

Chapter-One

General Introduction

The narrator, in *Green Hills of Africa*, is unwilling to come back to motherland, leaving the big game of hunting in Africa. This keen desire not to return to his motherland reveals his deep interest not only to exploit but also to subjugate the riches of Africa i.e. food, money, animals, people etc. He not only subjugates the African but also the animals, riches, properties, land etc. To subjugate the other countries Hemingway visits not the single country of Africa but also the different places of Africa e.g. Salt-lick area West Ward, Sable Country, Rift Valley, Lack Manyara and other. Even he wants to keep in touch with many countries of the world i.e. Turkey, Spain, France, Italy, Cuba, Russia and others. Regarding this vision of hegemony, Hemingway indirectly wants to keep his impression over those countries. While visiting Cuba, Hemingway presents the Cuban fisherboy not as defeated man but as an example of brave man. Narrating about Russia, he operates the reality of commune, Dostovosky and Russian Revolution.

It was the time when America was dominant in the world. The dominant position of America was equipped by the novels written in the period. And the 19th century writing helped to extend American imperial policy all over the world. Thus, Africa become the fertile location for celebrating the hegemony in intellectual, social and economic fields.

As a representative of American people, Hemingway wants to control the African riches, people, animals through hegemony by using his, friends, tricks and materials etc. Hegemonic control is there by Hemingway not using force but by influencing them, showing kindness in their activities. He wants to put a super social class achieves a dominant influence and power not by direct means but by succeeding

an ideology in which the subordinate class unwillingly accepts and participates in their oppression. So many examples of such activities are there in the book that prove his hegemonic ideas in the text. On the one hand, Hemingway keeps positive impact with African people and on the other, he writes and tells interesting stories with them while camping in many more places of Africa. He seems more diplomatic and more courageous with African people to subjugate them. All activities centered to him, with the help of his friends, are examples of hegemonic behaviour. Moreover, these African people are dominant group in the world. In this periphery the narrator wants to make them accept the hegemonic power.

About writer and his works

Ernest M. Hemingway was born in oak park, near Chicago, on July 21, 1899. He was the son of physician who initiated him into the rituals of hunting and fishing in the Michigan north woods. When Hemingway was a small child, his father used to take him out for hunting and preying in different parts of America. Psychologically, these basic activities guided him to take pleasure and to be happy in life by killing and hunting animals. Hemingway's compelling inspiration was war both as personal and symbolic experience as a continuing condition of mankind.

When he was grown up he was much tried exhausted with war. As an ambulance driver, he has seen so many facts of war that caused him to divert from America. During the last twenty years of his life, he started to publish many more creation, journal, adventure, hunting game and others. After working as a Kansas city reporter, he joined a volunteer ambulance unit in France, was seriously wounded in Italian front and then went to Toronto to write for the star journal. He was greatly influenced by naturalistic writers- Ezra Pound and Gertrude Stein, whose style

strongly affected him. Hemingway started to publish his creation in 1923 with "*Three stories and Ten Poems*". and "*In our times*" in 1925.

After Hemingway returned to New York, he wrote a novel called "*The Torrents of spring* in 1926." In the same year he also published another novel - *The Sun Also Rises* (1926). The main character and narrator of this creation Jack Barners lives in Paris with a group of American expatriates after the world war I. They move here and there enjoying, eating, drinking, brawling and love making. Jake is wounded in Italy in the war and sent to a hospital in Milan where he falls in love with Brett Ashley. They both moved to Paris and work there. They love each other but their love is impossible because of their paralised condition. Jack has hunted image of 'war, to forget it, he wants to move to Europe drinking. This novel depicts the atmosphere of the disillusionment of the World War I.

Greatly influenced by the war, he got success to potray the war events in the book "*A Farewell to Arms* (1929). It gives the vivid description of war and it ends in tragic love. The novel's narrator and protagonist is identified as Lieutenant Frederick Henry, an American who has volunteered for the Italian Army. He falls in love with a nurse of British Hospital - Catherine, and Henry's pathetic life depicts Hemingway's depth of human psyche. The novel shows love, despair and alienation of the wounded stoic narrator. This novel is famous for its tragic juxtaposition of love and war as well as the use of irony and symbolism.

He also published the collection of short stories, "*Men without women* (1927) and "*Winter Take Nothing* (1933)". Similarly, he wrote a literary book on 1932 called "*Death in the Afternoon*" an account of big game hunting "*Green Hills of Africa*" in 1935. Other considerable works by Hemingway are - *To Have and Have Not* (1937), *The fifth column* (1938) "*For Whom the Bell tolls* (1940), *Men and War* (1942), and

the masterpiece "*The Old man and the Sea*" in 1952, that recognized him as Noble Prize winner in 1954. The novel "*The Old Man and the Sea*" is an example of existential realism. He focuses on human struggle in the novel. The main issue raised over the novel is that human being can be destroyed but not defeated. A fisher boy struggles throughout his life in a sea just to catch the big fish. This novel published in 1952 played a crucial role in the development of Hemingway's critical reputation.

Among these great works, Hemingway wrote a very interesting and important book- *Green Hills of Africa* in 1935. It's an account of big-game hunting with degression on literary matters. That shows further cultivation of the primitive and brutal levels, contrasted with the hollow culture that had cheated the lost generation. This book is an expression of deep enjoyment and appreciation of being alive in Africa. It is the feeling of dew on the grass in the morning that shapes colour of the country and the companionship of friends. Returning from the love of the African continent and it's wildlife, Hemingway captures brilliantly the excitement of the hunter for big game. This book gives the description of a month Safari in the great game country of Africa. He also looks inward, seeking to explain the lure of the hunting and primal undercurrent of Africa. He was passionately involved with bullfighting, big-game hunting, sea-fishing and his writing reflected all this issues. His direct and deceptively simple style of writing is reflected in the text - *Green Hills of Africa*.

Literature Review

After the publication of Hemingway's *Green Hills of Africa*, in 1935 it has clearly drawn the attention of critics immediately. Many critics have offered divergent opinions regarding the text.

Robert E. Fleming writes, "a book of non-fiction concerning a blood sport. It is occasioned by an African Safari the author took with his second wife in 1933-34. In a brief the book is based on real people and actual events" (37).

Here, Robert E. Fleming commented that the book is just a description of non-fiction concerning an African safari by the author with his wife. It further hints at the reality of African people and events briefly. Further, Robert Fleming in "Africa Revisited" comments on Hemingway's *Green Hills of Africa* for the importance of memory in its creative process. He highlights Hemingway's memory and argues:

Green Hills of Africa should take its place in the Hemingway canon as the work which celebrates memory and which marks the crucial importance of memory for Hemingway in his creative process. If Hemingway's electro-shock treatments obliterated his memories obliterated all pictures, and if, as this pictures and memories were vital to his creative process, then indeed nothing would be left. (31)

Critic Harper finds this book as the fusion of "literary commentary and travel descriptions with metaphysics of big game hunting (11).

Harper, criticised this book as a fine literary commentary of travelling in Africa for big game hunting, metaphysically. Creating this book as literary work, he started to visit in remote area for big game hunting. That proves his keen desire of hegemony.

Another critic Strychacz, Thomas finds, *Green Hills of Africa* as a book, "with aesthetic principal expressed about his fiction in his works like *Death in the Afternoon*, where the young writer is depicted motion about the fact of Africa (15).

Strychacz, Thomas commented that it's a deep expression of fictional work with aesthetic principal where Hemingway depicts the reality of African emotion.

Thomas Strychacz in "Like Plums in Pudding" comments on the text for its monotonous narrative which mainly concerns a American writer's exploiting attitude towards African continent. He mentions:

[T]he fate of the continent the African in the presence of European Americans, where Hemingway seems to perform a similar sleight of hand by claiming to write the absolute truth about Africa while covertly consuming it. He as good as admits that Africa to him is little more than a raw materials out of which was to make the Humanity of one consequence upon the dehumanizing of the other. (40)

Here, he mainly focuses on Hemingway's dehumanizing act of exploiting the natives. He also supports the idea that Hemingway has shaped his novel with Africa raw materials.

James D. Hart criticized that the book is an account for big game hunting to cultivate that primitive and brutal African people who are known as lost generation in the world.

None of the critics, however, have analyzed it under the postcolonial traits regarding hegemony in the book. So, this research undertakes to analyze hegemonic motif of the narrator who keeps interest to hegemonize Africa by using soft and kind means. He influences them by showing positive attitude towards the African people. To hegemonize them, the narrator wants to enlarge the relationship with the Masia people. He befriends with them and encourages to guide on the way, in the forest, on the road and even in hunting area. Here, the narrator seems active to dominate these African people. He wants the native people to participate in his hunting game, eventhough they are not willing to do so. They were not greatly influenced by him.

