

Chapter I

Introduction

1.1 Masculinity and Contemporary American Novels

Masculinity refers to maleness. It also indicates the typical features of male people or animal, and often having special form different from female and like that. It emphasizes power, which is the only reality to exist in this earth. For masculinity, man rules over the remaining people or things. He exists with courage, strength, and boldness. It defines femininity as a secondary issue. In this regard, a prominent critic M. H. Abrams states: One who believes in masculinity ever sees a way “as to subordinate women to men in all cultural domains: familial, religious, political, economic, social, legal, and artistic” (89). So, the basic vision of masculinity is pervasively patriarchal that is, it is male centered and controlled in such a way to dominate women.

According to masculinity, man always possesses the quality of superman. It compares man with God, and place women in support to men. Masculinity negates love, mercy, and kindness, and respects one’s physics and its subjects, such as: strength, courage and boldness.

American society in pre-industrial and industrial era was celebrating the masculine concept of individual courage though this concept had been originated long back in the religious, literary and social history of the world. For this, The Holy Bible says: “And the rib which the Lord God had taken from man made he a woman and brought her unto the man” (3). This proves the sense of masculinity in western religious history.

Since man became superior to woman. Moreover, Aristotle defines a woman as an unfinished man. He says: “Woman may be good, and also a slave; though the

women may be said to be an inferior being and the slave quite worthless” (qtd. in Adams 58). This proves the origin of celebration of masculinity in ancient time. But again, the pre-industrial and industrial era got immense popularity for the unique placement of this concept in western countries. America in particular came face to face with many ups and downs during the time. It achieved immense material prosperity as well as the social and political prosperity. Not only had the males, some females also started occupying the concept of masculinity. They became amazons. Darwin’s theory of survival of the fittest and Nietzsche’s idea of superman became the hotcake in contemporary USA. On the one hand, these issues celebrated one’s physics rather than the knowledge and passion; on the other, they stayed behind the popularity of embodiment of masculinity.

American novels during pre-industrial and industrial era implemented the Zolian philosophy of Experimentation. M. H. Abrams states:

Zola and later naturalistic writers, such as: the Americans Frank Norris, Stephen Crane, and Theodore Dreiser try to present their subjects with scientific objectivity and with elaborate documentation, sometimes including an almost medical frankness about activities and bodily functions. Usually unmentioned in earlier literature. (262)

It suggests that a novel is organized in the mode of scientific experimentation on the behavior of the character it depicts.

In these confident years of progressive era popular naturalists like David Graham Philips, Jack London, Upton Sinclair, and Frank Norris described literary creation as a skill based on professional dedication. They said that authorship was not a matter of inspiration but rigorous work habits, a watchful eye on the market demand, and a sense of one’s responsibility to the public. So, American novels of this

era implemented the naturalist's notion of an end to the romantic separation of 'Art' and 'Industry'. Literature was now visualized as a form of labor. Writing was associated with the outdoors exertion with the world of man. A prominent critic Christopher P. Wilson quotes: "In advice to young authors, the naturalists claimed that strenuous technical devotion would generate a "masculine narrative voice conveying both factual reliability and spiritual purpose" (551). In particular; they reflected their era's stress on the importance of forceful personality.

Stephen Crane's novel *Maggie: A Girl of the Street* (1893) shows a Darwinian world, where life is lived in the urban jungle. Maggie, a poor and street girl suffers a lot by her lover. She becomes a prostitute, the victim of the genteel accusation of others though she had the dream of success, but she fails because she lacks the masculine attributes in the world of modern city where survival depends only on strength and fitness. Richard Ruland and Malcolm Bradbury state: "In his presentation copies of *Maggie*, he (Crane) wrote that the book intends to show "That environment is a tremendous thing in that work and frequently shapes lives regardless and the books naturalist bias is clear"(227). Maggie lies outside this world- "None of the dirt of *Rum Alley* seemed to be in her veins" (Ruland and Bradbury 227)

Like *Maggie: A Girl of the Street*, Stephen Crane's masterpiece: *The Red Badge of Courage* (1895) presents a true picture of nineteenth century America, which was saluting the masculine features of one's courage and intelligence. This novel exposes that this world is not for cowardice, but for those who are adventurous. Henry Fleming, the main protagonist of the novel involves into a war hoping to be a romantic hero. But for two days of hard fighting he loses his desire for heroism, and experiences cowardice. In the end, he strangely achieves his Red Badge of Courage, his initiatory Wound. Finally, Fleming comes to feel at home, but the place he

discovers is not for him. He is exposed as a weak hero in the novel.

Frank Norris, another novelist of that period also celebrates the similar theme of Anglo-Saxon Knockabouts. Generally, this term indicates the masculine attributes of power. The term 'Sincerity' became the hot cake during the time. It generally refers to the 'masculine', and realistic tenor of the literary voice- in a nutshell, the dominant impression of the narrative. Norris was one who often used the word sincerity in his writings. *MC. Teague: A Story of San Francisco* (1899) by Norris evokes the volatile end of the protagonist in the absence of masculine power.

MC. Teague, an Ox like swinish Agonist, an Atavistic dentist from California mining camp goes to San Francisco, and sexually awakened by Trina, of carefully peasant background, who is an androgynous figure. Although MC. Teague wants a material success, he wants a gold tooth to hang outside his parlor. Trina, the female protagonist wins a lottery, but that lottery brings misfortune in her life. Her marriage breaks up. MC. Teague, her husband kills her. Trina dies in the absence of power. In this way, the novel *Mc. Teague: A story of San Francisco* portrays a real picture of America, specially the contemporary American people.

Theodore Dreiser's *Sister Carrie* (1900) is an ambitious novel that has merged American innocence and deep social experiences in it. Dreiser's stories are generally a tale for struggling self- discovery, where he has focused his intention toward individuality and practicality. In it, Sister Carrie, the female protagonist at first suffers a lot. She loses her virginity as well. Then she understands the reality and gets her identity, when she uses her body and energy to win the economic and social success. Richard Ruland and Malcolm Bradbury state:

Sister Carrie is a novel written by an author who takes naturalism entirely literally. A plain tale of contemporary urban life and the very

material terms under which it is –lived, it tells the story of the Darwinian ascent of Carrie Meeber, a totally ordinary girl who leaves her Midwestern hometown, is captured by the amoral magnet of Chicago, loses her virginity and then uses her body and her energy to win economic success- a plot that offended all the moral idealism of the day. Yet has the ring of practical truth. (241)

In such a way, the amazon figure Sister Carrie proves the wide significance of masculine umbrella (not related to sexual issues only), which exists in the women figure as well.

Jack London, another prominent writer of that movement portrays the same (rough Darwinian theory of the survival of the fittest) in his writings except his later writings. As a social believer at the same time, he celebrates the Nietzsche’s doctrine of the superman as well. At all, this theory negates the social relationship and the other aspects such as: love, sex, human relationship, mercy, kindness and the transcendental peace though they are deep rooted in our life. Richard Ruland and Malcolm Bradbury state: “Writing in the Rooseveltian era of rugged individualism about the laws of pack and the tribe, the life of the wilderness, the sea and the jungle he celebrated endurance and Nietzschean energy” (244).

Jack London’s *The Sea-Wolf* (1904) exposes the middle class reality of pre-industrial and industrial USA. It mostly deals with the story of Titan Wolf Larsen who refuses to compromise his courageous way of living with any other things. This does not mean that he totally boycotts social relationship. Similarly, Sissy Humphrey Van Weyden, another protagonist of the novel although having emotional attachment with Maud Brewster also celebrates the ‘masculinity’, and becomes a prominent member of that era. Presenting Maud Brewster, a courageous woman London wants to declare

that masculine power remains even in the female amazons as well.

Wolf Larsen wants to live like a Lion as the King of the jungle, having power and boldness. The society that Larsen lives in is celebrating masculinity. American people during the time believed on their reason and logic rather than other's suggestion and advice. The concept of American dream urged them to do something individually. As a member of this society, Wolf Larsen salutes these masculine features, which make him a man of practicality. He starts living a Marianne life as a crew. His individual intelligence, bravery and logic make him a captain of a schooner *The Ghost* in a very short time. Even he teaches the same (standing in his own legs) to the people whom he has defeated and captured through out his journey. As a result, he gets his identity as The Sea-Wolf.

Although Jack London is sensitively able to record the burning issues of the time, he has successfully utilized the masculine concept of power and strength. In this regard a prominent critic Lee Clark Mitchell states:

London's *The Sea-Wolf* so unambiguously depicts to bodily position itself as an ideological premise. Finding one's feet, standing erect, walking without assistance: all are highlighted not only as typical aspirations in a narrative where characters are repeatedly knocked down but also, more importantly as confirmation of the Darwinian allegory of evolution through the body's physical ascent. Rising to an upright position is everywhere both test and sign of an ability to transcend one's animal past and achieve human preeminence. (317)

This suggests that manliness is not only severe domination to other, but also includes social norms and values, where one can perform his courage and intelligence. Since London was born in a middle class family who spent his adolescence as an Oyster

pirate, a Sea man, a Yukon prospector, and a tramp. In *The Sea-Wolf* also Wolf Larsen is a middle class average man. So, it is said that London's own figure / personality is exhibited in *The Sea-Wolf*. Masculine base was there behind the popularity of both Larsen as well as Jack London himself.

Even in another novels, Jack London portrays the similar ideas such as: celebration of intelligence, physical strength, will, and so on. In his novel *The Call of the Wild* (1903), Buck, the protagonist gets his identity while celebrating intelligence, physical strength and like that. At all, contemporary writings occupied the ideas of nature and other strenuous activities, which were the burning issues of that time and became the energy for their popularity.

In literary theses, we have plenty of research on feminist issues, which generally talk about female problems; their suppression, operations and domination by males. We rarely get thesis on masculinity and maleness in literature. In this context, I think the completion of this research process on the topic "Embodiment of Masculinity in Jack London's *The Sea-Wolf*" becomes a unique one, which provides a different taste among us.

The thesis proceeds in four parts. The first chapter has reviewed the general concept of masculinity, its basic history, and a comparative study of masculinity in the western literary classics. At the same time, it has focused on the nineteenth and twentieth century American novels, and the reason behind its popularity is discussed.

