than a vessel for creating children and a body to work for the Party is not equally applied to men, who are presumably allowed to experience sexual pleasure without being accused of sexcrime. It is undoubtedly significant that Big Brother, who probably is only a tool of propaganda, is male. Would a Big Sister have the same power over the minds of the populace? It is possible, given the inescapable nature of Big Brother's face and name, that a Big Sister could be used instead, but the very fact that she does not displays something not only about the imagined society but about Orwell's own. All figures with power or representations of power are masculine. The Big Brother is the fundamental proof in the novel, exemplifying the fact that Orwell overlooked the presence of women as a whole.

Here one can clearly see the portrayal of Pornosec laborers including only women except the head the authority: "He learned with astonishment that all the workers in Pornosec, except the head of the department, were girls. The theory was that men, whose sex instincts were less controllable than those of women, were in greater danger of being corrupted by the filth they handled" (150). The other point needed to be highlighted here is classifying the genders' sexual inclinations. Women are portrayed like less demanding than men when it comes to sexuality. The following quotation is to strengthen the society's point of view on girls or women: "They do not even like having married women there", she added. 'Girls are always supposed to be so pure'" (151). Girls are always seen like angels, carrying angelic characteristics like being pure and sinless whereas women, who are married, are liable commit sin because they most probably had a sexual intercourse with their husbands. It can be distinctively understood from the quote below, the protagonist Winston sees women as figure who approve of any idea that is told by men: "A young woman who was perhaps his secretary, and who was sitting with her back to Winston, was listening to him and seemed to be eagerly agreeing with everything he said. From time to time Winston caught some such remark as 'I think you are so right. I do so agree with you', uttered in a youthful and rather silly feminine voice" (62). This shows us how Orwell portray women in the eye of a man.

George Orwell's novel, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, deals with a variety of controversial topics, specifically involving gender, gender roles, and the treatment of these sexual politics and gender relations. A variety of feminist critics, including Anne Mellor, Elaine Hoffman Baruch, and Daphne Patai, have argued that Orwell's portrayal of Julia is both stereotypical and patriarchal. While many of the critics focus their attention on the portrayal of Julia, it is important to keep in mind that there are other women in the novel who are subject to the patriarchal society. For example, the relationship between Mrs. Parsons and her son and daughter can be interpreted as patriarchal. The young daughter follows the lead of the son, and both are raised with the mindset to maintain the status quo of the Party. As Winston observes, the two are bound to start spying on their mother. "Another year, two years, and they would be watching her day and night for symptoms of unorthodoxy" (24). Winston continues by stating that the worst thing about organization like the Spies is that they systematically turn children into "ungovernable little savages, and yet this produced in them no tendency whatever to rebel against the discipline of the Party" (24). Winston finds himself thinking about Mrs. Parsons repeatedly. "Within two years those children would be denouncing her to the Thought Police. Mrs. Parsons would be vaporized" (61).

Other authors would argue that the anti-feminine attitude of Orwell is more present in what he leaves unsaid, rather than anything he explicitly states. Orwell left many things unsaid for women while he says many things in terms of the ones who leads power. As it is distinctively known by everyone that the one who carries power is always masculine while the one who seems powerless is feminine. The masculine is portrayed in depth in Orwell's novels even when they are controlled by a more powerful figure who is clearly another man called Big Brother whereas women are obscure and being ignored.

Jerilyn Fisher writes in *Women in Literature: Reading Through the Lens of Gender* that the female characters in *1984*, "are insufficiently fleshed out" (216). She explains that none of the female characters are well developed (216). While this does not explicitly speak to the idea that Orwell saw these characters as shallow or basic, the author notes that this brings greater importance to Orwell's other comments. Fisher notes that Orwell's comment on Julia being "only a rebel from the waist downward" serves to greatly marginalize her within the story, despite her background making her a key character (216). As someone who plays a unique role in the novel, Fisher explains that it is telling of Orwell's beliefs that he chooses to marginalize her rather than draw on the dynamic character she *could* have been. (217). Orwell instead makes her the subject of scorn, and significantly limits her narrative within the story. The result is that



Julia is relevant and important only as a result of her contrast/conflict in relation to Winston. Overall, it is Winston that lives out, speaks on, and provides the narrative on the situation with him and Julia. This again places the male character as the central role, not allowing for the female role to speak for herself or the reader to form their own opinion. Rather, the female role is described through the male character, or the male lens of society. The author notes, interestingly, that it is possible to imagine Julia as a “three-dimensional character,” although this is ultimately not the case (217). Constructions of masculinity and femininity are manipulated masterfully in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, often being used as symbols for larger issues in the text. The restrictive notions of the ideal masculine and feminine are subtly likened to the oppressive ideals of Ingsoc, and their subversion is more often an act of rebellion than weakness.