As the issues of hypothesis at hand demands, hegemony is the theoretical tool to analyze the text. But in doing so, it won't cross the frontier of the textual research. It will be analyzed with the support of difference writers and critics from the domain concerned. The tentative chapters are divided into four sections whereas the first chapter of this research is about Ernest Hemingway and his writings along with his basic concerns of different issues. Similarly, the second chapter is about methodology to prove this research as the hypothesis demanded before. This is brief discussion about many elements related to postcolonial theory so far the hegemony which is the major concerned of this research. To hypothesize this issue, this dissertation will specify it by giving insights some conceptual ideas of Gramsci, Homi K Bhabha. By using theoretical tools of these theorists, this paper argues that how political, economic, geographical, social and intellectual hegemony is prevailing in the South African context. Likewise, Chapter third is about textual analysis focusing on hegemony and analyzing its social, intellectual political, geographical and economic base. Finally, chapter four will summarize the arguments put forward in the preceding chapters, with reference to the concept of hegemony in *Green Hill of Africa*.

Chapter-Two

Theoretical Tool

Study of Hegemony

Hegemony is a concept that has been used to describe and explain the domination of one social group over another. Such that the ruling group or hegemony acquires some degree of consent from the subordinate, as opposed to dominance purely by force. It is used broadly to mean all kinds of dominance, and narrowly to refer to specifically cultural and non-military dominance, as opposed to the related notions of empire and suzerainty. In international relations a hegemony may be defined as a power that can dictate the policies of all other power in its vicinity or one that is able to defeat any other power or combination of power that it might be at war with. The processes by which a dominant culture maintains its dominant position: for example, the use of institutions to formalize power, the employment of a bureaucracy to make power seem abstract, the inculcation of populace in the ideas of the hegemonic group through education, advertising, publication to subdue opposition.

Many researchers use the word 'hegemony' to explain how dominant groups or individual can maintain their power-the capacity of dominant classes to persuade subordinate ones to accept, adopt and internalize their values and norms. Antonio Gramsci devised one of the best known accounts of hegemony. He says hegemony consists of socio-political power that flows from enabling the 'Spontaneous consent' of populace through intellectual and moral leadership or authority as employed by the subalterns of the state. The power of hegemony is thus primarily through consent rather than armed force. Such conceptions are sometimes referred to 'cultural hegemony'. Moreover, Gramsci focused that a social class achieve a dominant influence and power direct means but by succeeding with ideology. Hegemony

compels people in subordinated position to accept and participate in their oppression system. Every social group, coming into existence on the original terrain of an essential function in the world of economic production, creates together with itself, organically, one or more intellectual which gives an awareness of its own function not in economic base but also social and political field.

Hegemony was a concept previously used by Marxists to indicate the political Leadership of the working -class in a democratic revolution but developed by Gramsci into an acute analysis to explain why the inevitable socialist revolution predicated by orthodox Marxism had not occurred by the early 20th century. Capitalism, Gramsci suggested, maintained control not just through violence, political and economic coercion but also ideologically, through a hegemonic culture in which the values of the bourgeoisie became the values of all. Thus a consensus culture developed in which people in the working-class identified their own identity with the identity of the bourgeoisie, and helped to maintain the status quo rather than revolting. The working-class needed to develop a culture of its own which would overthrow the notion that bourgeois values represented natural values for society and would attract the oppressed and intellectual classes to the causes of the proletariat. In Gramsci's view, any class that wishes to dominate in modern condition has to move beyond its own narrow interests, to exert intellectual and moral leadership and to make alliance and compromises with a variety of forces.

Regarding this, Gramsci calls it the union of social forces a historic bloc. This bloc forms the basic of consent to a certain social order, which produces and reproduces the hegemony of the dominant class through a institutions, social relations and ideas. In this manner, Gramsci developed a theory that emphasized the importance of superstructure in both maintaining and fracturing relations of the base.

Gramsci stated that the west cultural values were tied by Christian dogma and hegemonic culture is aimed at religious norms and values. For Gramsci, hegemonic dominance ultimately relied on coercion and in a crisis of authority the mask of consent slip away revealing the force.

In Hegemony and socialist strategy, Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe redefined hegemony as "discursive strategy of combining principles from different system of thought into one coherent ideology". Drawing on their ideas, critic Jennifer Daryl Slack's defines hegemony as "a process by which a hegemonic class articulates the interests of social group such that those groups actively 'consent' to their subordinated status". Perry Anderson argues: "hegemony refers to the class alliance of the proletariat with other exploited groups, above all the peasantry, in a common struggle against the oppression of capital".

Major Issues of Hegemony

Hegemony, the term comes under the post-colonial studies. However, hegemony does have many more dimensions. Among them social hegemony, political hegemony, intellectual hegemony, economic hegemony and geographical hegemony are its variations.

Regarding all these, geography of hegemony does not leave untouched. Henry Lefebvre in "The Production of Space" insists that space is not a passive locus of social relations and that space is trialectical. That space is comprised of mental space, social space and physical space. Hegemony can be read as a spatial process. Ancient hegemony developed in fertile river valleys: Egypt, China and the succession of states of Mesopotamia. In China, during the warring states Era these states created artificial waterways in order to give itself an advantage over its neighboring rival states. Hegemonic successor states in Eurasia tended to cluster around the middle east for a

period, using either the sea or the land. The focus of European hegemony moved west to Rome, then northwards to the Franks and the Holy Roman Empire. The Atlantic seaboard had its heyday (Spain, France, Britain) before the fringes of the European cultural area took over in the twentieth century especially on USA and Soviet Union.

Some regions show continually fluctuating areas of regional hegemony. India, Balkans, North China, Africa, East Asia and other regions show relative stability of hegemony. These long-lived hegemonies offer a contrast to shorter domination over the different territories of the world.

Social Hegemony

Social hegemony, according to Gramsci, has two major superstructural levels: the one that can be called "Civil Society" that is the ensemble of organisms commonly called 'Private' and that of political or the State Society. These two levels correspond on the one hand to the function of 'hegemony' which the dominant group exercises throughout society and on the other hand to that of direct domination. The functions are precisely organizational and connective. The intellectuals are the dominant group exercising the subaltern function of social hegemony. It comprises:

The 'spontaneous consent given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group through their intellectuals who act as their agent. This consent is historically caused by the prestige of which the dominant group enjoys because of its position and function in the world of production (12).

Here, it is clear that the special function of intellectuals (besides organizing domination for the bourgeoisie) is to organize the consent of the masses in support of the dominant class.

The function of organizing social hegemony and state domination certainly gives rise to a particular division of labour and to a whole hierarchy of qualification, in some of which there is no apparent functions. for example, in the social and state direction there exist a whole series of jobs of character. This jobs of characters verify social level which expanse social hegemony (13).

In this afore mentioned lines, Gramsci intends to say that this social hegemony which is the supremacy of social group manifests itself in two ways, one as domination and another as subjugation by force. A social group can and indeed must exercise leadership before winning the Power, it subsequently becomes dominant when it exercise power. However, every essential social group which emerses into history out of economic structure expresses the developed structure, who found their own categories seem indeed to represent historical categories even by the most complicated changes in the political and social form. The function of organizing social hegemony and domination certainly gives rise to the particular division of labor and it refers to a hierarchy of qualification. Thus, hegemony is related to the 'spontaneous consent' of the masses to the general direction used by the dominant social group. To acquire the social domination on state, the leader should exercise before attending the power. The same thing verify the following lines:

The methodological criterion on which our own study must be based is the following: that the supremacy of a social group manifests itself in two ways, as domintion and as moral leadership. A social group dominates antagonistic groups, which it tends to liquidate or to subjugate even by armed force. A social group can and indeed must already exercise 'leadership' before winning government power this indeed is one

of the principal condition for the winning of such influential power, it subsequently becomes dominant when it exercises power (57-8).

The normal exercise of hegemony on the classical terrain of the parliamentary system is nicely characterized by the combination of force and consent. Indeed, the attempt is always made to ensure that force will appear to be based on the consent of majority expressed by so-called public opinion. Here, Gramsci discusses the piedmont situation in which social groups emerged that wanted to dominate, but not to lead, he says this is not a situation of hegemony. It is not a case in which these groups have the function of domination without that of leadership, dictatorship without hegemony. The hegemony will be exercised by the part of the social group over the entire group.

Political Hegemony

After the social hegemony, Gramsci turns to talk about the political issues on hegemony. He says there are certain elements of politics. However, if they are repeated innumerable times, they become the pillars of politics.

The first element is that there really do exist rulers and ruled, leaders and led. The entire science and arts of politics are based on the primordial fact. The origins of the fact are a problem apart, which have to be studied separately but the fact remains that there do exist rulers and ruled, leaders and led. Given this fact, it will have to be considered how one can lead most effectively; hence how the leads may best be prepared, and how, on the other hand, one can know the lines of least resistance or the most rational lines along which to proceed if one wishes to secure the obedience of the led or ruled. In the formation of leaders, one premise is fundamental: is it the intention that the situation on which this division is no longer necessary? In other words, in the initial premises, the perpetual division of the human race, or the belief that this division is only an historical fact, corresponding to certain conditions. Yet it

most be clearly understood that the division between rulers and ruled thought in fact things they are also to be found within the group itself, even where it is socially hegemonous one. In a certain sense, it may be said that this division is created by the division of labor, is nearly the technical fact, in order to avoid the fundamental problem.