The second part reviews some of the comparative gender theories and practices, the development of feminist gender theories, including the Sex/Gender distinction, Embodiment theories, and Performative theory are discussed. Subsequent to this, Bob Connell's idea of hegemonic masculinity is briefly discussed. Similarly, my choice of Connell's masculinity upon others to apply in Jack London's *The Sea-*

Wolf is clearly defined. This is followed by a brief discussion of Bob Connell's dimension of gender relations upon which this project is built. Secondly, my reflection on the research process with related to feminist methodological consideration is discussed.

The third part is about the application of Connell's masculinity in *The Sea-Wolf*. It analyzes the brief study about the structure of masculinity in the novel from various angles, while the concluding section draws out the main agenda or implication of masculinity in the novel at crux.

Chapter II

Theoretical Analysis of Gender Theories

2.1 Review of Feminist Gender Theories

Feminist gender theories are the very ingredients of this section. They developed as a means of challenging the gender categories, which in general, treats men and women as pre-formed categories with their essential qualities. Connell quotes: "This popular discourse on differences between men and women is frequently based on the polarization of men and women due to their bodies/biology or behavior/psychology" (174). These issues are briefly discussed below. Subsequent to feminist critiques, the major strengths of Connell's gender theory are discussed.

Biological Determinism

Biological determinism in general talks about the different social position of men and women in terms of their innate biological nature. "In the 1970s, the socio-biological explanation – men and women occupy different social position on account of their innate biological nature became the most prevalent concept of Sex, from which the social construction of Gender was distinguished" (qtd. in Hidaka1). The socio-biological explanations of Sex differences thus argue that gender inequality has

to be accepted because biology is inescapable.

Bob Connell, a popular gender theorist defines biological determinism's defectiveness in explaining sex differences. According to him, the identity of men and women is based on social influences. Hidaka quotes: "Biological determinism is defective in explaining sex differences, when the impact of social influences-gender-is also understood" (12). In this way, Connell says that people have different societal influences, which provide them different identities. So, labeling men and women in terms of their biology is not justifiable.

Psychological Determinism

Psychological determinism alleges the different orientation of mentalities between the two sexes. The psychological rhetoric that reinforces the dichotomy between the two sexes was also used in the propaganda of the Mythopoetic men's movement in USA in the early 1990s. Robert Bly became one of the best selling authors for his book *Iron John* (1990) advocating the resurgence of the innate quintessence of masculinity, "Zeus energy" (22). This theory talks about the heterosexual relationship with various sexual differences between men and women.

However, Connell sees it defective. According to him, most of the scholars and researchers focus on averages. It means not that every woman in a society has the hensure nature, having the feature of domesticity. Hidaka, a Japanese sociologist states:

Since the 1890s in pursuits of facts about men and women, various studies have been conducted. These found few uncontested differences between men and women because such research focuses on averages and, therefore ignores the fact that most men and women are in overlapping categories with members of the other sex above and below each individual's score. (13)

This is how, Connell defines the weaknesses of psychological determinism for its insufficiency to incorporate the whole concept.

Sex Role Theory

The concept of Sex role theory is that people acquire a position and learn a set of expectations which are allocated to one's sex through interactions with the family, schools, media, and so on. This theory considers men's roles to be instrumental and women's roles to be expressive; and thus to complement each other. Bret E. Carroll quotes:

Men undertook the aggressive work of nation building and breadwinning, women were invested by their culture with the qualities that their culture with the qualities that men were encouraged to neglect in the workday world: Sensitivity, piety, emotionality, gentleness, selflessness and dedication to moral principle. (32)

This theory at all, is the restoration of the ancient definition of gender theory, which generally links men with breadwinning and nation building activities rather than human sentiments.

But the modern gender theorists define it in against to masculinity. According to them, this theoretical ideology negates the masculine feature of power, strength, boldness and change at all. Demetrakis Z. Demetriou quotes:

In Connell's later writing, Sex Role theory is attacked precisely because of its inability to conceptualize power (and resistance to power) as an essential feature of the relationship between genders and with in genders; and also because of it's subsequent to grasp change as a product of the contradiction with in gender relations themselves. (338)

Moreover, Sex Role theory is also incapable of grasping the complexities and power relationship with in genders. Modern theorists point out the narrow definition of Sex

Role theory towards gender issue. “Connell defines the inability of Sex Role theory to theorize the relationship between the structure and agency, and its reliance in biological determinism” (Demetriou 338). Here structure refers to the social values and institutions, where as agency suggest the body, which is both an object and agent of social practice. Because of its static nature, Sex Role theory does not acknowledge changes in role performance within society and across it as well.

Sex/Gender Distinction

The concept of Sex Roles gave rise to the concept of gender in feminist theories. Simon de Beauvoir forcefully writes in *The Second Sex* (1949) “One is not born, but rather becomes a woman” (qtd. in Adams 995). In this way, she draws a clear line of distinction between sex and gender. The term sex differences were used to describe the minimal biological differences between men and women, while gender differences were regarded as socially and culturally constructed behavior and psychological features. Tomoko Hidaka quotes: “The sex/gender differentiation to be built on biological sex, but enormous variability in each society” (14). However, this theory defines gender differentiation in terms of biology and later it slightly links with social activities.

Modern gender theorists are not in favor of this idea. According to them, this theory at first focuses on body and later on to the psycho-social activities. It creates the dilemma either to favor social determinism or biological determinism. Judith Butler argues: “Such a distinction deludes us into playing little attention to the complicated interplay between sex and gender without favoring one over other” (5). In this way, modern theorists embark their dissatisfaction on it.

Freudian Psychoanalytic Theory

Sigmund Freud’s psychoanalytic theory talks about the concept of penis envy

that implies at the girl's unconsciousness envy of the symbolic power, which men and penis have over the mother. The Oedipus complex focuses on the conflict between instinctive drives and the frustration of the child caused by the familial relationship. "Oedipus complex –that is, the repressed but continuing presence is the adult's unconscious of the male infant's desire to possess his mother" (qtd. in Abrams 250). This indicates the male child's fulfillment of sexual desire to his mother one way by sucking her breast and other by playing with her.

Modern theorists do not accept the Freudian theory as a whole. According to them Freudian psychoanalysis has shortcomings in common: the assumption of the conventional family structure, i.e. the mother as the full time caretaker and; father as the busy breadwinner in a family, in which the goal of the child development is to achieve heterosexuality and neglect the social relations. Tomoko Hidaka quotes: "Connell states that psychoanalysis informs us that masculinity and femininity are constructed in the process of child development and that emotions, sexual feelings and identity shape the relationship among people and vice versa, which constitute one facet of gender relations" (15). It clearly talks only about the sexual relationship between male and female, but in living people has to follow many societal customs and values, which this theory totally undermines.

Performative Theory of Gender

Judith Butler, one of the prominent postmodern feminists of US defines gender a performative act. She argues that gendered identity is constituted through a series of repeated acts, gestures and enactments over time. These acts are performed in accordance with a scenario of heterosexual coherence, naturalizing the dichotomy between male and female bodies, their cohesion into the norm and consistent gender binary of male masculinity and female femininity. Peter Digereser states:

An important theme within postmodern feminism is that essentialist's notion of women and naturalized conception of the human subjects is unnecessary and troubling ingredients for feminist political theory and practice. Perhaps, one has advanced this claim more forcefully than Judith Butler through her use of the ideas of performativity. According to the effects of publicly regulated performances. (665)

Butler further says that the identity produced by gender acts manifests itself on the surface of the body and is discursively sustained. Peter Digeser further points out:

She argues that the categories of gender, sex and self are not expressive of our bodies or natures; rather they are merely the results of socially governed performances. Gender is not expressed but "done". Repeated gesture and successful performatives are the stuff of identity and not some Cartesian self or subject that is distinct from body, brain and experience. (656)

Accordingly, she does not consider that gender is understood as a practice within the cultural intelligibility of regulated discourse.

Modern critics claim that Butler fails to notice that the facts and events of the body play an important role in forming gendered subjectivity. Her focus on the sexually marginalized indicates that she pays little attention to subjects who are marginalized on other grounds. They argue that mere performances cannot generate the identity. Peter Digeser further quotes:

When per formatives are not explicitly linked to some constative, their success appears to depend upon a confusion over the nature of the performativity itself. If neither of these modes – explicit linkage or confusion – is present, performatives will be ineffective. As such,

performances that are merely performances would not be successful. For example, specific gestures by actors on a stage come closet to being pure performances and are not effective in the relevant sense. They do not bind the actors. Marriage, vows given in a play do not really marry the actors. (664)

In this way, they comment on Butler in a sense, her idea of performance is not clear at all.

2.2 Connell's Theory of Masculinity

This thesis applies Connell's gender theory because of its inclusive nature. Built on a critique of other approach to sex, gender, and sexuality, Connell's gender theory encompasses agency, includes the impact of the bodies and of the psyche in producing and expressing sexuality, and locates gender within social structure. The next section describes Connell's main idea about gender.

Hegemony and Masculinity

Hegemony initially a term referring to the dominance of one state with a confederation, is now generally understood to mean domination by consent. This broader definition was coined and popularized in 1930s by Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci, who investigated why the ruling class was so successful in promoting its own interest in society. In general, hegemony is the power of the ruling class to convince other classes that their interests are the interests of all. Domination is thus exerted not necessarily by force or by active persuasion but by more subtle and inclusive power over the economy and over the state apparatus, such as: education and the media, by which the ruling class's interests is presented as the interests of common people, and thus come to be taken for granted. An Australian critic Mike Donaldson states:

Hegemony a pivotal concept of Gramsci's prison notebooks . . . is about the winning and holding of power and the formation (and destruction)

of social groups in that process. In this sense it is importantly about the ways in which the ruling class establishes and maintains its domination. The ability to impose a definition on of the situation, to set the terms in which events are understood and issues discussed, to formulate ideas and define morality is an essential part of the this process. Hegemony involves persuasion of the greater part of the population, particularly through the media, and the organization of social institutions in ways that appear “natural”, “ordinary”, “normal”. The state through punishment for non-conformity is crucially involved in this negotiation and enforcement. (645)

At all, it reflects power with respect to social system in which every object is dependent with each to other.