In order to prevent the very corruption, modern era causes, Orwell conveys that the individuals’ rebellion against this horrible risk is inevitable and that individuals must do away with the isolation of their rebellion (Kubal 135). This represents that individuals fall into a state of marginalization and isolation because of the hazards of the modern world. The existence of such dangers is emphasized at the end of the novel in a satirical and warning thematic treatment when O’Brien calls Smith in an apocalyptic tone “the last man” in order to make visible the destruction of human spirit. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, consecutively, Orwell produces a naturalistic novel in which rising complex structures are pointed out in the era of global risks of economic, social, and political crisis. Besides being a novel of a pace-maker in the era of global dangers, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* underlines boundless despair and depressions in human psychology as a response to the changing social and political matters (Deutscher 39).

## CONCLUSION

### Orwell's Works and Hegemonic Masculinity

Gender polarity exists as a difference in expectations for men and women that place them differently in society. Masculinity contrast sharply with femininity. Masculinity is best characterized by this appear differently in relation to gentility, with masculinity not continually requiring manly things, however continually requiring the evasion of female things. "The liberation of women must mean a loss of power for most men; and given the structuring of personality by power, also a great deal of personal pain" (Tim Carrigan, Bob Connell and John Lee 107). "It is, for example, a fundamental element of modern hegemonic masculinity that one sex (women) exist as potential sexual object, while the other sex (men) is negated as a sexual object" (109). Masculinity, then, is best characterized by this show up in an unexpected way in connection to social polish, with being masculine not ceaselessly requiring masculine things, but it may ceaselessly require the avoidance of feminine things. In fact, it is best defined by this contrast with femininity, with masculinity not always including masculine things, but always including the avoidance of the things that are related to females.

Hegemonic masculinity is the process of these gender poles aligning themselves in relation to the center of power of society. In this male-female dynamic that favors men, women are marginalized while men remain closely positioned to the center of power, which represents political and economic strength, as well as a favorable position for creating social norms to be favorable to you. I mean in this male-female unique that favors men, ladies are minimized while men remain intently situated to the focal point of intensity, which speaks to political and monetary quality, just as a great position for making social standards to be good to you. Despite the obvious advantage provided to men in this setup, hegemonic masculinity is toxic for society as a whole. The conspicuous favorable position given to men in this setup, hegemonic masculinity is harmful for every individual in society in a nutshell. Because hegemonic masculinity not only marginalizes women and puts unnecessary barriers up between them and societal advantages, it also places unrealistic expectations on men as the center of familial and societal life. It is important to remember that the negative connotations for men and women are significantly different, however. While women are marginalized in their ability to access the mainstream society, men's drawbacks come as negative consequences of being allocated



power. As women are minimized in their capacity to get to the standard society, men's disadvantages come as negative results of being allotted power.

George Orwell lived a fascinating and enlightened life. His interesting childhood, variety of worldly experiences, and sharp intellectual mind left us with a number of works that remain extremely relevant today. He is praised not only for his literary style, but also the themes he was able to discuss through this style. Many of these literary themes were ahead of his time, and were able to bring significant political and societal issues to the attention of the everyday reader.