Since the division between rulers and ruled exists even with in the same group, certain principles have to be fixed upon and strictly observed. For it is in this area that the most serious 'Error' take place, and that the most criminal weakness and the hardest to correct are revealed. For the belief is common that obedience must be automatic, once it is a question of same group: that only the must but without any demonstration of necessity or rationality being needed but it must be unquestioning. Thus it is difficult to cure leaders completely or the conviction that thing will be done because the leader consider it just and reasonable that it should be done. Yet the common sense shows that the majority of collective political disaster occur because no attempt has been made to avoid useless sacrifice. Every one has heard officers from the front recount how the soldiers were quite ready to risk their lives when necessary, but how on the other hand they rebel when they saw over looked.

This principle extends to all actions demanding sacrifices. Hence, after every disaster, it is necessary first of all to enquire into the responsibility of the leaders, in the most literal sense, a front is made up of various sectors and each sector has its leaders. It is possible that the leaders of one sector are more responsible for a particular defeat than those of another.

The principle once posed that there are leaders and led, rulers and ruled, it is true that parties have up till now been the most effective way of developing leaders and leadership. Parties may present themselves under the most

diverse names even calling them anti-parties or the negation of the parties. In reality, even the so called 'individuals' are party men. (146)

Considering about the 'political party' Gramsci puts his arguments and says it has already been said that the protagonist of the new era could not in the modern age be an individual hero, but only the political parties. That is to say, at different time and in various internal relation of various nations, that determinate party which has the aim of finding new state, was rationally and historically created for that end. Although every political party is the expression of a social group and of one social group only, in certain condition certain political parties represent a single social group precisely in so far as they exercise balancing and arbitrating function between the interest of their group and other groups and succeed in securing the development of the group which they represent with consent. The formulae stating that it is not the head of state who is responsible for the actions of the government, but his ministers, are the casuistry behind which lies the general principal of the unity of state; the consent of governed to state action- whatever the current personnel of government and which ever party may be in power.

In strict sense, the political action is necessary for one to be able to speak of political party. It is observable that in the modern world, in many countries, the fundamental political parties have been compelled by the struggle or for other reasons to split into fraction which one calls itself 'a party' and even an 'independent party'. This idea can be studied with greater precision if one starts from the point of view that newspaper or review is 'a party' or 'fraction of party' or a 'function of party'. for the functions of such a party are no longer directly political but merely technical one of propaganda and public order. So, the political function is indirect. For, even if no other legal parties exist other parties in fact always do exist and other tendencies

which can't be legally good. In any case it is certain that in such parties cultural functions predominate, which means that political language becomes jargon. In other words, political questions are disguised as cultural ones, and as such become insoluble.

To write the history of political party, it is necessary in reality to confront a whole series of problems of less simple kind of believes. In what will the history of a party consists? How it comes into existence, the first groups which constitute it, the ideological controversies through which it program and its conception of the world and of life are formed. In such a case, one would merely have a history of certain intellectual groups or even sometimes the political biography of a single personality. The study, therefore, have be to a vaster and more comprehensive framework.

Gramsci puts three very important elements about the history of political parties. To know the history of political parties, it is necessary to develop the following lines of reasoning for a party to exist. These elements are-

1. A mass element: which is composed of ordinary, average men whose participant takes the form of discipline and loyalty rather than creative sprit. Without these things, party wouldn't exist. They are a force in so far a there is somebody to centralize, organize and discipline them. This is cohesive force.

2. The principal cohesive element: which centralizes nationally and renders effective and powerful a complex of force which left to themselves would count for nothing. This element is endowed with great cohesive, centralizing and disciplinary power.

3. An intermediate power: which articulates the first element with the second and maintain contact between them not physically but also morally and intellectually. In reality, for every party there exist fixed proportions between these three elements.

Similarly, talking about the political thought Gramsci says: A social group can , and indeed must already exercise 'leadership' be hegemonic before winning governmental power. Gramsci as great revolutionary Marxist thinker, concerned himself with the sphere of "civil society" and of "hegemony" in his prison writing can't be taken to indicate a neglect of the moment of political society, of force, of domination. On the contrary, his entire records show that this was not the case and that his constant thought was to avoid ethnical-political aspects of politics or theory hegemony and consent from the aspect of force. What is, however, true is that Gramsci didn't succeed in finding a single, satisfactory conception of 'civil society' or the state. The state is defined as 'political society' + 'civil society' and elsewhere again as a balance between political society and civil society. Gramsci stresses that in concrete reality, civil society and state are one and the same.

Regarding the same thought about political hegemony, Gramsci says in every country the political process is different but the context is same. And this very context is the crisis of ruling class hegemony, politically. That occurs either because the ruling class has failed in some major political undertaking or forcibly extracted the consent of broad masses or huge masses. In reality, this is precisely the crisis of hegemony or general crisis of the state.

Some Theoretical Aspects of Economics

Economics- theoretical movement for Free Trade, should be considered to what degree it derives originally from the philosophy of praxis and what degree from the economic doctrines of Free Trade in the last analysis from liberalism. It should be considered whether economic in its most developed form, is not a direct descendent of liberalism, having very little connection with this philosophy even in its origin and what connection it had only purely verbal.

The ideas of Free Trade movement are based on a theoretical error whose practical origin is not hard to identify; They are based on a distinction between political society and civil society which is made into and presented as an organic one. Thus it is asserted that economic activities are belong to civil society and the state must not intervene to regulate it. But in reality civil society and state is one and the same, it must be made clear that *laizzes faire* too is a form of state introduced by legislative means. It is a deliberate policy and automatic expression of economic facts. Gramsci says here we are dealing with subaltern group, which is prevented by this theory from ever become dominant or from developing beyond the economic corporate stage and rising to the phase of ethical-political hegemony in society and of domination in the state.

The altitude of economism towards expression of political and intellectual will, action or initiative is to say the least strange- as if these didn't emanate organically from economic necessities and indeed were not only expression of the economy. Thus it is incongruous that the concrete position of the problem of hegemony should be interpreted as a fact subordinating he group seeking hegemony. The fact of hegemony presupposes that account be taken of the inters and the tendencies of the group over which hegemony is to be exercised. In other words, the leading group should make sacrifice of an economic corporate kind. There is also no doubt that such sacrifices and such a compromise can't touch the essential; for though hegemony is ethical- political, it must also be economic, must necessarily be based on the decisive function exercised by the leading group in the nucleus economic activities.

Further, Gramscu argues about economic hegemony by bringing many more examples. The capitalist creats himself as industrial technician, specialist in politics. It

should be noted that the capitalist himself represent higher class social level and technical capacity. He must be an organizer of masses of mass, businessmen and customer of his production. If not all capitalists among them must have the capacity to be an organizer of society in general, to expand their own class; at least they must possess the capacity to choose the employees. However, every essential social class which emerges into history out of economic structure, should found own category. This category seemed indeed to represent the historical category even by the most complicated changes in political and social form.

Intellectual Hegemony

After talking more about social, political, economic hegemony, Gramsci turns to argue about intellectual hegemony, while distinguishing between intellectuals and non-intellectuals, one is referring in reality to the immediate social function. One has in mind the direction in which their specific activities are weighted. This means one can speak of intellectuals but not of non-intellectual because non-intellectual don't exist. There is no human activities from which each form of life can be excluded. Each man carries some form of intellectual, he might be a philosopher, an artist, as a man of test with consciousness.

Similarly, the relationship between intellectuals and the world production is not as direct as it is with the social group but is mediated by the whole society and by complex superstructure. What people can do is to fix two major superstructure i.e. levels of civil society and next is the private or that of political society or the state. These two levels correspond on the one hand about the function of hegemony which the dominant group exercise through society, on the other hand, the direct domination through the state. Intellectuals are dominant group exercising the function of social hegemony. It also clashes with preconception of cast. The function of organizing

social hegemony and domination certainly gives rise to the particular division of labor and hierarchy of qualification. Thus, hegemony is related to the spontaneous consent of masses used by the dominant social group.

Here, Gramsci presents intellectuals in two ways: organic intellectuals and traditional intellectuals. The central point remains the distinction between intellectuals as an organic category of ever fundamental social group and intellectuals as traditional category. It can be said that within its field the political party accomplishes its function more completely and organically than the state does within the large field. An intellectual who joins the political parties of a particular social group is merged with the organic intellectuals of the group itself.

One good phenomenon in USA is the formation of surprising number of negro intellectuals who absorb American culture. It is worth bearing in mind that indirect influence that negro intellectual could exercise on backward masses in Africa which clarifies that African blacks have been hegemonized by the black American intellectuals. To be specific when the ruler consent to be ruled that is hegemony. In the novel *Green hills of Africa* African negros are consenting the rules of America through domination.

American expansionism should use American negros as its agent in the conquest of African market and the extension of American civilization through domination. similarly, the struggle for the unification of the American people should intensify in such a way as to provoke a negro and the return to Africa the most energetic and independence intellectuals elements. Linguistically, English language become the educated language of Africa, bringing unity in the place of dialect. Intellectuals could have sufficient organizing capacity to give a national character. It seemed that American negros have a national and racial sprit which is negative rather

than positive; one which is the product of the struggle carried on by the whites in order to isolate them.