Although heterosexuality and homophobia are the bedrock of masculinity, and any understanding of its nature and meaning is predicted on the feminist insight that in general, the relationship between men to women is oppressive. Indeed, the term hegemonic masculinity was invented and is used to maintain certain focus. Then the contemporary critics defined it on their own way. According to them, the fundamental element of hegemonic masculinity is that women exist as potential sexual objects for men. Women provide heterosexual men with sexual validation, and men compete with each other for this. Next, they say that this does not necessarily involve men being particularly nasty to individual women. In this way, they could not give clear meaning of hegemonic masculinity. If so, what is hegemonic masculinity? Bob Connell, the propounder of this theory says that it is built on a critique of other approaches to gender, and sexuality. This gender theory incorporates agency in terms

of the impact of body and of the psyche in producing and expressing sexuality and defines gender with social structure. Judith Lorber states:

In masculinities, he looks at four other sites of what he calls the dynamics of masculinity- the construction of masculine identity in times of change. He uses a life history methodology and psychoanalytic insight, and locates his subjects in the practical routines of social life. He also, for each, describes what that masculinity is inscribed on the body – through work, exercise, illness and sexual relationships. (470)

Firstly, Connell comprehends agency as an important concept in elucidating the grounds and reasons for the transformation of gender relations. While agency is broadly understood as ‘being a person’, which at the same time, suggests the notion of identity and subjectivity. He accepts the traditional humanist understanding of agency such as: autonomous, rational and unified subjects. These properties enable people to organize political activities that are based on common identities. But he says that the concept of agency varies according to time and context, at all. Patricia Yancey Martin states: “Connell defines masculinities as a place in gender relations, practices through which men and women engage that place and the effects of those practices in bodily experience, personality and culture. Masculinity is an ongoing gender project not a stable object of knowledge” (472). It suggests masculinity as a place, where females and males can equally perform their roles.

The agency that Connell proposes mostly does allow for collective action. He claims the significance of the materiality of the body, the close relationship between agency and body; and the interconnectedness between the bodies, which always produces a physically and emotionally different body from the body that has began the practices. Here he is somehow similar to Butler’s performative identity of gender.

But he says that bodies and their practices construct social Structure. The body is neither the absolute object of social practice because it is the site where one engages in the social world; nor is the body the absolute subject of social practice because there are necessarily material and institutional constrains. Tomoko Hidaka states:

The agency that Connell . . . proposes is not situated in the traditional humanist's concept of agency but does allow for collective action.

Connell opposes the poststructuralist idea of discursively constructed body with its contingent nature, claiming instead the significance of the materiality of the body, the close relationship between agency and the body and social practices. (19)

Connell equates agency with the perpetual creative activity of the body. In other words, the body is both an object and agent of social practice. This however does not mean that agency is a unified or fixed entity. Agency according to him is rather a shifting potential. It is thus understood as activities and creativities of bodily practices within material and social constrains, which always have a potential for the transformation of the social structure. In this context, Connell defines masculinity as a site where male and female can practice their masculinity and femininity equally. He says that a woman can do have masculinity and a man can do have femininity.

Patricia Yanci Martin quotes:

Connell defines masculinity as a place in gender relations practices through which men and women engage that place, and the effects of those practices in bodily experience, personality and culture.

Masculinity is an ongoing gender project, not a stable object of knowledge. (472)

This suggests that modern women do not limit themselves in the household activities rather they can perform their roles like the males who are proud for having masculinity. Similarly, Connell's theory embarks about the male's femininity as well. So, Connell defines hegemonic masculinity not only the domination to femininity but also the subordinate masculinities, as well.

The second strength of Connell's approach is the rejection of biological essentialism. Connell asserts that biology cannot account for gender practice, but rather the anatomy and reproductive process of human beings where socially and culturally mediated meanings of men and women, and masculinities and femininities are produced. Thus, he points to the inseparable relationship between biology and society. "This generic body is inadequate because there are millions of different bodies-with their differing sizes, ages, health conditions etc. in the world" (qtd. in Hidaka 20). Moreover, he asserts that although the body is often the focus of philosophical and sociological study.

Thirdly, Connell argues that everything about gender is historical. It involves bodies, social practices which shape social structure and personal paths. It can create unconventional state for new practices. Patricia Yancey Martin states: "Connell's critical realist stance depicts masculinities as products of culture and social relations that are historically and contextually mediated" (472). This proves the strong aspect of masculinity in context to cultural and social relations.

The fourth strength of Connell's masculinity is its rejection of homosexuality. Homosexuality refers to a process in which a person, usually a man involves sexually attracted to the people of the same sex. It is an abnormal sexuality. Homosexuality creates counter hegemony, which is dominated to hegemonic masculinity.

Antagonism to gay man is a standard feature of hegemonic masculinity. Such hostility is inherent in the construction of masculinity itself. Mike Donaldson points out:

Conformity to the demands of hegemonic masculinity pushes heterosexual men to homophobia and rewards them for it in the form of social support and reduced anxiety about their own manliness. In other words, male affirmed by hatred for, and fear of gay men. (648)

Consequently, homosexual men are socially defined as effeminate and any kind of powerlessness or a refusal to compete. In this sense, hegemonic masculinity is also threatened by the assertion of homosexual identity.

Connell thus opens up new horizons for theorizing gender by integrating various factors such as: agency, structure, history etc. into his theory of gender.

Chapter III

Application of Connell's Masculinity in *The Sea-Wolf*

3.1 Standing Up, Falling Down

Standing up here suggests to striving to rise above the horizontal. It refers to a very pivotal issue of hegemonic masculinity. Although the term hegemonic masculinity has broad meaning, it is a hybrid concept. So, it may come as no surprise that a novel about an inept man's schooling at sea devotes so much energy to the acquisition of "Sea Legs", but the process of getting one's legs beneath one functions as a conceit more central to the meaning of *The Sea-Wolf* than simply adapting to turbulent seas.

The phrase "Finding one's legs" recurs insistently through the narrative and acquires multiple meanings. It refers not only for striving to rise above the horizontal, but also for preserving one's life, discovering one's soul, and defining one's status independent of culture. But this culture never totally boycotts the social norms and values. Indeed, through the pathetic fallacy the phrase is occasionally applied to all of creation, as when Wolf Larsen describes the onset of a storm by saying, "Old mother nature's going to get up on her hind legs" (109). More generally, this phrase is invoked to characterize human self-sufficiency, a freedom from the compliancy – inducing support of class and social distinctions, which are expressed in Larsen's early report to Humphrey van Weyden's announcement that he has an independent income : "Who earned it, eh? I thought so. Your father. You stand on dead man's legs. You never had any of your own" (18). This reference to an unearned legacy is reiterated throughout, as a goad to Van Weyden's learning to depend on him.

Here the central character Wolf Larsen exposes himself a very exemplary figure of masculinity, which is a hegemonic one. Hegemonic masculinity here means not necessarily the supreme bodily position but the strength what it creates for domination. Humphrey Van Weyden states:

Not that in appearance, he seemed in the least gorilla-like. I am striving to express is this strength itself, more as a thing apart from his physical semblance. It was a strength we are wont to associate with things primitive, with wild animals, and the creatures we imagine our tree – dwelling prototypes to have been – a strength savage, ferocious, alive in itself, the essence of life in that it is the potency of motion, the elemental stuff itself out of which the many forms of life have been molded; in short, that which writhes in a body of snake when the head is cut off, and the snake as a snake is dead, or which lingers in a shapeless lump of turtle – meat and recoils and quivers from the prod of a figure.(13)

This defines Larsen's very bodily posture, which compels Humphrey to praising it. He defines Larsen's masculinity in such way that Tiger remains always Tiger; no matter it is alive or dead. Still earlier, aboard the *Martinez* (the ferry whose sinking initiates the plot), Humphrey Van Weyden (one of the crews of *Ghost*) had met a retired seaman with artificial legs – as if Jack London wanted to open his novel about the figurative importance of standing upright through an uncanny figure who had lost his physical legs, then regained them. “Stumping gallantly” (5) on a mechanical limbs just before the ferry founders, the seaman helps women don life jackets, at the same time expressing disgust at their behaving hysterically, screaming wildly, and losing control as he undertakes to calm them down.

In this way, London through the seaman (Wolf Larsen) marginalizes the femininity for their lack of boldness, strength, and power. Following hegemonic masculinity, Jack London believes that civilized values have led to physical and emotional deterioration, promulgating feeble standards of response to adversity and including a false sense of moral security. Thomas Mugridges's (a cook of Ghost) loss of his foot supports the aforesaid vision. As a ship's cook, his role is already stereotypically feminized; and his cowering, overly emotional demeanour and weak constitution establish him as someone who will be literally unable to keep his feet in this novel: "Mugridge seemed to be in rabid fear of water, and he exhibited nimbleness and speed we did not dream possessed. Cornered in the right angle of the poop and galley, he sprang like a cat to the top of the cabin and ran aft" (20). He represents a good example of marginalized masculinity. The transformation occurs during an enforced bath at sea, when a shark snaps off Mugridge's foot. The implication of these nearly predictable events is confined by the actions that constitute the scene. Thomas Mugridge breaks a Steersman's legs in his frantic resistance and even attacks Wolf Larsen as well:

But at this juncture, Mugridge, who had lifted his head and ascertained the extent of his loss, floundered over on the deck and buried his teeth in Wolf Larsen's leg. Wolf Larsen stopped, coolly, to the cockney, and pressed with thumb and finger at the rear of the jaws and below the ears. The jaws opened with reluctance, and Wolf Larsen stepped free. (141)

This is how, the novel even indicates the minor character's switching position to achieve masculinity. The important of keeping one's lower limb is never far in this novel. It is figured most prominently in the alignment of Van Weyden with Maud

Brewster, a poet later Larsen caught up from another ship while seal hunting, who admits “We may be feeble land creatures without legs” (161). Maud’s metaphor here acknowledges rather more than she means (that they lack only sea legs), registering a social Darwinist equation of weakness with earlier stages of development. On the other corner, Humphrey Van Weyden defines him as fundamentally the same:

I had never done any hard manual labor or scullion labor, in my life. I had lived a placid, uneventful, sedentary existence all – my days – the life of a scholar and a recluse on an assured and comfortable income. Violent life and athletic sports had never appealed to one. I had always been a book – worm; so my sister and father called me during my childhood. I had gone camping but once in my life, and then I left the party almost at in start and returned to the comforts and conveniences of a roof. . . . I was not strong. . . . My muscles were small and soft like a woman’s, or so the doctors had said time and again in the course of their attempts to persuade me to go in for physical culture fads. But I had preferred to use my head, rather than my body; and here I was in no fit condition for the rough life in prospect. (30)

These lines clearly define Humphrey’s bodily pragmatics, which at all, lack the manliness in the very beginning of the novel. By contrast, Wolf Larsen’s most dramatic movement occurs, when his first mate pitches him overboard. Dragging himself from the midnight sea, he quickly rises to his feet before descending to the dark forecandle to confront a mutinous crew. Humphrey narrates: “He drew himself inboard with a quick effort, and arose to his feet glancing shiftily, as he did so, at the man at the wheel, as though to assure himself of his identity and that there was nothing to fear for him” (91). More than half dozen people beat him there; again he slowly rises: “Step by step, by the might of his arms, the whole pack of men striving

to drag him back and down, he drew his body up from the floor till he stood erect. And then, step by step, hand and foot, he slowly struggled up the ladder” (95). It proves that every pace is equally challenging, where one has to carry the risk, otherwise success is impossible.

Few other scenes so clearly epitomize the novel’s conflation of upright stance and evolutionary advance, as if an erect bodily posture represented the triumph of human development against all the forces opposing it. Each and every moment Wolf Larsen shows his masculinity to undermine them; sometimes through direct bodily force and sometimes through his hegemony. When the domination comes towards an extreme phase, every character mirrors the same what Wolf Larsen does. Johnson, a crew of the same ship, for example is beaten mercilessly by Wolf and Johansen, and then repeatedly picked up only to be brutally upended:

Wolf Larsen and Johansen were all about the poor fellow. They struck him with their fists, kicked him with their heavy shoes, knocked him down, and dragged him to his feet to knock him down again. His eyes were blinded so that he could not see, and the blood running from ears and nose mouth turned the cabin into a shambles. And when he could no longer rise they still continued to beat and kick him where he lay. (80)

Although particularly dramatic, this moment hardly stands alone in the novel that persists in knocking characters down apparently just to see them rise again, whether it is a cabin boy George leach “Staggering to his feet” (22) after being decked by Wolf Larsen; or Humphrey Van Weyden who “Managed to struggle to his feet” (27) after a mild storm upends him. Wolf discourses endlessly on being crippled yet: “Don’t let a little thing that bother you. You’ll yet used to such things in time it may cripple you some, but all the same you’ll be learning to walk” (27), and in the process of upright

movement but he repeatedly sinks down:

So, I thought it out at the time, feeling my conscience. . . . The situation was something that really exceeds rational formulas for conduct and demanded more than the cold cohesion of reason. When viewed in the light of format logic, there is not one thing of which to be ashamed; but nevertheless a shame rises within me manhood I feel that my manhood has in unaccountable ways been smirched and sullied. All of which neither here nor there. The speed with which I ran from the galley caused excruciating pain in my knee and I sank down helplessly at the break of the poop. But the cockney had not pursued me. (32)

Humphrey needs a cooperative behaviour into the ship, but interesting thing is this he never gets such environment even by the people who are victimized by Wolf Larsen as such. Again Humphrey states: “My feet went out from under me. I simply could not stand upright and endure the agony” (59). Or again, he “Tried to rise but struck his head and knocked back on hands and knees” (114) before learning the entire secret to “Standing erect” (93). It is as if Humphrey Van Weyden’s emotional state could be graphed according to his changing position, with fear measured in the degree to which he too is finally “Knocked down” (94). Nearly everyone mirrors the same pattern in the novel.

Indeed the moral implications of an upright position are conveyed by those like George Leach, who stands against Wolf Larsen in “Splendid invincibility of immortality” (81) and even by Larsen himself, who vigorously resists his own crew and all of howling nature itself. Thomas Mugridge’s cowardly submission is clearly exposed through the novel by his prone position, “Knocked down” (83) by others left

to “Crawl weakly across the galley” (85) no more craven when deprived of foot than when he was physically whole.

Standing and falling are imaged in other ways as well, including the prominent framing of the narrative onboard the *Ghost* by scenes of ocean burial. Lifeless bodies are hoisted erect and dropped “Feet first into the sea” (251): at the opening, the dead first mate and at the closing Wolf Larsen himself. In fact, death seems to result simply from lying down and giving up. The entire novel echoes this pattern in displaced terms, as ship’s masts are knocked down by Thomas Mugridge, raised by Humphrey Van Weyden and Maud Brewster, lowered by Wolf Larsen, and finally resurrected in a sequence that resonates as much with evolutionary expectations. Lee Clark Mitchell states:

The entire novel traces a rough Darwinian allegory of homoerectus, . . . by which the human body can be made to rise above an animal level. There is no need here to emphasize how much less London’s ideas owe to Darwin’s nuanced conception of natural selection than to Herbert Spencer’s popularized view on social evolution and survival of the fittest – except to help clarify the ways in which the novel tends to conflate behavioral progress with cultural and ethical standards. The evolutionary process of standing up and walking on two feet represents for London’s a series of less strictly physical qualities: independence, moral heroism, and virile manhood. By contrast, lying down denotes dependency, death, cowardice, and ultimately femininity. (321)

In this way, there is no need to compare London’s ideas with Charles Darwin and Herbert Spencer (struggle for existence). London here embarks masculinity with social and cultural values rather than the bodily position itself.

In conclusion, what London tries to show the behavioural progress of a man with cultural and ethical strands is not the severe bodily domination, but the domination remaining in the same culture and the society is much related to Connell's idea of hegemonic masculinity. Wolf Larsen explicitly and implicitly rules others. From the very beginning of the novel, we find him as a navigator, who is coming from San Francisco to Japan for seal hunting. He is the captain of his ship/sea schooner 'Ghost'. There are other crews, whom we see are ruled by his hegemonic masculinity. Wolf Larsen appreciates the people, who embody masculinity and hates those, who embody not. Masculinity for Connell is a place, where males and females can equally perform their role. Jack London's intelligence for the entrance of Maud Brewster in the narrative defines the same. It conforms that lying down position has to be occupied by someone, since life requires death, heroism dictates cowardice and masculinity necessarily defines femininity. It is just a system, and has no link with sex differences. To ensure social equilibrium, some need to fall so that others may stand erect.

Finally, Jack London shows that gendered identity can be achieved by performances in relation to other social activities, not only by sexual differences as such.

3.2 Trading Places: Question of Masculinity

In *The Sea-Wolf*, Jack London portrays Wolf Larsen and Humphrey Van Weyden's switching position in a much more radical fashion. It is not simply that hard knocks at sea, transform an effete idealist into a tough minded materialist, but that a man who essentially lacks a body gains one, while a consummately physical figure is stripped of him. Even as this exchange fits into the reciprocal economy that says that a woman has to occupy horizontal position. It illustrates another very tenet of social Darwinist ideology, which indicates that among men only one can occupy

the most prominent upright position. What might have seemed a relatively straightforward shaping of bodily places in fact raises serious questions about the self's constitution. At the novel's beginning Wolf Larsen's inner intellectual and emotional strength is defined in purely physical terms:

He was firmly planted on his legs; his feet struck the deck squarely and with surety; every movement of a muscle, from the heave of the shoulders to the tightening of the lips about the cigar, was decisive, and seemed to come out of a strength that was excessive and overwhelming. In fact, though this strength pervaded every action of his, it seemed but the advertisement of a greater strength that lurked within, that lay dormant and no more than stirred from time to time, but which might arouse, at any moment, terrible and compelling, like the rage of a lion or the wrath a storm. (13)

Similarly, Humphrey Van Weyden's courage is matched by his developing physical tone. In this way, London's philosophy of emotional strength seems to match that of gold's gym, where bulging biceps are seen as evidence of corresponding inner strength. The converse also supports the very idea, as raging headaches begin to incapacitate Wolf, forcing him "Down from his sitting posture till he lay on the deck" (210). A series of strokes, the result of a brain tumour lead to his loss of his physical control reducing the most extraordinary specimen of bodily perfection to little more than a corpse in bed, akin to what Van Weyden was at the novel's beginning prone on the deck.

However he loses his bodily power, but still shows his sense of masculinity, which is very hegemonic in a sense it carries the masculine concept of inner strength.

Wolf Larsen and Humphrey Van Weyden continue to engage in a long-running debate on what is actually occurring in this dissolution of Wolf's physical prowess:

The curse of it is that I must lie here, conscious mentally unimpaired, knowing that the lines are going down, breaking bit by bit communicating with the world. I cannot see; hearing and feeling are leaving me; at this rate I shall soon cease to speak; yet all the time I shall be here, alive, active and powerless. When you say you are here, I'd suggest the likelihood of the soul, I said. Bosh! Was his retort. It simply means that in the attacks of my brain the higher physical centers are untouched. I can remember. I can think and reason. When that goes, I go. I am not. The soul? He broke out in mocking laughter. (237)

Larsen here intellectually describes his life. He says that he can think and reason till the end of his life. When that goes from him, he would no more remain in the earth. Later wolf Larsen can no longer speak, laugh, rage, or otherwise express himself in hand gestures: yet he remains the same, a man, having the integrity of masculine characteristics. Lee Clark Mitchell points out:

The man of him was not changed. It was the old, indomitable, terrible Wolf Larsen imprisoned within that flesh which had once been so invincible and splendid. No more would he conjugate the verb "to do" in every mood and tense. "To be" was all that remained to him to be, as he had defined death, without movement, to will, but not to execute; to think and reason and in spirit of him to be alive as ever, but in flesh to be dead, quite dead. (324)

Humphrey Van Weyden persists him as fundamentally the same:

I weaved my arm from the fore-castle head and dropped down to the

deck. Aft. I walked to the cabin companion where I contented myself with hailing below. Wolf Larsen answered and he started to ascend the stairs I cocked my revolver. I displayed it openly during our conversation, but he took no notice of it. He appeared the same, physically as when last I saw him. (213)

Manliness was with Larsen at the first sight of Humphrey, and it is still with him. Though his physical structure has changed, but for Humphrey he is still the same Larsen as well.