Despite a significant degree of enlightenment, Orwell believed in (and played into) the superiority of men over women. He simply ignored female while he constantly highlighted the male characters in his works. His works provide a window into the way these thought patterns play out in day-to-day life, as well as how they have played out throughout history. The carelessness in which Orwell throws around stereotypes, assumes male superiority, and describes his characters makes his works great for examining feminist issues. These issues, however, are not evident due to a wish by Orwell to push their agenda. Rather, they are readily available due to Orwell's lack of sympathy for the feminist cause, and the ways in which he did not fully recognize the gravity of his statements. While the attitude of society towards men and women has not been completely changed, a positive can be seen in the fact that these issues are no longer so easily overlooked. Studying the works of Orwell serves the purpose of not only understanding what hegemonic masculinity looks like as a societal attitude, but also serves to understand how these attitudes have been societally accepted (to the point that they are not even thought of) and pushed in some of our most beloved works.

*Animal Farm* serves to show that Orwell did not necessarily have an anti-feminist agenda. Rather, Orwell's political statements simply ignored the feminine role in political and social development. While this theme was not always present, it still remains relevant in many of the things that Orwell left unsaid. It is possible to see Orwell less as an anti-feminist and more as a societal creation resulting from hegemonic masculinity. Orwell would be far from the most successful pusher of overly masculine ideals. When talking about the most masculine-pushing authors of all time, it is not clear that Orwell would be anywhere near making the list. What is clear, however, is that Orwell did not manage to escape the backwards thinking of his time. While he was ahead of his time on many political issues, he exemplifies the everyday thinking of his time when it comes to feminist issues. This thinking, while not being out of the ordinary for his time (or even now), is a result of a toxic way of viewing women in society. Not

only does it result from this toxic way of thinking, it serves to further support it. The only remaining question is the exact extent to which works of this nature *intended* to push this agenda, or to what extent they passively took place.

Men and women are in radically different positions to change the societal polarization of opposing genders. However, there is evidence to support that doing so would be in the best interest of society as a whole. It can even be argued, for some, that it would be in the best interest of men. Doing so requires a recognition of the existing problem, and a willingness across genders to work on solving it. If manhood could be proved, it had to be proved in the eyes of other men. From the early nineteenth century until the present day, most of men's relentless efforts to prove their manhood contains this core element of homosociality. From fathers and boyhood friends to our teachers, co-workers, and bosses, it is the evaluative eyes of other men that are always upon us, watching, judging. (*The Birth of Self-Made Man* Micheal Kimmel 141). Theories on masculinity have been homosocial rather than heterosocial, that is, focusing on the relations between men rather than on the relations between men and women. The most commonly used theories (e.g. Connell, 1995; Kimmel, 1994) in the field have, with few exceptions (e.g. Halberstam, 1998; Sedgwick, 1985) primarily focused on power and hierarchies between men, which has silenced women's voices and experiences in regards to doing masculinity (Fjelkestam, Hill, & Tjeder, 2013). In Orwell's works we see how misogynistic discourse is present in his characters and narration as well as his choice of words. Even though he made a huge impact in terms of criticizing totalitarian regimes and problems of his society, he failed to point out the structural oppression of women.



## Bibliography

Alakhunova, Niyara, et al. "Defining Marginalization: An Assessment Tool." May 2015.

Aardema, Jennifer. "The Not-Yet of Gender Equality: The Representation of Gender in Dystopian Literature." 2014.

Animal Farm website. December, 2018.

<https://animalfarmprojecthw.weebly.com/feminism.html>

Balswick, Jack O., and Charles W. Peek. "The Inexpressive Male: A Tragedy of American Society." *The Family Coordinator*, vol. 20, no. 4, Oct. 1971, pp. 363-68.

Bloom, Harold. *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations*. Infobase Publishing, 2009.

Connell, R.W. "The Men and The Boys." 2000.

Connell, R.W. "Studying Men and Masculinities." 2001.

Connell, R.W. "On Hegemonic Masculinity and Violence." 2002.

Connell, R. W. & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005), Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept, *Gender & Society*, number 19 (6), s. 829-859.

"George Orwell (1903 - 1950).", BBC, 2014,  
[www.bbc.co.uk/history/historic\\_figures/orwell\\_george.shtml](http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/historic_figures/orwell_george.shtml).

Halberstam, Judith. "An Introduction to Female Masculinity: Masculinity Without Men".

Horclacher, Stephen. Towards Comparative Masculinity Studies: On the Interdependence of National Identity and the Construction of Masculinity.