To sum up, Gramsci's hegemony consists of socio-political power that flows from enabling the 'spontaneous consent' of the populace through intellectual and moral leadership or authority as employed by the subalterns of the state. The power hegemony is thus primarily through consent rather than armed force. To clarify this, the analysis of hegemony (rule) was formulated by Antonio Gramsci to explain why the revolutions had not occurred where they were most expected. Further, the working class to overthrow capitalism in a revolution restructure the economic, political, social and rational models, began to go ahead for communist societies. In Marxian terms, the dialectically changing economic base of society would determine the cultural and political superstructure. Gramsci argued that the failure of the workers to make an anti-capitalist revolution was due to the successful of capture of the workers ideology, self- understanding and organizations by the hegemonic culture.

Gramsci didn't contend that hegemony was either monolithic or unified. Instead, hegemony was portrayed as a complex layering of social structure. Each of the structure has its 'mission' and members to behave in a way that is different from those in different structure. Hegemony works in a same manner. In the same way each person lives his/her life in a way that is meaningful in the setting in which each person exists and to this person, the different part of society may seem to have little in common with him. Yet taken as a whole, each person's life also contributes to a larger hegemony of society. So, political, social, intellectual, economic hegemony is there in the text *Green Hills of Africa*. The next chapter will analyze it in detail in light of the issue of these hegemony.

Chapter-Three

Textual Analysis

Hegemony in *Green Hills of Africa*

Hegemony is a concept that has been used to describe and explain the dominance of one social group over another, such that the ruling groups acquires some degree of consent from the subordinate, as opposed to dominance purely by force. And the term 'hegemony' is used broadly to mean any kind of dominance. In the same way, Gramsci says hegemony consists of socio-political power that flows from enabling the 'consent' through intellectual and moral leadership by the subordinate of the state.

The book *Green Hills of Africa* invites us to believe that "[U]nlike many novels, none of the characters or incident in this book is imaginary" and that the "writer has attempted to write an absolutely true book." In these lines the true sense is that this book is based on the reality of Africa and its domination. And the device of hunting has structured the novel *Green Hills of Africa* reflecting African reality, people, culture, geographical situation, socio-economic bases of it. In this sense, Hemingway has made this novel a representation in which he tries to find 'real thing' of Africa by promoting big -game hunting.

As a narrator, Hemingway begins this novel with the memory that they "were sitting in the blind hunters area at the edge of salt-lick than the theatrical one of the two trackers stood up" (2). Hemingway divides the hunter group as 'we' and 'they'. We "means the American hunters group whereas 'they' means the dominated native group. The narrator intends to establish the superiority of American over the marginal group of Africa. His superiority reaches in high intensity when his other friends refer Hemingway as a colonel and says, "we use this military title as nick name. No offense

if you're a colonel yourself" (9). It clearly shows that the Americans people always desire to be recognized as superior and like to keep other under their domination. So, here Hemingway and Pop have become dominant in the text who have great intensity to hegemonise other:

... M' Cola to pour water into it from the canteen, drinking this, the first one of the day, the finest one there is, an looking at the thick bush we passed in the dark, feeling the cal wind of the night and smelling the good smell of Africa, I was altogether happy. I with Kamau standing before an unhooded engine in a crows of natives. (5)

With this notion, the westerners always think and feel good even in dark and cold wind at night. Using these ideas, the narrator dominates and proves his hegemonic nature. He further clarifies that there is co-operative relation with the natives that shows friendship relation but of power, of domination of varying degree of complex hegemony. Hegemony is the power of the ruling class to convince other classes that their interest is the interest of all.

That good smell of Africa and happiness living there gives the sense of hegemonising manner quoting this line, the narrator wants to be happy living in Africa not only his friends but also the natives support his interval motif of hegemony:

With my wife. We would be delighted. Yes, a white hunter.

Why is he not out with you ?

He believes you should hunt kudu alone.

It is better not to hunt them at all. what is he ? English ?

Yes.

Bloody English ? (7)

The text in this context becomes more powerful because the narrator being English himself hates the white and call them bloody people. He is not ready to be an English man; hates originality and desires to befriend African reflects the hegemonic motif. Hunting in Africa - Kudu, is good but being with English hunter is non sense to him. That dominant intention of the narrator to be African encourages native to be happy living in Africa.

Well, I said, we have had in America, skillful writers. Poe is a skillful writer. [...] Emesson, Hawthorne. Henry James, Stephenson Crane, Mark Twain. All modern American writers come from one book by Mark Twain called Huckleberry Finn. But it's the best book we've had. All American writers comes from that. There was nothing before. There had been nothing as good since. (13-14)

Significantly, the westerners writing reveals the good images of western, representation and depiction of literary history. Gramsci does not distinguish between intellectual and non-intellectuals. For him, non-intellectuals do not exist. Each man carries some form of intellectual idea be it a philosopher, an artist, a man of interest with consciousness. But the narrator, had a different notion of intellectuality who takes American people and writers as intellectual and African people as non-intellectuals. The narrator who is living in Africa and talking about American contemporary writers, reveals that westerners are in center and non westerners are in the margin. The writers and the text in this context becomes more powerful because language used to produce the text reflects the American domination by consent to other world people, such text or discourses produce the knowledge that helps to hegemonize other texts as well as people.

... still. I love my country very much. I have lost everything here but I have more than anyone has in Europe. To me it is always interesting. The native and the language. I have many books of notes on them. Then too, in reality, I am a king here. It is very pleasant. (21)

While dominating the African natives, the narrator feels more comfortable. Living in Africa and hunting there, the narrator feels more comfortable. Hence, he is American, though, he feels pleasant to be there in Africa. He feels so good there by accumulating the natives, wants to talk more with them. Not only that he wants to live there and wants to show true love to the land (Africa). While hegemonizing other, he says that the powerful group can collect the sense of superiority to dominate the natives. This domination led them to come under social hegemony. The fact that African landscape, animals, birds and language provides the source of pleasure to him, reflects complex hegemonic motif. The images and symbols used by the narrator are made for the purpose of degenerating and demoralizing the African. The symbol and images created by themselves are used upon the marginal group which represents westerns as educated, civilized and moral. That influenced the African people to be so. Thus, the referential ideas reveals the economic hegemony. The relationship, which the narrator calls "I am a king here". of king and people is the relationship of power, of domination, of varying degree of complex hegemony regarding economic, social and intellectual field.

The afternoon of the day we came into the country we walked five miles from camp. [...] It was a green, pleasant country, with hills below the forest that grew thick on the side of mountain and it was cut by the valleys of several watercourse that came down out of the thick time on the mountain. If you looked away from the mountain side you

could follow the watercourse and the hill slope and the land flattened and the grass was brown and burned away, across a long sweep of country, was the brown Rift Valley and the shine of Lake Manyara.

(34)

Hemingway, leaves some position influence upon natives positively. This description helps to understand that American with the domination of physical space or geography, reforming the native minds and intriguing local history put positive influence and good thought of American to African. Not only in single camp, but also many more places from Rift vally to Lake Manyara and other all over this territory, the narrator operates his hegemonic attitude, nicely beautifying the land itself. Not only in camp area with friends but also in different parts of Africa, the narrator wants to overpower the native's attitude towards him, that broadens the degree of geographical as well as social hegemony.

He had not seen war but he had seen a revolution and the commune and the revolution is the most best if you don't biogated because everyone speaks the same language. Just as civil war is the best war for writers, the most complete. [...] Dostovsky was made by being sent to Siberia. Writers are forged in injustic as a sward is forged. (48)

These lines connect with Edward Said's "notion of discourse". Discourse involves three things - representation, truth and power. Power, creates the truth since westerners are in power they create truth in binary opposition i.e. peace - war which ultimately becomes truth. This above quoted lines, brings war contest and civil war which is important to the writer because they elaborated the meaning of war in relation to power. So power which comes under the concept of orient also comes under the hegemony. Horrifying others by the war result influenced negatively to the

natives African. To be very far from war, Hemingway wants to give negative sense about other and positive about Africa. Negative sense of war sometime leads them in peace. Regarding this issue, war hegemonizes the African natives and leads them far from it. Forwards the hegemonic examples which the narrator calls political hegemony.

All I wanted to do now was get back to Africa. We had not left it, yet, but when I would wake in the night I would lie, listening, homesick for it already. I love the country so that I was happy as you are after you have been with a woman that you really love. [49]

Here, Hemingway presents his plan of domination to Africa. He says he wanted to come back to Africa. Even in night when he is in rest condition, wants to listen the same sound -Africa. He furthermore, operates that he loves the country as a man really loves his wife. To verify this ideas, Hemingway expresses the following lines:

But you are not alone, because if you have ever really loved her happy and tragic, she loves you always; nor where she goes she loves you more. So, if you loved some woman and some country you are very fortunate and if you die afterwards it makes no different. Now, being in Africa, I was hungry for more of it, the changes of the seasons, the rains, the names of the trees, of the small birds, of all animals, to know the language and have time to be it and to move slowly. I had loved country all my life; the country was always better than the people. I would only care about people a very few at a time. (49)

These lines operate his reality of hegemony. Though Hemingway himself is American but he loves the African natives. He says I am hungry for the African seasons, about the rains, with the names of tree. He seems eager to love the bird, to know about all

animals, to know about the language. Further, he expresses his domination by saying he loved the country all his life which is better place for him, truly presents his way of enlarging the domination.