Despite Humphrey Van Weyden's invocation of "The soul of the man" – a metaphysical assumption earlier denied by wolf Larsen. The clearer implication is that a disembodied self is no self at all, that the locution "It knew only itself" registers an empty claim. Certainly this perception is novelistically true, since characters reduced to such a state of non-communications are thereby reduced to non-characters. Yet one argues idealistically for Larsen's continuing selfhood, the more compelling point is the way in which Van Weyden and Wolf Larson gradually exchange both bodies is not simply transformed. He narrates his transformation, "Wolf Larson, in large doses, before and after taking" (221). The transformation is not simply a matter of Van Weyden's new- found independence from his father and social institutions – the secret pride in himself he feels after having " Found his legs with a vengeance" (126). Rather, the larger exchange involves his acquiring masculinity that represents little more than a physical body. Auerbach notes that at the novel's beginning "Van Weyden is feminine by virtue of idleness," and that achieves a masculine stature not by action but by "Holding his own verbally against Larsen" (195). In this way, through his language Van Weyden achieves masculinity.

The exchange is best clarified by comparing Van Weyden's initial fog bound

experience, “Alone in the moist obscurity” (1) of San Francisco Bay, with wolf’s condition at the novel’s end. The opening shipwreck plunges Humphrey Van Weyden into cold water: “I could not swim a stroke. And I was alone, floating apparently in the midst of gray primordial vastness, I confess that a madness seized me, that I shrieked aloud as the women had shrieked and beat the water with my numb hands” (7), which actually shows his feminized way of living.

As I’ve already elaborated, hegemonic masculinity is not only related to one’s physics, rather it occupies the self as well. It’s consent of rule to be ruled. The passage suggests that the question addressed by the novel concerns the constitution of the self and more particularly the extent to which any construction of self depends on a physical body. If so, what is the connection between a body and its actions, or between desires and then enactments?

These are not simple questions and it is a tribute to London that his responses as reflecting the novel’s narrative voice is less clear-cut than those of his characters. At all, the energy is with both Wolf and Humphrey Van Weyden for the constitution of masculinity. Although Wolf- Larsen, the Sea-Wolf holds the image of masculine figure from the very beginning and till the end of the novel, his masculinity is a short of hegemonic one. It means not that hegemonic masculinity totally subordinates women to men. It places the masculinities taking the constrains, such as: power, boldness, courage, and confidence. Wolf Larsen has embodied the very masculinity after a long trial:

In the English merchant service cabin boy at twelve, ship’s boy at fourteen, ordinary seaman at sixteen, able seaman at seventeen, and cock of the fo’sc’sle, infinite ambition and infinite loneliness, recovering neither help nor sympathy, I did it all for myself –

navigation, mathematics, science, literature and what not. And of what use has it been? Master and owner of a ship at the top of my life, as you say when I am beginning to diminish and die paltry, isn't it? And when the sun wars ups I was scorched, and because I had no root I withered away. (70)

Wolf Larsen had not easily become the captain of the ship. He had experienced plenty of ups and downs throughout his life journey. As a representative of the hegemonic masculinity, he explicitly and implicitly rules others. From the very beginning of the novel, we find him as a navigator, who is coming from San Francisco to Japan for seal hunting. He is the captain of his sea schooner 'Ghost'. There are other crews, whom we see are ruled by his masculinity model. Wolf Larsen appreciates the people, who embody masculinity and hates them, who embody not. Sometimes, he physically punishes them as well. As a master, he teaches the same philosophy to his crews in the *Ghost*. Humphrey narrates:

When I had finished the bed, I caught myself looking at him in a fascinated sort of way. He was certainly a hand-some man – beautiful in the masculine sense. And again, with never failing wonder, I remarked the total lack of viciousness, or wickedness, or sinfulness, in his face. It was the face of a man who either did nothing contrary to the dictates of his conscience, or who had no conscience. I'm inclined to the latter way of accounting for it. He was a magnificent atavism, a man so purely primitive that he was of the type that comes into the world before the development of the moral nature. He was not immoral, but merely unmoral. (68)

Humphrey further quotes Larsen's remarks for Masculinity:

Might is right, and that is all there is to it. Weakness is wrong. Which is a very poor way of saying that it is good for oneself to be strong, and evil for oneself to be weak – or better yet, it is pleasurable to be strong, because of the profits; painful to be weak, because of the penalties. Just now the possession of this money is a pleasurable thing. It is good for one to possess it. Being able to possess it, I wrong myself and the life that is in me if I give it to you and forego the pleasure of possessing it. (55)

This is how; sissy Van Weyden describes Wolf Larsen, a prototype of Superman. As an androgynous figure, the emotional man finds it a materialistic one and dislikes it, but he heartily glorifies the way what Wolf Larsen living.

Humphrey Van Weyden starts living with Wolf Larsen, when Larsen rescues him from his ship “Martinez”. By nature he is an intellectual man. As he says, he was entitled “sissy” by his family. It is because he had the behaviour like women. Feelings, emotions, love all lie in him. He has no experience about manhood, courage, boldness, and so on. What he decides depends on his intellectual mind:

I had lived a placid, uneventful, sedentary existence all my days – the life of a schooner and a recluse on an assured and comfortable income. Violent life and athletic sports had never appealed to me. I had always been a book-worm; so my sisters and fathers had called me during my childhood. I had gone camping but once in my life, and then I left the party almost as its start and returned to the comforts and conveniences of a roof. . . . I was not strong. . . . My muscles were smart and soft, like a woman’s, or so the doctors had said time and again in the course of their attempts to persuade me to go in for physical culture fads. But I

had preferred to use my head, rather than my body; and here I was, in no fit condition for the rough life in prospect. (30)

Furthermore, Humphrey Van Weyden's life is full of human sentiments, which he finds opposite to Wolf Larsen that provides him obstacle, at all to remaining at the sea for the rough life. Slowly and gradually Humphrey starts embodying masculinity. He asks many questions to Wolf- Larsen, and every time gets the same answer, glorification of masculinity. Wolf Larsen says, "The big eat the little that they may continue to move, the strong eat the weak that they may retain their strength. The lucky eat the most and move the longest that is all" (35). This is actually the nature's law; and Larsen is fully aware about it.

Moreover, wolf Larsen shows Humphrey Van Weyden about his feminized way of living. He says: "You have slept in soft beds, and worn fine clothes and eaten good meals, who made those beds? And worn fine clothes? And those meals? Not you, you ever made anything in your own sweat. You live on an income which your father earned" (36). These questions are all about one's self-reliance, which Jack London has focused much through out the novel.

When Humphrey makes a good study about the ship family, he dislikes remaining there because there is no spiritual, religious and social environment. But he has to remain with Larsen's ship family because he is helpless and alone. In Humphrey's words:

All of which has set me wondering. Where are the mothers of these twenty and odd men on the Ghost? It strikes me as unnatural and unhealthful that men should be totally separated from women and heard through the world by themselves. Coarseness and savagery are the inevitable results. These men about me should have wives and

sisters, and daughters; then would they be capable of softness, and tenderness, and sympathy. As it is not one of them is married, in years and years not one of them has been in content with a good women. . . . There is no balance in their lives. Their masculinity, which in itself is of the brute, has been overdeveloped. The other and spiritual side of their natures has been dwarfed atrophied, in fact. (89)

He evaluates the condition of *Ghost*, where the presence of woman is missing, and as such, Humphrey finds it unnatural to be remaining in that unnatural place.

To some extent, Humphrey celebrates the manhood of Wolf Larsen. He compares Wolf with God, a Superman of perfectness. He states:

But Wolf Larsen was the man type, the masculine an almost a God in perfectness. As he moved about or raised his arms the great muscles leapt and moved under the satiny skin. I have forgotten to say that the bronze ended with his face. His body, thanks to his Scandinavian stock, was fair as the fairest women's. I remember his putting his hand up to feel of the wound on his head, and my watching. The biceps move like a diving thing under its white sheath. It was the biceps that had nearly crushed out my life once that had seen strike so many killing blows. I could not take my eyes so many killing blows. I could not take my eyes from him. I stood motionless, a roll of antiseptic cotton in my hand unwinding and spilling itself down to the floor. (99)

Wolf Larsen's concept for this body is different. He defines it a means of ruling the subordinate masculinities and the femininities as well:

This body was made for use. These muscles were made to grip, and teach and destroy living things that get between me and life. But have

you thought of the other living things? They too have muscles of one kind and on other, made to grip and tear and destroy; and when they come between one and life, I outgrip them, out tear them. Out destroy them. Purpose does not explain that utility does. (99)

In this way, wolf Larsen establishes hegemony in front of Humphrey. Jack London through his novel implicitly says that American dream is not possible until one achieves the masculine nature of human characteristics such as: courage, boldness, strength, and individualism. Identity is possible because of this. Finally, Humphrey Van Weyden, knowingly, unknowingly moves ahead embodying masculinity. He is the man of sensibility; so in one corner of his heart, he still carries his repressed desire, i.e. emotions, feeling etc. On their way to Yokohama, they capture a woman, Maud Brewster, a poetess by her profession where he learns more about masculinity.