Howson, Richard. Challenging Hegemonic Masculinity. [Electronic Resource]. London; New York: Routledge, 2006., 2006. EBSCOhost, search.ebscohost.com.opac.bilgi.edu.tr/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat03166a&AN=bil.b2420248&site=eds-live.

Jackson, Peter. "Cultural Politics of Masculinity: Towards a Social Geography." Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, vol. 16, no. 2, 1991, pp. 199-213.

Kimmel, Micheal S. The History of Men: Essays in the History of American and British Masculinities. London: State U of New York, 2005.

KÖSEMAN, Z . "Psychoanalytical Outlook for Orwell's Coming Up for Air, Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty-Four". Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences 15 (2016): 867-880 <<http://dergipark.gov.tr/jss/issue/24216/256703?publisher=gantep>>

Lorber, Judith. "The Social Construction of Gender." The Inequality Reader: Contemporary and Foundational Readings in Race, Class, and Gender, edited by David B. Grusky and Szonja Szelenyi, 2nd ed., Routledge, 2018.

Martin, Carol L., et al. "The Development of Gender Stereotype Components." Child Development, vol. 61, no. 6, Dec. 1990.

McHugh, Susan. "Animal Farm's Lessons for Literary (and) Animal Studies." Humanimalia: a journal of human/animal interface studies, vol. 1, no. 1, Sept. 2009, pp. 24-39.

Merriam-Webster, 2018 Merriam-Webster, Incorporated, [www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hegemony](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hegemony).



Meyers, Jeffrey. George Orwell, Routledge, 2002. ProQuest Ebook Central, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/bilgi-ebooks/detail.action?docID=168702>. Created from bilgi-ebooks on 2019-01-17 07:07.

Meyers, Jeffrey. Orwell: Life and Art, University of Illinois Press, 2010. ProQuest E-book Central, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/bilgi-ebooks/detail.action?docID=3414108>. Created from bilgi-ebooks on 2019-01-20.

Norma, International Journal for Masculinity Studies, 2014. Vol 9, No 1, 1-4. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/18902138.2014.892267>

Orwell, George. "Coming up for Air." Penguin Classics, 2001. Print.

Orwell, George. "Animal Farm: A Fairy Story." New York, NY : Signet Classics, 1996. Print.

Orwell, George. "1984". London: Secker and Warburg, 1949. Print.

Parker, Kim, and Renee Stepler. Americans see men as the financial providers, even as women's contributions grow, Pew Research Center, 20 Sept. 2017, [www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/09/20/americans-see-men-as-the-financial-providers-even-as-womens-contributions-grow/](http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/09/20/americans-see-men-as-the-financial-providers-even-as-womens-contributions-grow/).

Patai, Daphne. The Orwell Mystique: A Study in Male Ideology. Amherst, The University of Massachusetts Press, 1984.

Reuben, Rebekah. Only a Rebel From the Waist Downwards, Critical & Creative Arts Publication, 8 Sept. 2015.

Smith, David G., et al. The Different Words We Use to Describe Male and Female Leaders, 25 May 2018, [hbr.org/2018/05/the-different-words-we-use-to-describe-male-and-female-leaders](http://hbr.org/2018/05/the-different-words-we-use-to-describe-male-and-female-leaders).

Social Exclusion and Marginalization, Institute of Development and Economic Alternatives,  
May 2015, [ideaspak.org/our-research/social-exclusion-and-marginalization](http://ideaspak.org/our-research/social-exclusion-and-marginalization).

Sociology: Hegemonic Masculinity. Web. December, 2019.

<http://sociology.iresearchnet.com/sociology-of-gender/hegemonic-masculinity/>

Stoltenberg, John, ed. Refusing to Be a Man: Essays on Sex and Justice. Revised ed. London:  
UCL, 2000.

Tim Carrigan, Bob Connell and John Lee. "Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity".

Witt, Susan D. "Parents Influence on Children's Socialization to Gender Roles." *Adolescence*,  
vol. 32, no. 126, 1997.

Woolner, David. African Americans and the New Deal: A Look Back in History, Roosevelt  
Institute, 5 Feb. 2010, [rooseveltinstitute.org/african-americans-and-new-deal-look-back-history/](http://rooseveltinstitute.org/african-americans-and-new-deal-look-back-history/).