Giving hegemonic vision of westerners in specific terms; the narrator opens his reality as an intellectual persona. Focusing hegemonic modes of thought, he Says that he wants to get back to Africa. This essentially Foucauldian understanding of thought is an intellectual fact that gives way almost in much contemporary post colonial theory. Then, Hemingway appreciates the African continent as happy land where he could play big-game hunting, alluding to the relation between husband and wife. It clarifies that Hemingway loves Africa as much as a husband does to his wife. That vision impresses African natives to keep relation with the narrator which indirectly dominates them. Hemingway not only keeps social hegemonic relation with the people but also reveals the natural love relation with tree, birds, animals, seasons, rains, language etc. That represents his desire for hegemony over the world and its phenomenon. He says, "being in Africa, he feels hungry for all living and non-living things, proves his hegemony in economic base. 'Hungry' the word operates his interest to hegemonies the African land and its all riches (birds, seasons, trees, animals etc.)

Hemingway recalls, 'I had loved country life all my life; the country was better than the people. These core ideas of this novel represents Hemingway's hegemonic vision not only over the African people but also over the whole world. He only cares about the land, when the land is hegemonies under the post-colonial concept, then the people (natives) are hegemonies automatically. These lines are clearly attached with the vision of Eurocentrism with western world. The narrator says, 'when I have time to be in it and then I will move slowly. These very dominant lines "I will move slowly", further, operates his future hegemonic plan not only in Africa but also over

the whole world, comes under the sense of universal hegemony. So, the Europeans handle their domination in the projects of studying Africa People. The Europeans devalued, demoralized and even brutalized the African for their inferiority. This European way of hegemonizing the African people and riches supports the domination.

The term 'hegemony' which comes under the broad theoretical ideas of postcolonial theory involves discussion about experience of various kinds: migration, slavery, suppression, resistance, representation, difference, race, gender, place and response to the influential master discourse of imperial Europe in history, philosophy, linguistic and fundamental experience of speaking and writing by which that all comes into being. Essentially, postcolonial traits forms the complex degree of hegemony by making other, representative. Hemingway as a narrator and representative character, modifies the African natives vision to westerns by the issue - hegemony using positively.

'It's as good chance as any for ...' Pop said.

'By god, isn't it a great looking country ?' I said 'Spendid' Pop said.

'who would ... it ?'

Look at the green. It's Mason. Why cannot a good painter see this country ? (64)

On the project of big-game hunting, Hemingway with his friend pop, beautifies the African land and appreciates it as really great and beautiful country. These lines help Hemingway to uplift his intention of hegemony in local level. They said not only the American but also the greatest painters of the world can see the forest, tree, land itself. In this way, Hemingway indirectly influences the African citizens through the appreciation of Africa and its landscape.

While hunting in Africa, Hemingway becomes more conscious about belongingness and accordingly maintains his supremacy by distancing himself from a distance in relation with the natives and his group of people. He creates a relationship with the natives which is profoundly hegemonic in the sense that it informs the construction of American self accurately measurable against the African. In hunting process, he uses the modern mechanical tools like camera, rifle, binocular and gun which stand for American technological power that represents the authority and power. Hemingway's mission of hunting has become the source of his research of Africa which functions by dominating and controlling other; really reflects the economic hegemony. Hunting which is the main concern in this novel, when there is not hunting, there is no meaning of life to Hemingway. He wants to control the natives not by pressure or force but by giving pleasure, providing food, kindness, good relationship, money, other riches etc. Visiting not only in one specific area of Africa but also from camp to camp, from one country to another area, Rift valley etc. represents his hegemonic mission all over the continent - Africa.

Killing very big animals - big kudu, big bull, big lion etc. he thinks is more adventurous deed. When he kills a big rhino, he appreciates it because the rhino was two times bigger than usual. Seeing this very big rhino, Hemingway calls it "The Dream Rhino". so, to attach the natives emotionally with him, he wants to do great deeds or adventure that led them to come under the grip of the narrator - specifically under economic hegemony. When he kills big animals in Africa he appreciates it as good country; when he cannot get any animals to hunt than he himself curses as bad man and the Africa as bad or bloody place. This reality reflects his inner intention of hegemony. The same things support the following lines - 'For a long time we drove to

sun rise area in east, when I asked him what the country was like to the south, as a million miles of bloody Africa." (107)

'I'd like to try to write something about the country and the animals and what it's like to some one who knows nothing about Africa'. (132) These lines connect, especially, with the Antonio Gramsci's vision about intellectual. The narrator wants to befriend natives by visiting Africa. For Gramsci, universally there are two types of intellectuals: organic intellectuals Vs: traditional intellectual. Organic intellectual are the expert and specialist whereas the teachers, philosophers and others are the traditional type of intellectuals. Hemingway, wants to beautify the Africa by writing. Writing about specific area in beautiful language, where the natives are living, leads them to intellectual domination.

Hemingway with his friends seems entering in the next new village which he says "we were entering a country the loveliest that I had seen in Africa. It was a country to wake from, happy to have had the dream "... (148-149)'. It was Masai village which Hemingway calls virgin country, an unhaunted area, fine country. (150) And the people are called "good Masai". Here, addressing the natives as good country and good Masai brings the inner diplomatic ideas of domination by Hemingway. African natives can't say that Africa is good country but American called it good country and good people because they are intellectual in Gramsci's term and Masai/natives are non-intellectuals on the one hand, natives are victimized and on the other they are dominated. sometimes, he calls them 'good people' and sometimes savage, bastard, the son of bitch, hell, bloody people etc. This conflicting vision, which Hemingway frequently uses, tries to dominate the natives and inferiorize them.

In this book *Green Hills of Africa*, the natives also show resistance against Hemingway's brutal act of hunting in African forest. He says, "they come up to the car

and surround it, all laughing, smiling, talking" (150) It shows that the natives in the 19th century could not resist verbally with Western people, who are under the cultural hegemony. They could resist by physical gesture - laughing, and smiling. When Hemingway can not understand the natives who are laughing, smiling and talking to each other, he asks M' Cola about it. Instead, M' Cola nods his head empathetically "Good good Masai" (151) Implicitly, this statement supports the natives who are resisting Hemingway's hegemony. Natives always obey Hemingway so, they call him 'big - brother'.

However, scholars in postcolonial studies have tended to situate Eurocentrism in epistemic terms as an intellectual atmosphere or hegemonic modes of conceptualization. This essentially Foucauldian understanding of Eurocentrism as an intellectual atmosphere that gives way almost inevitably in much contemporary post colonial theory to a further proposition of western thought. Hemingway says, "After that the Roman and I had a long talk in which I spoke Spanish [...] entire campaign for the next day." (166) In this context, Hemingway keeps the relation both with African and Roman people. This is an example of using authority upon not only the Africans but also the non-African. Linguistic hegemony is there because the narrator does have the capacity to speak different languages which inspires the native to be his friends and mimic what he does.

"I was thinking all the country in the world is the same country and all hunters are the same people" (170). He narrates that everywhere the world and the people are same. Westerners are in power and they think others are powerless. Colonizing other draws the same attitude to American. Hemingway, in the last chapter, led by Roman brother and Masai people, kills many more animals in different villages. He keeps friendly relation with natives, especially, Masai. He is led by an old Masai to fertile

hunting land. Natives have already been controlled by the narrator. Thus, all the natives are ready to do what he desires them to do.

Hemingway's hunting project ends with the Masai in corn field area. While coming back, Hemingway gets ready to go. And he says, "we were all packed now and ready to go." (188) When they were ready for coming back at the same time the natives and Masai (the old man) fully supported him and even followed. Garrick and Hemingway say that they are hurt and begin to feel sorry for the poor, bloody, useless, the theatrical. He, further, says that they were going through deer-park looking country now". (189). Returning with friends Hemingway reveals the reality that is "there would be another country where a man could live and hunt if he had time to live and hunt." (192). "Another country" represents the narrator's desire not only to hegenonize the Africa but also to control the other countries and do the same things. He says, "I love this country and I felt at home and where a man feels at home" (192)

Hemingway gives message to natives that he loves Africa as his home country. This idea of Hemingway really reveals his hegemony in Africa.

It is easier to keep well in a good country by taking simple precautions than to pretend that a country which is finished is still good. [...] A continent ages quickly once we come, the native live in harmony with it. But foreigners destroys, cuts down the tree and every things destroys. At I had seen it start to blow Canada. The east gets tried of being exploited (193)

While leaving this continent, the narrator dominates it by saying that this country is still good. But other people are destroying it carelessly; cut down the tree, water drained, soil is sad etc. This seemingly pious vision about the Africa leads African to accept his ideas; that recalls geographical hegemony.

I would come back to Africa but not make a living from it. I could do that with two pencils and a few hundred sheet of cheap paper. But I would come back to where it pleased me to live; to really live. Our people went to America because that has the place to go then. It had been a good country and we had made a bloody mess of it and I would go, now, somewhere else as we had always had the right to go. You would always come back. Now I would go somewhere else. We always went in the old days and there were still good place to go" (193).

Regarding the above lines, the narrator says that he would come back to Africa not to live but to rule with intellectual power. He would come back to Africa which pleased him to live, really live. Many people who went to America have made it bloody. So, Hemingway is not ready to back to his home country but somewhere else. He is in the quest of good and comfortable country which is still good. The recurring arguments elaborate his desire to hegemonize not only Africa but the whole globe.