The Odyssey of Humphrey Van Weyden begins from here; he falls in love with Maud Brewster. One day Van Weyden and Maud Brewster escape from Wolf Larsen. On the way he suffers a lot. At last, they come to an unknown island, which they give a name Endeavour Island. They start their living in that Island. From this very phase, the novel shows about Humphrey Van Weyden's embodying masculinity in his heart, although he does all of these for the shake of his love. Once Wolf Larsen says:

I beg your pardon, Mr. Van Weyden. I congratulate you. I think you can now fire your father's legs back into the grave to him. You've discovered your own and learnt to stand on them. A little rope work, sail making, and experience with storms and such things, and by the end of the voyage you could ship on any coasting schooner. (102)

For the first time Wolf Larsen praises Humphrey for his courage and confidence, which he had never experienced from Humphrey; and as such feels pride to his

disciple. The way Humphrey Van Weyden follows is slightly different than others in the novel. He embodies masculinity remaining in the emotional attachment with Maud Brewster. He gets learned a lot about masculinity from her. So, Humphrey fails to demise her at all. As Connell says:

Hegemonic masculinity adopts an aspect of the psychoanalytic approach to sexuality and gender, in particular, the emotional attachment to an object. Connell deploys Freud's discovery of patterned relationship in the family unit that has led to the investigation of emotional relations in sociology. (qtd. in Hidaka 21)

In this sense, Humphrey Van Weyden's masculinity represents a very hegemonic one. It means not that Wolf Larsen negates heterosexuality. He loves it. He likes women, but hates the feminine ways of their living. Larsen agrees with Maud Brewster; and even tries to make love with her. "I like you a hundred percent better for that", he said. Books and brains, and bravery. You are well-rounded a blue – stocking fit to be the wife of Pirate chief" (161). In this way, Larsen's masculinity cannot be biased from this.

Humphrey Van Weyden becomes envious to Wolf Larsen for his eyeing to Maud Brewster. As a result, Humphrey leaves the schooner "Ghost" and comes to Endeavour Island away from Wolf Larsen. At the end of the novel, Wolf Larsen arrives at Endeavour Island. He arrives there at the verge of his death. Though weak and fragile the body, Wolf never accepts the way cowardice live in. Even in this phase, he keeps the same genius. He creates a hierarchy, but never surrenders him to them. However powerful Humphrey Van Weyden, at last fails to attack Wolf Larsen. He prepares the gun, but cannot shot him. Humphrey narrates:

Hump, he said slowly, 'you can't do it. You are not exactly afraid. You are important. Your conventional morality is stronger than you. You are the slave to the opinions which have credence among the people you have known and have read about. Their code has been drummed into your head from the time you lisped, and in spite of your philosophy, and of what I have taught you, it won't let you kill an unarmed, unresisting man. (208-209)

The afore written dialogue is a consent of rule through which Humphrey Van Weyden is ruled. He says, "I had backed away from him, almost weeping at my inability to shoot him" (209). Explicitly both Humphrey and Brewster hate Wolf Larsen, but implicitly both of them glorify Wolf's masculinity. Finding Humphrey Van Weyden a prototype of hegemonic masculinity in his last hours, Wolf Larsen wishes to remain at Endeavour Island for dying. At last, this Superman "Wolf Larsen" dies in between Humphrey Van Weyden and Maud Brewster. Both of them glorify Wolf Larsen's embodiment of masculinity.

The death of Larsen makes them panic. Humphrey quotes: "I saw her lips trembling and the tears swimming up in her eyes" (244-245). After his death, both Humphrey and Maud leave the Endeavour Island. It is unclear in the novel that where did they go; perhaps they headed towards Japan. Interesting thing is this; with them they had love and masculinity.

3.3 Women's Place in the Novel

The *Sea-Wolf* has generally been read as a celebration of the self's integration, with Humphrey Van Weyden becoming a more fully integrated figure in learning to live by his own resources free of the enervating social institutions that preserve the weak and unfit. Many critics and literary scholars have defined Wolf Larsen's

hostility to just such effects of conventional morality, of sentimental ideals and egalitarian ethical fictions, helps explaining his vigorous celebration of a social Darwinian tinged with Nietzschean individualism.

But it is not satisfactory. The way Wolf Larsen follows is not his hostility towards women or heterosexuality or the conventional morality of sentimental ideals. He loves them, but wants to see that as identifiable. Rather than cowardice or dependable, he likes capable, strong and energetic women. He personifies masculinity with power that may exist even in women, and not in all men as such. So, “To depend on other’s “legs” – by accepting the legacy of cultural capital is for Wolf Larsen to feminize men and masculine women” (Mitchell 328). It was nothing but the need of the time. The pre-industrial standard of competence to which Wolf Larsen and later Humphrey Van Weyden aspire is based on a mercantile integration of labour and an idealist conception of free market economies. Whatever social division now exist ensue from a radical equality of opportunity that allows true excellence to emerge independent of social class or moneyed influence, and free of compelling cultural influences.

Yet strangely, the novel ends otherwise disproving the claims advanced by various characters that the alienating effect of industrial capitalism is uniformly bad. Humphrey Van Weyden and Maud Brewster are left alone as survivors, once again inscribing privilege, separation, and specialization back into the novel’s moral economy and doing so, remarkably enough, along lines of gender. Perhaps one shouldn’t be surprised, given the other binary oppositions structuring the novel as whole, since the contrasts of strength and weakness, standing up and being compelled to lie down, nearly ensures a reinstalling of the antithesis between stereotypical masculinity and femininity. Surprising thing is that although characters are able to

change places transcending larger categories, prove impossible in the novel or rather changing places only further confirms the established categories. This is true of the capitalists economy onboard ship, in which “Humphrey Van Weyden simply becomes another Wolf to Thomas Mugridge and rest of the crew, and it is also true of the novel’s economy of gender, through which masculine and feminine roles are prescribed” (Auerbach178, 215).

The novel begins by actively critiquing Humphrey Van Weyden’s delight in industrialism’s “Division of labor” (1). His vivid enthusiasm onboard the Martinez for a diversified realm of critics, navigators and captains, each with a specialized knowledge that saves others from unneeded toil, and all operating in an economy that releases individuals to pursue their own ends for the efficient benefit of all: “It was good that men should be specialist” (1). He speaks for the development of self sufficient, and proposes to train Van Weyden as seaman “For the good of your soul” (18). Larsen’s alternative vision is one of extreme individualism in which labours gain competence in an industry by working from the bottom up, learning all levels and aspects of the job refusing to depend on anyone for anything. And his rationale for shanghaiing Van Weyden concedes, when he becomes first mate, and admits his “Executive ability has been considerably developed, which could not be anything but wholesome for sissy Van Weyden” (108). The nickname itself suggests the way in which gendered oppression continuous. Humphrey states:

I had always been a book – worm; so my sisters and father had called me during my childhood. I had gone camping but once in my life, and then I left the party almost at its start and returned to the comforts and conveniences of a roof. And here I was, with dreary and loss vistas before me of table –setting, potato peeling, and dish washing. And I was not

strong. The doctors have always said that I had a remarkable constitution, but I had never developed it or my body through exercise. My muscles were small and soft, like woman's, or so, the doctors had said time and again in the course of their attempts to persuade me to go in for physical culture fads. But I had preferred to use my head, rather than my body; and here I was, in no fit condition for the rough life in prospect. (29-30)

Significantly, this is also the point at which a woman enters the all male pressure and Humphrey Van Weyden once again introduces an ideal of specialization into the novel.

Basically, the novel lacks the female characters. We have not shown any such characters until the middle of the novel. In the middle, Jack London exposes a female character Maud Brewster, a poet by her profession. She is shown as an exemplary figure. When Wolf Larsen rescues her from her boat at the verge of sinking, he brings her in "Ghost". As we have already known Wolf Larsen, a man of stereotypical masculinity, asks a lot of questions to Maud Brewster. From here, Jack London has shown that the masculinity, what Wolf Larsen carrying is not brutal only, but in a sense a hegemonic one. When Larsen asks about her profession, Maud says, "I earn about eighteenth hundred dollars a year" (136). In this very confidence and economic self-reliance Wolf Larsen glorifies her. Towards the end of the novel also, we see Larsen praising the masculinity of Maud Brewster. Somewhere the novel exposes a glimpse of one-sided love of Wolf Larsen to Maud Brewster as well.

Although Wolf Larsen denies the human sentiments such as: love, feelings, emotions, and so on, and always sees the things from his brain. Materialistic individualism is the very easily tangible feature of him through which he dictates upon other. But sometimes, Wolf-arsen himself feels some short of lackingness of

these things. He is aware that people remain most happy in terms of these things.

When Larsen looks upon Maud, he finds her a creature of perfectness, where he finds his masculinity in a new path. Larsen defines Maud that people can be most happy in human sentiments than human mind. Humphrey quotes Larsen's language:

Do you know, I sometimes catch myself wishing that I, too, were blind to the facts of life and only knew its fancies and illusions. They're wrong, all wrong. . . . Delight is the wage for living. Without delight, living is worthless act. . . . He who delights the most lives the most, and your dreams and unrealities are less disturbing to you and more gratifying than are my facts to me. . . . Dreams must be more substantial and satisfying. Emotional delight is more filling and lasting than intellectual delight; and besides you pay for your moments of intellectual delight by having the blues. Emotional delight is followed by no more than jaded senses, which speedily recuperate. I envy you. I envy you. (154-155)

In this way, Maud ironically turns out to be very different from the "Delicate, ethereal creatures of romance – the bit of Dresden china – Humphrey initially believes her to be" (146). Wolf Larsen once says, "I like you a hundred percent better for that"- Books and brains and bravery" – you are well – rounded, able – stocking fit to be the wife of a pirate chief" (161). This is the very masculinity of Maud Brewster, where Larsen could not remain silent without praising it.

Once Humphrey sees Wolf Larsen's enforcement to Maud for embracing which makes him envious. He directly goes to Wolf Larsen and start punching him but in front of his huge bodily position Humphrey fails to part Maud from Larsen. But again, with the help of knife he strikes Larsen and releases her from him. Humphrey quotes:

I saw Maud, my Maud, straining and struggling and crushed in the embrace of Wolf Larsen's arms. . . . I struck him with my fist, on the face, as he raised his head, but it was a puny blow. He roared in a ferocious, animal like way, and gave me a shove with his hand. It was only a shove, fist of the wrist, yet so tremendous was his strength that I was hurled backward as from of catapult. I struck the door of the state – room which had formerly been Mugridge's splintering and smashing the panels with the impact of my body. I struggled to my feet, with difficulty dragging myself clear of the wrecked door, unaware of any hurt whatever. I was conscious only of an overmastering rage. I think I, too, cried aloud, as I drew the knife at my hip and sprang forward a second time. (173-174)

This disturbance of Wolf Larsen towards the lovers (Van Weyden and Maud Brewster) enforces them to run away from the sea schooner "Ghost". His sexual envy urges Humphrey to show his masculinity. For this, Maud Brewster's courage cannot be demised. She gives a very back support to Humphrey Van Weyden. As a result both of them successfully rescue from Wolf Larsen. Humphrey praises Maud as: "It is you who are a brave woman" (178), which helps him to become another Wolf at the end of the novel.