Moreover, he remarks that he can "do it with two pencil and paper" hints his intellectual power that led Africa under the grip of domination. Africa has already been hegemonized and he wants to go in other countries to spread the seeds of hegemony. This diplomatic vision of the narrator reveals the sense of hegemony globally.

Similarly, bringing the hegemonic issue in this book *Green Hills of Africa*, the narrator, says:

I knew a good country when I saw one. Here there was game, plenty of birds, and I liked the natives. Here I could shoot and fish. That, and reading, and writing, and seeing. Pictures was all I cared about doing.

And I could remember all these pictures. Other things I liked to watch but they were what I liked to do (194)

In these quoted lines, the narrator says that he knew the country which is good. When he saw the country, there he found game, birds and natives. The very good lines here is that he liked the natives. This point raised the love relation between the narrator and the natives. In true sense, this love relation is not really love relation but it is the idea of domination to Africans. The country in which he feels good. Shooting, fishing, reading, writing, seeing pictures of African landscape, remembering Africans natives and so on are the proper examples of domination. While living in African land, Hemingway feels more comfortable. Hunting wild animals, fishing, observing African landscape, writing more and more about Africa are some means to reflect his true image in front of native-that broadens his influence through domination.

This domination narrator argues that he wants to see 'other things'. 'Other things' means all the things of Africa. Here, he wants to operate his real intention and attitude to Africa. This attitude co-operates with universal hegemony. He wants to use every thing of Africa. Loving birds, keeping friendly relation with natives, seeing picture of the country denotes his sense of hegemony. To clarify the hegemonic motif, the narrator speaks the following lines:

There were the young warriors who had run with us, and now there women and the children all come out to see us, [...] these all people seemed to be our great friends and we gave a very successful party with refreshments in the shape of our bread which they all ate with much laughing. (194)

These lines also reveal the same issue which is the major concern in this novel. He says that not only the warriors but all the natives; men as well as women and children

are ready to befriend with the narrator's group also. 'All came out to see us' means native are the integral part of the hunter's group. He says all natives seemed to be their great friends. Here the word 'great' refers to be an unseperable organ of American people. That falls under the concept of social hegemony. Eating foods with natives, laughing with each other in party show the intimate relationship with each other. This relationship is an example of domination which comes under social hegemony. The narrator says:

... watching the country, saw, suddenly, all the trees were full of white storks. I did not know whether they were in the twilight, they were lovely to see and deeply moved by us. I gave the old man a good two fingers of beer that was left in the bottom of the bottle. (195)

Here, the narrator operates his love towards the natives. He says that they were lovely to see and deeply moved by us. It means the natives were moved by the hunter's group. Moreover, the narrator says that he provides some bottle of beer, food, and other things. Providing such things to natives by the narrator shows his domination. This domination leads African to economic hegemony, indirectly.

Similarly, he points out some important lines from the text and says: "the women were into ecstasy, the children into panic, and the warriors into delight ... even they seem looking after us and smiling' (145). This diverse situation also gives the sense of domination. On the one hand there natives were in ecstasy and pain and on the other they were smiling in front of them. African people smiling with American in the course of separation proves domination. The domination comes under social hegemony.

Summing up, Hemingway in the book *Green Hills of Africa*, uses the idea of hegemony in different layers-social, political, geographical, intellectual etc. Social

hegemony is there in the book when he visits in different part of continent, keeps social relation with African people influencing them. he does so not by using force but by keeping friendly relation. He puts positive impact of his own with them in course of big game hunting there. Similarly, political hegemony can be seen in the book in different cases i.e. by providing an ideology, Hemingway carries them under his grip. He wants to establish superior position in front of natives people, ideologically. Indirectly, he wants to rule them as ruler. Further, intellectual hegemony is prevalent in the text. By providing the value of English writers and their position, in the literature, Hemingway attacks them to follow their track. This is an example of intellectual hegemony. Hemingway, as a narrator, visits many more places of Africa to carry them under his influence. While hunting in this land, he wants to visit all the area of the continent-shows his geographical hegemony. Not only this, Hemingway, wants to get the riches land, animal of Africa. So, this all examples proves true economic hegemony in the book *Green Hills of Africa*.

Chapter-Four

Conclusion

'Hegemony' is a term mostly employed and debated in postcolonial studies. In general, hegemony refers to central order by one country, people, organization over other country within particular group. Gramsci says, in hegemony, a social class achieves a dominant influence and power not by direct means but by succeeding making it an ideology in which the subordinated groups unwillingly accept and participate in their won oppression.

Hemingway's *Green Hills of Africa* is a hunting memory of being in Africa. It reflects the reality of African people, their identity, geography and socio-political condition of them. Hemingway consciously manipulates many aspects from his perspective and recollects to make his own domination. In this novel, Hemingway is unwilling to come back to his motherland, leaving big game hunting in Africa. This keen desire not to return to his homeland reveals his deep interest to dominate and to subjugate the riches of Africa. The narrator, Hemingway, is ready not only to subjugate the African but also the things of many more countries through hegemony. As an American representative, he wants to control the African riches, people (native), animals through hegemony. Friends and African natives, especially Masai, had already been controlled by his intellectual hegemony. Hemingway exercises his hegemony by consent and showing kindness in his activities and behaviour. Here, the narrator wants to put that socially superior class achieve a dominant influence and power not by direct means but by succeeding ideology in which the subordinate group/class willingly accepts and participate in their oppression. So many examples of hegemonic motif are there in the novel - *Green Hills of Africa*.

To prove this, Hemingway furnishes his ideas with certain techniques - symbols and images. Hemingway describes about native with his friends M' Cola and Droopy. While commenting about natives, Hemingway uses the words such as savage, bastard, uncivilized, bloody, son of a bitch and so on. When the natives are judged according to their colour, personality, social prestige and physical structure, it takes a permanent form of domination and subjugation. Hemingway always represents the native with some derogation. While hunting in Africa, Hemingway seems more conscious about his supermacy. So, his mission of hunting has become the source of dominating and controlling the 'other' - African as well.

In the literary conversation with Kindisky, Hemingway highly values his own literary works and clarifies that he knows that truth about Africa which is superb example of authentic authority to put foreword the domination in Africa. Gramsci says that in intellectual hegemony, intellectuals exist whereas non-intellectuals follow them. Here, as an intellectual the narrates narrators the success stories of great American writers and their works but Africans can only hear about them. Hemingway equates African geography with a hunting place. He refers to Africa as a bush country, a bloody area, kudu area etc. Such saying implicitly manipulate 'domination. These above mentioned ideas support the intellectual and geographical hegemony in the novel.

Along with his hunting mission, Hemingway starts measuring the native's social history. He directly comments on M' Cola that Africans are the men without history. So, this method of historicizing the native is Hemingway's desire of creating a western history to embody the native within it. But the history Hemingway creates to replace the natives is made by power relation which Gramsci calls social hegemony. Again, Hemingway explores the psyche of natives in the African land. He mentions

that he would again return to African continent with two pencils and a few hundred sheets of cheap paper to write about land. The desire of bringing pencil and paper shows his unquenchable intention of hegemonizing the Africa. The way of representing Africa, politically, geographically, socially by the narrator seems hegemonious. So, the novel *Green Hills of Africa*, by Hemingway is really the study of hegemony.

Hegemony as Theoretical Tool in Hemingway's Green Hills of Africa

Hegemony is a concept that has been used to describe and explain the domination of one social group over another. Such that the ruling group or hegemon acquires some degree of consent from the subordinate, as opposed to dominance purely by force. It is used broadly to mean all kinds of dominance, and narrowly to refer to specifically cultural and non-military dominance, as opposed to the related notions of empire and suzerainty. In international relations a hegemony may be defined as a power that can dictate the policies of all other power in its vicinity or one that is able to defeat any other power or combination of power that it might be at war with. The processes by which a dominant culture maintains its dominant position: for example, the use of institutions to formalize power, the employment of a bureaucracy to make power seem abstract, the inculcation of populace in the ideas of the hegemonic group through education, advertising, publication to subdue opposition.

Many researchers use the word 'hegemony' to explain how dominant groups or individual can maintain their power-the capacity of dominant classes to persuade subordinate ones to accept, adopt and internalize their values and norms. Antonio Gramsci devised one of the best known accounts of hegemony. According to him, hegemony consists of socio-political power that flows from enabling the 'Spontaneous consent' of populace through intellectual and moral leadership or authority as employed by the subalterns of the state. The power of hegemony is thus primarily through consent rather than armed force. Such conceptions are sometimes referred to 'cultural hegemony'. Moreover, Gramsci focused that a social class achieve a dominant influence and power direct means but by succeeding with ideology. Hegemony compels people in subordinated position to accept and participate in their

oppression system. Every social group, coming into existence on the original terrain of an essential function in the world of economic production, creates together with itself, organically, one or more intellectual which gives an awareness of its own function not in economic base but also social and political field.