Maud Brewster and Humphrey Van Weyden after escaping from Wolf Larsen's dominion end up in an uninhabited place they playfully name Endeavor Island – a seal rookery populated with rowdy, rutting animals. The island provides Humphrey with an arena to test his newly acquired masculine skills. The couple's stay among the real herds symbolically functions as a final site of passage towards a revitalized form of heterosexual union.

Maud gives an internal energy to construct the masculinity for Humphrey.

Each and every second she shows her strength that gives a strong courage to perform his masculinity. Maud says, “I’ll admit it, I don’t like defeat any more” – you lack perspective Humphrey” (199). After this Humphrey glorifies the masculinity from his heart and says, “I shall never forget, in that moment, how instantly conscious I became of my manhood. The primitive deeps of my nature stirred. I felt myself masculine, the protector of the weak, the fighting male” (201). Furthermore, he identifies his life in the presence of Maud is a remarkable one. Maud energy for him becomes a very sword, which helps Humphrey to go ahead successfully. In other words, the artisan values introduced into the novel by Maud Brewster inform Humphrey Van Weyden’s final scene of empowerment on Endeavor Island:

And yet, I aver it and I aver it again I was unafraid. The death which Wolf Larsen and even Thomas Mugridge had made me fear, I no longer feared. The coming of Maud Brewster into my life seemed to have transformed me. After all, I thought it is better and finer to love than to be loved, if it makes something in life so worthwhile that one is not loath to die for it. I forget own life in the love of another life; and yet, such is the paradox, I never wanted so much to live as right now when I place the least value upon my own life. (185)

On the other hand, it is an irony that throughout the novel, Humphrey Van Weyden subscribes to a belief in strict gender divisions, cherishing a conventional valuation of femininity as the spiritual antithesis of masculinity, “ Which in itself is of brute” (89). Not until he meets Maud Brewster however, does he realize as it, “For the first time what a delicate, fragile creature a woman is” (123). She prompts in him an intense awareness that feminine spirituality cannot sustain itself in a perilous world; following a series of sentimental sexist observations:

I was surprised, and joyfully, that she was so much the woman and the display of each trait and mannerism that was characteristically feminine gave me a keener joy. For I had been elevating her too highly in my concepts of her, removing her too far from the plane of the human, and too far from me, I had been making of her a creature goddess – like and unapproachable. So I hailed with the head which flung back the cloud of hair, and the search for the pin. She was woman, my kind, on my plane and the delightful intimacy of kind, of man and woman, was possible as well as reverence hold her. (181)

Here the Victorian ideal of etherealized woman is introduced into a narrative that had previously constructed stereotypically female behaviour. “Whinnying, cringing, carrying hysterically, lying prone on deck – these all have constituted the clear, pitiful signs of what it means not to be a man and therefore to be, by definition, a woman” (Robinson 62), has limited women in a narrow space.

Curiously up to now, Maud has escaped such a dismissive characterization, having been exalted by Humphrey Van Weyden and treated by Larsen as an equal – a view echoed by others on board, including most prominently the seaman Louis, a crew member of the ‘Ghost’, who kind and generous he is throughout, nevertheless refuses to risk “A broken head” out of any misplaced notion of chivalry: “For a woman I have never laid my eyes upon before this day” (129). Even, Humphrey Van Weyden occasionally entertains an egalitarian view of Maud, almost as an exception to his more generally sexist views. Although he does such, to align Maud physically from with Larsen. In fact, as Humphrey tellingly observes, invoking the attribute most celebrated in the novel. Each may be “Nothing that the other as everything that the other was not. I likened them to the extreme ends of the human ladder of evolution-

the one the culmination of all savagery, the other the finished product of the finest civilization” (147). They are the two most accomplished figures on their feet.

All the same, Humphrey Van Weyden praises the physical grace that both embody: “It never seemed to me that she walked, he admits. Hers was an extreme lithesomeness, and she moved with a certain indefinable airiness” (146). At the same moment he acknowledges of Wolf, “There was nothing heavy about his stride. The jungle and the wildness lurked in the stride. The jungle and the wilderness lurked in the uplift and down put of his feet. He was cat footed, and lithe, and strong, always strong” (147). Humphrey’s enamoured description of Maud Brewster:

No more out of environment could be imagined. She was a delicate, ethereal creature, swaying and willowy, light walked, or at least, walked after the ordinary manner of mortals. Hers was an extreme lithesomeness, and she moved with a certain indefinable airiness, approaching one as down might float or as a bird on noiseless wings. She was like a bit of Dresden china, and I was continually impressed with what I may call her fragility. As the time I caught arm when helping her below, so at any time I was quite prepared, should stress or rough handling befall her, to see her crumble away. I have never seen body and spirit in such perfect accord. (146-147)

This could just as easily have been applied to other. Significantly, this description links Maud and Wolf in terms of physical accomplishment of achieved grace as upright figures, clarifying the stakes involved in the reduction of either to a prone position. Nevertheless, Humphrey Van Weyden’s general inclination is to assume that the rubric woman embraces a set of characteristically limiting activities and attitudes, mostly horizontal. In this way, he creates one hierarchy. Despite long schooling at sea

in the debilitating effects of any form of specialization, he reinstates that ideal along the lines of gender midway through the novel. It is as if Wolf Larsen though ruthless in his everyday design, were the most enlightened egalitarian figure, while Humphrey Van Weyden despite his earnest liberal sympathies were committed to an ongoing condition of social dependency for the women. That inegalitarian pattern is reinforced, moreover, through the novel's structuring of desire as largely passive and secular. Humphrey Van Weyden's adoration of Maud is one version of such desire as seen in his effusive delight at her presence and her superiority to him. The feeling dwindles when he realizes she is only a woman at all.

Whatever the case, these three major characters in the novel embody the masculinity that is a hegemonic one. Jack London through this narrative tries to express the very slogan of hegemonic masculinity: "not only women, those who act like women are treated in a feminized way". But somehow, the idea of secondary status for woman is made explicit towards the end of the novel.

When Humphrey Van Weyden and Maud Brewster arrive at Endeavour Island, he exhorts her, "I think it vastly better for you to remain, and sleep, and rest and do nothing" (193). She has become the figure what he was at the novel's beginning – the incompetent, dependent, figuratively legless character, which he represent himself as first being. After all, to remain in the context of social relationship, Maud Brewster does not mind this. This time, Maud and Humphrey both lack their perspective, and become Romeo and Juliet in their love. In conclusion, the novel celebrates the masculine way of living. Jack London absolutely glorifies the new women Amazon figure Maud Brewster. Christophe Den Tandit states:

Maud immunity to over civilization is indeed established when, questioned by Wolf Larsen about her economic status, she proudly

replies that she earns eighteen hundred dollars a year through “peace work”, that is by writing poems. As such, Maud embodies the artisan work gender identity. David Leverenz argues that the mid – nineteenth century writers notion of manhood “in Jeffersonian terms, as autonomous self sufficiency” and prescribed that, unlike reckless and entrepreneurs, a man should be “a model of industry and honesty”. In this light, Maud’s dedication to an artisan work gender carries the positive connotations of the early nineteenth century work ethics. (643)

In this way Jack London glorifies the masculinity of Maud Brewster through out his novel. Though female by her biology, he exposes her as a supreme dedicated figure, who has her own economic status, and has the optimistic thinking for future life.

Finally, the story that has been portrayed in the novel cannot be biased from our day to day life, where generally women are somehow submissive, and the society is hierarchical. Like Maud Brewster, there are some women in our society. They cannot be placed in inferior position. They are superior women, and society must respect their masculinity. This is hegemonic masculinity; and the novel is a testament for this.

Chapter IV

Conclusion

4.1 Celebrating Masculinity

Celebration of masculinity is the major energy for all success and all achievement in the pre-industrial and industrial USA: either it is personal or social. Man's every quest for identity gets never fulfilled unless people realize the concept of celebrating masculinity, which indicates such as: courage, boldness, strength, self reliance, logic, and so on. *The Sea-Wolf* is a novel about the glorification of manliness in which mainly the three characters: Wolf Larsen, Humphrey Van Weyden, and Maud Brewster make their identity embodying masculinity. In this sense the novel becomes a testament as such.

Wolf Larsen, the first protagonist of the novel always keeps the keen concept of achieving success through individual's own struggle, "You couldn't walk alone between two sunrises and hustle the meat for your belly for three meals" (18). Larsen actually is a Sea-Wolf, who likes to remain at sea. Seal hunting is his profession. In the very beginning, the novel describes Wolf Larsen's sea voyage of San-Francisco to Japan for seal hunting. On his way to Yokohama, Larsen rescues Humphrey Van Weyden following the wreck of a cross – bay ferry, *The Martinez*. Larsen is the captain of the seal-hunting schooner *Ghost*, bound for Japan. Brutal and cynical, yet also highly intelligent and intellectual he rules over his ship. He often teaches his crews about self – reliance, labor, strength, logic and work as such.

Larsen's teaching at all, reinforces the masculine ideology, which encourages the crews to have self-reliance and autonomy through which they can achieve something in their life.

Although Larsen exposes himself a healthy man and physically strong and

energetic as well, his face with large features and strong lines of the square order is apparently massive. The Jaw, the chin, the brow rising to a goodly height and swelling heavy above the eyes are strong in themselves. In this way, Jack London defines the physical strength of Wolf Larsen, which obviously embarks for creating masculinity.