Hegemony was a concept previously used by Marxists to indicate the political Leadership of the working -class in a democratic revolution but developed by Gramsci into an acute analysis to explain why the inevitable socialist revolution predicated by orthodox Marxism had not occurred by the early 20th century. Capitalism, Gramsci suggested, maintained control not just through violence, political and economic coercion but also ideologically, through a hegemonic culture in which the values of the bourgeoisie became the values of all. Thus a consensus culture developed in which people in the working-class identified their own identity with the identity of the bourgeoisie, and helped to maintain the status quo rather than revolting. The working-class needed to develop a culture of its own which would overthrow the notion that bourgeois values represented natural values for society and would attract the oppressed and intellectual classes to the causes of the proletariat. In Gramsci's view, any class that wishes to dominate in modern condition has to move beyond its own narrow interests, to exert intellectual and moral leadership and to make alliance and compromises with a variety of forces.

Regarding this, Gramsci calls it the union of social forces a historic bloc. This bloc forms the basic of consent to a certain social order, which produces and reproduces the hegemony of the dominant class through a institutions, social relations and ideas. In this manner, Gramsci developed a theory that emphasized the importance of superstructure in both maintaining and fracturing relations of the base. Gramsci stated that the west cultural values were tied by Christian dogma and

hegemonic culture is aimed at religious norms and values. For Gramsci, hegemonic dominance ultimately relied on coercion and in a crisis of authority the mask of consent slip away revealing the force.

In *Hegemony and socialist strategy*, Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe redefined hegemony as "discursive strategy of combining principles from different system of thought into one coherent ideology". Drawing on their ideas, critic Jennifer Daryl Slack's defines hegemony as "a process by which a hegemonic class articulates the interests of social group such that those groups actively 'consent' to their subordinated status". Perry Anderson argues: 'hegemony refers to the class alliance of the proletariat with other exploited groups, above all the peasantry, in a common struggle against the oppression of capital'.

Major Issues of Hegemony

Hegemony, the term comes under the post colonial studies. However, hegemony does have many more dimensions. Among them social hegemony, political hegemony, intellectual hegemony, economic hegemony and geographical hegemony are its variations.

Regarding all these, geography of hegemony does not leave untouched. Henry Lefebvre in "The production of space" insists that space is not a passive locus of social relations and that space is trialectical. That space is comprised of mental space, social space and physical space. Hegemony can be read as a spatial process. Ancient hegemony developed in fertile river valleys: Egypt, China and the succession of states of Mesopotamia. In China, during the warring states Era these states created artificial waterways in order to give itself an advantage over its neighboring rival states. Hegemonic successor states in Eurasia tended to cluster around the middle east for a period, using either the sea or the land. The focused of European hegemony moved

west to Rome, then north wards to the Franks and the Holy Roman Empire. The Atlantic sea board had its heyday (Spain, France, Britain) before the fringes of the European cultural area took over in the twentieth century especially on USA. and Soviet union.

Some regions show continually fluctuating areas of regional hegemony. India, Balkans, North china, Africa, East Asia and other regions show relative stability of hegemony. This long-lived hegemonies offer a contrast to shorter domination over the different territories of the world.

Social Hegemony

Social hegemony, according to Gramsci, have two major super structural levels: the one that can be called "civil society" that is the ensemble of organism commonly called 'private' and that of political or the state society. These two levels correspond on the one hand to the function of 'hegemony' which the dominant group exercises throughout society and on the other hand to that of direct domination. The functions are precisely organistional an connective. The intellectuals are the dominant group exercising the subaltern function of social hegemony. It comprise:

The 'spontaneous consent' given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group through their intellectuals who act as their gent. This consent is historically caused by the prestige of which the dominant group enjoys because of its position and function in the world of production (12).

Here, it is clear that the special function of intellectuals (besides organizing domination for the bourgeoisie) is to organize the consent of the masses in support of the dominant class.

The function of organizing social hegemony and state domination certainly gives rise to a particular division of labour and to a whole hierarchy of qualification, in some of which there is no apparent functions. for example, in the social and state direction there exist a whole series of jobs of character. This jobs of characters verify social level which expanse social hegemony (13).

In this afore mentioned lines, Gramsci intends to say that this social hegemony which is the supremacy of social group manifests itself in two ways, as domination and as subjugation by force. A social group can and indeed must exercise leadership before winning the power, it subsequently becomes dominant when it exercise power. However, every essential social group which emerses into history out of economic structure expresses the developed structure, who found their own categories seem indeed to represent historical categories even by the most complicated changes in the political and social form. The function of organizing social hegemony and domination certainly gives rise to the particular division of labor and it refers to a hierarchy of qualification. Thus, hegemony is relate to the 'spontaneous consent' of the masses to the general direction used by the dominant social group. To acquire the social domination on state, the leader should exercise before attending the power. The same thing verify the following lines:

The methodological criterion on which our own study must be based is the following: that the supremacy of a social group manifests itself in two ways, as domintion and as moral leadership. A social group dominates antagonistic groups, which it tends to liquidate or to subjugate even by armed force. A social group can and indeed must already exercise 'leadership' before winning government power this indeed is one

of the principal condition for the winning of such power, it subsequently becomes dominant when it exercises power (57-8).

The normal exercise of hegemony on the classical terrain of the parliamentary system is nicely characterized by the combination of force and consent. Indeed, the attempt is always made to ensure that force will appear to be based on the consent of majority expressed by so-called public opinion. Here, Gramsci discusses the piedmont situation in which social groups emerged that wanted to dominate, but not to lead, he says this is not a situation of hegemony. It is not a case in which these groups have the function of domination without that of leadership, dictatorship without hegemony. The hegemony will be exercised by the part of the social group over the entire group.

Political Hegemony

After the complete talking on social hegemony, Gramsci turns to talk about the political issues on hegemony. He says there are certain elements of politics. It is the first elements the most elementary things, which are the first to be forgotten. However, if they are repeated innumerable times, they become the pillars of politics.

The first element is that there really do exist rulers and ruled, leaders and led. The entire science and arts of politics are based on the primordial fact. The origins of the fact are a problem apart, which have to be studied separately but the fact remains that there do exist rulers and ruled, leaders and led. Given this fact, it will have to be considered how one can lead most effectively; hence how the leads may best be prepared, and how, on the other hand, one can know the lines of least resistance or the most rational lines along which to proceed if one wishes to secure the obedience of the led or ruled. In the formation of leaders, one premise is fundamental: is it the intention that the situation on which this division is no longer necessary? In other words, in the initial premises, the perpetual division of the human race, or the belief

that this division is only an historical fact, corresponding to certain condition. Yet it must be clearly understood that the division between rulers and ruled thought in the last analysis it has its origin in a division between social groups- is in fact things beings they are also to be found within the group itself, even where it is socially hegemonous one. In a certain sense, it may be said that this division is created by the division of labor, is nearly the technical fact, in order to avoid the fundamental problem.

Since the division between rulers and ruled exists even with in the same group, certain principles have to be fixed upon and strictly observed. For it is in this area that the most serious 'error' take place, and that the most criminal weakness and the hardest to correct are revealed. For the belief is common that obedience must be automatic, once it is a question of same group: that only must but without any demonstration of necessity or rationality being needed but it must be unquestioning. Thus it is difficult to cure leaders completely or the conviction that thing will be done because the leader consider it just and reasonable that it should be done. Yet the common sense shows that the majority of collective political disaster occur because no attempt has been made to avoid useless sacrifice. Every one has heard officers from the front recount how the soldiers were quite ready to risk their lives when necessary, but how on the other hand they rebel when they saw over looked.

This principle extends to all actions demanding sacrifices. Hence, after every disaster, it is necessary first of all to enquire into the responsibility of the leaders, in the most literal sense, a front is made up of various sectors and each sector has its leaders. It is possible that the leaders of one sector are more responsible for a particular defeat than those of another.

The principle once posed that there are leaders and led, rulers and ruled, it is true that parties have up till now been the most effective way of developing leaders and leadership. Parties may present themselves under the most diverse names even calling them anti-parties or the negation of the parties. In reality, even the so called 'individuals' are party men (146).

Considering about the 'political party' Gramsci puts his arguments and says it has already been said that the protagonist of the new era could not in the modern epoch be an individual hero, but only the political parties. That is to say, at different time and in various internal relation of various nations, that determinate party which has the aim of finding new state, was rationally and historically created for that end. Although every political party is the expression of a social group and of one social group only, in certain condition certain political parties represents a single social group precisely in so far as they exercise balancing and arbitrating function between the interest of their group and other groups and succeed in securing the development of the group which they represent with consent. The formulae stating that it is not the head of state who is responsible for the actions of the government, but his ministers, are the casuistry behind which lies the general principle of the unity of state; the consent of governed to state action- whatever the current personnel of government and which ever party may be in power.

In strict sense, the political action is necessary, for one to be able to speak of political party. It is observable that in the modern world, in many countries, the fundamental political parties have been compelled by the struggle or for other reasons to split into fraction each one calls itself 'a party' and even an 'independent party'. This idea can be studied with greater precision if one starts from the point of view that newspaper or review is 'a party' or 'fraction of party' or a 'function of party'. for the

functions of such a party are no longer directly political but merely technical one of propaganda and public order. So, the political function is indirect. For, even if no other legal parties exist other parties in fact always do exist and other tendencies which can't be legally good. In any case it is certain that in such parties cultural functions predominate, which means that political language becomes jargon. In other words, political questions are disguised as cultural ones, and as such become insoluble.