For this, many scholars as well as critics have defined Larsen as an individualist, a hedonist, and a materialist, who does not believe in the immortality of soul, and even the societal norms and values. Often they criticize him as brutal and cynical, yet also highly intelligent and intellectual rules over his ship and terrorize the crew with the aid of his exceptionally great physical strength. Even the novel sometimes epitomizes the similar scenes such as: killing of Johansson, torture to Thomas Murgidge and others. Sometimes, Larsen speaks the kind of language, which henceforth urges the scholars to think materialistic individualism into him. On the one hand they define Wolf as a nonconformist, and relate him as a homosexual man; on the other they take his masculinity totally in against to women and femininities. These are the very points the novel raises among us.

In my opinion, they are not true at all. As I've already defined, Connell's idea of gender is historical, which involves bodies, social practices that shape social structure and personal path. Larsen uses his body in his sea schooner *Ghost* not for creating wilderness and terror, but for achieving his target. Jack London presents this character in such a way that he creates the sea discipline and imposes all characters to follow; as such, he establishes hegemony. But quite often he uses his physical force to control over the entire environment of the ship. This does not mean to oppose social norms and values.

Although he does not believe in immortality of the soul, and does not care about feelings and emotions, but in general, Larsen is not special. He is not different from

anyone else. His story is not heroic. It is just a story of an individual trying to get his identity. It does not mean that Wolf dislikes or really negates the human feelings and sentiments. He says, "Dreams must be more substantial and satisfying. Emotional delight is more filling and lasting" (155). This proves his repressed desire of these very issues.

Wolf Larsen in one side does not care about women and femininities, on the other he rules over the men as well. He ever remains conformist towards the society. But he creates one hierarchy, where not only females, but also the males having feminine qualities are hierarchically placed. Wolf Larsen shows his gratitude towards the female characters such as: Maud Brewster, who is self-reliant by herself and for this kind of woman, Larsen actually wishes to make his love. So he clearly says her to be the wife of him or a sea pirate.

So for me, doing all kind of things remaining inside the society obviously leads a man to success. Until and unless people care about these issues, they never achieve their own identity. Wolf Larsen gets the identity The Sea-Wolf in the novel because of his intense interest to it. In my opinion, Jack London has given this title to Larsen's sense of masculinity, which he shows in the very beginning of his life and keeps it alive till the end of his life.

Humphrey Van Weyden at last, becomes another Sea-Wolf towards the end of the novel. When Hump is rescued by Larsen and compels to stay at ship, he really wishes not to be there. But he has to work there as a crew of *Ghost*. The novel in the beginning shows Hump a womanly type of character who however has not the masculine experience in his life. As he describes: "My muscles were small and soft, like a woman's. I was, in no fit condition for the rough life in prospect" (30). Even, he was entitled 'sissy' by his father and his sisters.

In this way, the novel in the beginning presents Humphrey as an intellectual

man, but not a man of masculine model. When he sees the physical structure of Wolf Larsen that compels him somehow to praise the masculinity. So, he praises Larsen's body and strength as: "The eyes were large and handsome – intense and masculine" (17). This indicates Hump's beginning of masculine path.

The question about self-reliant or personal income of Larsen gives a shock to Hump to "Manage to struggle to his feet" (27). As the story goes ahead, Hump follows the way of Larsen's ideology. He is now capable of doing anything. Thomas Mugridge's physical torture also becomes a point of departure which mentally aids Hump to following the very path. He himself feels pride in the imagination of manliness inside him.

With engaging Maud Brewster, Humphrey changes his switching position. He falls in love with her; and one day escapes from the *Ghost* and arrives at Endeavour Island with Maud. Scholars define the very issue as the hatredness of Hump to Larsen's masculinity. But for me, it is not real. As a general people he becomes envious to Larsen for his love, but still he has the same respect for Larsen's masculinity. If it is not the case, why does Humphrey give shelter to Larsen at Endeavour Island? Why not he kills him though Larsen is incapable to doing something physically? As he says: "I am unable to shoot a helpless, unresting man" (220). This actually proves the very idea of celebrating masculinity. Humphrey's falling in love with Maud Brewster is one way of living in society. Socio-cultural violation leads to violence or conflict. As a social animal he/she has to follow the social norms. It is a part of social life in which love, marriage etc. are the social institutions and men and women are defined as two wheel of a cart.

Furthermore, Jack London's inclusion of only one female character with Amazon posture has aided a new interest into the novel. Though female according to

her biological nature, her role in the novel is masculine. Her confident answer to Wolf Larsen about her self –economic reliance helps Jack London to clearly epitomize the idea of masculinity in a new way. From this very exposition, even Larsen feels proud to having her as his ship staffs and as such, Maud also praises the masculinity of Wolf Larsen in the novel.

Next we see Maud teaching Humphrey Van Weyden to having masculinity. According to her, boldness, strength, logic, and perspective lead a man to success. As Humphrey defines Maud all to him, an unfailing source of strength and courage; Jack London through this novel shows Maud Brewster, a woman having the very zeal of masculinity. So, she weeps at the death of Wolf Larsen and says: “He still lives” (251), which defines her interest to live her life being an Amazon figure

Although Humphrey Van Weyden defines Maud a delicate, ethereal character in the end of the novel, he defines himself the protector of women; and Maud easily accepts it for her love. Here, many critics raise the question of Maud’s masculinity and tries to interpret her as a common woman in the society.

But for me, it is no more a crucial issue. As for love her acceptance of the dominion cannot be judged in another way, although she is biologically a woman. As Connell defines: gender is historical, where somehow submissiveness of women is respected in the society. For this I think, Maud does not mind for Humphrey’s words. Nevertheless she has masculinity as such, and the novel cannot boycott her. This situation totally resembles to our society where we find some women like Maud Brewster, who really questions the traditional definition of women.

Finally, Jack London through this novel shows that there are some Mauds in the society and society must respect them, who are the pillars of modern state. This is masculinity, and the novel is a Bible of it.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7th ed. Bangalore: Eastern Press, 2004.
- Adams, Hazard, ed. "The Second Sex". *Critical Theories since Plato*. Florida: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc, 1992. 993-996.
- . ed. "Poetics". *Critical Theories since Plato*. Florida: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc, 1992. 49-60.
- Auerbach, Jonathan. *Male Call: Becoming Jack London*. Durham N. C.: Duke University Press, 1996.
- Baskett, Sam S. "Sea Change in *The Sea-Wolf*". *American Literary Realism*. N.P., n.p., 1999. 5-22.
- Bly, Robert. *Iron John: A Book about Men*. New York: Vintage Books, 2004.
- Bonne, Joseph. *A Gender Studies: New Direction in Feminist Criticism*. ed. Judieth Spector, Bowling Green Ohio: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1986.
- Carroll, Bret E. "The Religious Construction of Masculinity in Victorian America: The Male Mediumship of John Shoebridge Williams". *Religion and American Culture*. California: University of California Press, 1997. 27-60.
- Connell, R.W. "Masculinities: Reply". *Gender and Society*. N. P., Sage Publications, 1998. 474-477.
- Demetriou, Demetrakis Z. "Connell's concept of Hegemonic Masculinity: A Critique". *Theory and Society*. N. P., Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001. 337-361.
- Digester, peter. "Performativity Trouble: Postmodern Feminism and Essential Subjects". *Political Research Quarterly* 47 (1994): 655-673.
- Donaldson, Mike. "What is Hegemonic Masculinity", *Theory and Society*. Special

- Issue of *Masculinities* 22, N. P., Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1903. 643-657.
- Gurian, Jay. "The Romantic Necessity in Literary Naturalism: Jack London".
American Literary Naturalism, Durham N. C.: Duke University Press, 1996.
112-120
- Hidaka, Tomoko. "Corporate Warriors or Company Animals?: An Investigation of Japanese Salaryman Masculinities across Three Generation". Diss. University of Adelaide, 2006.
- London, Jack. *The Letters of Jack London*. ed. Early Labor, Robert C. Leitz, III, and I. Milo Shepared. S. Voss. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988.
---. *The Sea-Wolf*. ed. New York: Bantam Books, 1904.
- Lorber, Judieth. "Review: Man's Gender politics". *Gender and Society*. N. P., Sage Publications, 1998. 469-472.
- Macmillan, Malcolm. "Limitation to Free Association and Interpretation",
Psychological Inquiry. N. P., Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2001. 113-128.
- Martin, Patricia Yanci. "Review: Why Can't Man be more like a Woman? Reflection on Connell's Masculinities". *Gender and Society*. Sage Publications Inc., 1998. 472-474.
- Mitchell, Clark Lee. "And Rescue us from ourselves: Becoming Someone in Jack London's *The Sea-Wolf*". *American Literature*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998. 317-355.
- Papa, James A. Jr. "Canvas and Steam: Historical Conflict in Jack London's *The Sea-Wolf*". *The Midwest Quarterly* Pittsburgh: Pittsburg State University, 1999. 274-284.
- Pitcher, Edward W. "The Sea-Wolf: Jack London's Swinish Title". *ANQ*. Lexington: Heldref Publications, 2003. 42-44.

Robinson, Forrest G. *Having It Both Ways: Self-Subversion in Popular in Popular*

Western Classics. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico press, 1933.

Ruland, Richard and Malcolm Bradbury. *From Puritanism to Postmodernism: A*

History of American Literature. New York: Penguin Books, 1992.

Sanders, Pamela Peden. "The Feminism of Dorothy West's *The Living is Easy*: A

Critique of the Limitations of the Female Spheres Through Performative

Gender Roles". *African American Review*, 36 (2002): 435-436.

Seidler J. Victor and Michael Schwalbe, *Man Enough: Embodying Masculinities*,

Contemporary Sociology. N. P., American Sociological Association, 1999. 49-51.

Stacey, Judith. "Toward Kinder, Gentler Uses for Tosterone". *Theory and Society*.

Special issue: Masculinities. N. P., Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993. 711-721.

Tandt, Denchristophe. "Amazons and Androgynies: Over Civilization and the

Redefinition of Gender Roles at the Turn of the Century". *American Literary*

History, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996. 639-664.

The Holy Bible. ed. N.P., The Gideons International, 1978.

Thompson, Mitchel. *Reproductivity, the Workplace and the Gendering of the Body*.

Law and Literature. California: University of California Press, 2002.