To write the history of political party, it is necessary in reality to confront a whole series of problems of less simple kind of believes. In what will the history of a party consists? How it comes into existence, the first groups which constitute it, the ideological controversies through which it program and its conception of the world and of life are formed. In such a case, one would merely have a history of certain intellectual groups or even sometimes the political biography of a single personality. The study, therefore, have be to a vaster and more comprehensive framework.

Gramsci puts three very important elements about the history of political parties. To know the history of political parties, it is necessary to develop the following lines of reasoning for a party to exist. These elements are-

A. A mass elements: which is composed of ordinary, average men whole participant takes the form of discipline and loyalty rather than creative sprit. Without these things, party wouldn't exist. They are a force in so far a there is somebody to centralize, organize and discipline them. This is cohesive force.

B. The principal cohesive element: which centralizes nationally and renders effective and powerful a complex of force which left to themselves would count for nothing. This element is endowed with great cohesive, centralizing and disciplinary power.

C. An intermediate power: which articulates the first element with the second and maintain contact between them not physically but also morally and intellectually. In reality, for every party there exist fixed proportions between these three elements.

Similarly, taking about the political thought Gramsci says: A social group can , and indeed must already exercise 'leadership' be hegemonic before winning governmental power. Gramsci as great revolutionary Marxist thinker, concerned himself with the sphere of "civil society" and of "hegemony" in his prison writing can't be taken to indicate a neglect of the moment of political society, of force, of domination. On the contrary, his entire records show that this was not the case and that his constant thought was to avoid ethnical-political aspects of politics or theory hegemony and consent from the aspect of force. What is, however, true is that Gramsci didn't succeed in finding a single, satisfactory conception of 'civil society' or the state. The state is defined as 'political society' + 'civil society' and elsewhere again as a balance between political society and civil society. Gramsci stresses that in concrete reality, civil society and state are one and the same.

Regarding the same thought about political hegemony, Gramsci says in every country the process is different but the context is same. And this very context is the crisis of ruling class hegemony, politically. That occurs either because the ruling class has failed in some major political undertaking or forcibly extracted the consent of broad masses or huge masses. In reality, this is precisely the crisis of hegemony or general crisis of the state.

Some Theoretical Aspects of Economism

Economism- theoretical movement for Free Trade, should be considered to what degree it derives originally from the philosophy of praxis and what degree from the economic doctrines of Free Trade in the last analysis from liberalism. It should be

considered whether economism in its most developed form, is not a direct descendent of liberalism, having very little connection with this philosophy even in its origin and what connection it had only purely verbal.

The ideas of Free Trade movement are based on a theoretical error whose practical origin is not hard to identify; They are based on a distinction between political society and civil society which is made into and presented as an organic one. Thus it is asserted that economic activities are belongs to civil society and the state must not intervene to regulate it. But in reality civil society and state is one and the same, it must be made clear that *laizzes faire* too is a form of state introduced by legislative means. It is a deliberate policy and automatic expression of economic facts. Gramsci says here we are dealing with subaltern group, which is prevented by this theory from ever become dominant or from developing beyond the economic corporate stage and rising to the phase of ethical-political hegemony in society and of domination in the state.

The altitude of economism towards expression of political and intellectual will, action or initiative is to say the least strange- as if these didn't emanate organically from economic necessities and indeed were not only expression of the economy. Thus it is incongruous that the concrete position of the problem of hegemony should be interpreted as a fact subordinating he group seeking hegemony. The fact of hegemony presupposes that account be taken of the inters and the tendencies of the group over which hegemony is to be exercised. In other words, the leading group should make sacrifice of an economic corporate kind. There is also no doubt that such sacrifices and such a compromise can't touch the essential; for though hegemony is ethical- political, it must also be economic, must necessarily be based on

the decisive function exercised by the leading group in the nucleus economic activities.

Further, Gramsci argues about economic hegemony by bringing many more examples. The capitalist creates himself as industrial technician, specialist in politics. It should be noted that the capitalist himself represent higher class social level and technical capacity. He must be an organizer of masses of mass, businessmen and customer of his production. If not all capitalists among them must have the capacity to be an organizer of society in general, to expand their own class; at least they must possess the capacity to choose the employees. However, every essential social class which emerges into history out of economic structure, should found own category. This category seemed indeed to represent the historical category even by the most complicated changes in political and social form.

Intellectual Hegemony

After talking more about social, political, economic hegemony, Gramsci turns over to argue about intellectual hegemony, while distinguishing between intellectuals and non-intellectuals, one is referring in reality to the immediate social function. One has in mind the direction in which their specific activities are weighted. This means one can speak of intellectuals but not of non-intellectual because non-intellectual don't exist. There is no human activities from which each form of life can be excluded. Each man carries some form of intellectual, he might be a philosopher, an artist, as a man of test with consciousness.

Similarly, the relationship between intellectuals and the world production is not as direct as it is with the social group but is mediated by the whole society and by complex superstructure. What people can do is to fix two major superstructure i.e. levels of civil society and next is the private or that of political society or the state.

These two levels correspond on the one hand about the function of hegemony which the dominant group exercise through society, on the other hand, the direct domination through the state. Intellectuals are dominant group exercising the function of social hegemony. It also clashes with preconception of cast. The function of organizing social hegemony and domination certainly gives rise to the particular division of labor and hierarchy of qualification. Thus, hegemony is related to the spontaneous consent of masses used by the dominant social group.

Here, Gramsci presents intellectuals in two ways: organic intellectuals and traditional intellectuals. The central point remains the distinction between intellectuals as an organic category of ever fundamental social group and intellectuals as traditional category. It can be said that within its field the political party accomponishes its function more completely and organically than the state does within the large field. An intellectual who joins the political parties of a particular social group is merged with the organic intellectuals of the group itself.

One good phenomenon in USA is the formation of surprising number of negro intellectuals who absorb American culture. It is worth bearing in mind that indirect influence that negro intellectual could exercise on backward masses in Africa which clarifies that African blacks have been hegemonized by the black American intellectuals. To be specific when the ruled consent to be ruled that is hegemony. In the novel *Green hills of Africa* we see African negros are consenting the rules of America through domination.

American expansionism should use American negros as its agent in the conquest of African market and the extension of American civilization through domination. similarly, the struggle for the unification of the American people should intensify in such a way as to provoke a negro and the return to Africa the most

energetic and independence intellectuals elements. Linguistically, English language become the educated language of Africa, bringing unity in the place of dialect.

Intellectuals could have sufficient organizing capacity to give a national character. It seemed that American negroes have a national and racial spirit which is negative rather than positive; one which is the product of the struggle carried on by the whites in order to isolate them.

To sum up, Gramsci's hegemony consists of socio-political power that flows from enabling the 'spontaneous consent' of the populace through intellectual and moral leadership or authority as employed by the subalterns of the state. The power hegemony is thus primarily through consent rather than armed force. To clarify this, the analysis of hegemony (rule) was formulated by Antonio Gramsci to explain why the revolutions had not occurred where they were most expected. Further, the working class to overthrow capitalism in a revolution restructure the economic, political, social and rational models, began to go ahead for communist societies. In Marxian terms, the dialectically changing economic base of society would determine the cultural and political superstructure. Gramsci argued that the failure of the workers to make an anti-capitalist revolution was due to the successful capture of the workers ideology, self- understanding and organizations by the hegemonic culture.

Gramsci didn't contend that hegemony was either monolithic or unified. Instead, hegemony was portrayed as a complex layering of social structure. Each of the structure has its 'mission' and members to behave in a way that is different from those in different structure. Hegemony works in a same manner. In the same way each person lives his/her life in a way that is meaningful in the setting in which each person exists and to this person, the different part of society may seem to have little in common with him. Yet taken as a whole, each person's life also contributes to a larger

hegemony of society. So, political, social, intellectual, economic hegemony is there in the text *Green Hills of Africa* , the next chapter will analyze in detail in light of the issue of these hegemony.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M. H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 6th ed. Banglore: Prism Book. India, 1993.
- Condy, J. *The American Writers*. St. Martine Griffin: New York, 1920.
- Crowther, J. et. al. (eds). *Oxford Advanced learner's Dictionary of Current English*. 5th ed., New York, 1996.
- Dhital, C.M. *Hemingway' as Pessimist Writer in The Sun also Rises and a Farewell to Arms*. Kathmandu: Nepal, 2006.
- Donaldson, S. *The Cambridge Companion to Hemingway*. Cambridge University Press: America, 1996.
- Flenong, R. E. *Hemingway's Green Hills of Africa*. New Mexico, 2002.
- Harper. *The Harper American Literature*, 2nd ed. New York, 1993.
- Hart, J.D. *The Oxford Complain to American Literature*, 5th ed. New York, 1983.
- Hemingway, L. *Green Hills of Africa*. Arrow Book: London, 2004.
- Hoare, Q. and Smith, G.N. *Selection from the Prison. Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci, Okient Longman*. Lawervce and Wishart: London, 1971.
- Hornby, A. S. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. 7th ed. Oxford university Press: New York, 2005.
- Marris, R.B. *Encyclopedia of American History*. 6th ed. New York, 1817.
- Stryehact, T. *The Hemingway Review*. 2000.
- Van Doren, C. *The American Novel*, New York, 1989.