



International Journal of Research in English

ISSN Print: 2664-8717
ISSN Online: 2664-8725
Impact Factor: RJIF 8.00
IJRE 2024; 6(2): 25-28
www.englishjournal.net
Received: 24-04-2024
Accepted: 30-05-2024

Sabrata Manzoor
Department of English,
Barkatullah University,
Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh India

Confronting a contradiction on feminism

Sabrata Manzoor

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33545/26648717.2024.v6.i2a.201>

Abstract

The contemporary discussion focusing round the boundary of women's activist talk has of late been extremely strong in resolving the issues of specific biased ideas in our current male centric construction. This paper is an endeavour to show the continuous conundrum existing in the realm of woman's rights which has completely scrutinized the male centric culture and has naturalized sexual personalities, in this way extolling man's incomparability and domain. The male centric culture lionized the beliefs of quickness, mental fortitude, and keenness and thought about these as the main extraordinary assets of man in the public eye. The characteristics of being compliant, kind and minding in nature is viewed as "great" and selective characteristics of a lady. Despite the fact that these characteristics are "great" to ladies, they are disposed of from being considered as widespread in nature and are considered immaterial in the standard cultural structure. These characteristics are treated as mediocre, and solely womanly and consequently can't make their substitute the traditional male centric social request. Therefore, a dilemmatic circumstance emerges here. My work is to demonstrate the way that this situation can't be uncovered in that frame of mind of orientation explicit human characteristics.

Keywords: Dilemmatic, immaterial, fortitude, feminism, orientation explicit human characteristics

Introduction

The paper is an endeavour to show the continuous Catch 22 (or it would be smarter to say a inconsistency) existing in the realm of women's liberation which has completely evaluated the male centric culture and has naturalized sexual characters. This male centric culture has consistently celebrated the matchless quality of man as opposed to ladies in the public arena. This has led to demeanour of mastery among men. The women's activists belittle the prevailing method of creation, which honours man over ladies and gives support to all reasonable characteristics as only moved by men of which ladies are denied of. History uncovers that ladies are treated as objects to be utilized and consumed by others; they are additionally taken advantage of for modest work, paid low wages and are segregated all through. The male centric culture which advanced double-dealing, bondage and biased perspectives against ladies at large, added to treat ladies just as a 'second sex'. In the tune of Carol Gilligan (Gilligan, 1993) ^[3], we can say women's voice as different that gets suppressed due to the roar of patriarchy. Hence, the central concern of feminism is the unequal power hierarchy which governs our society due to the gender divisions. And this hierarchy in power relations has given rise to a paradoxical phenomenon in the world of feminism.

The term 'second sex' is first theoretically used by Simone de Beauvoir. In her magnificent work *The Second Sex*, she very well portrayed the history of feminist structures and the evolution of the coming into being of the feminist thought. See, Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, London: Vintage, 1953 ^[1].

Conventional male centric culture has stringently held or sorted orientation characteristics, by which an individual is called either a man or a lady. Men are considered to have the qualities of reason, insight, fortitude, boldness, dominancy, etc. These qualities basically have a place with the human class. Going against the norm, womanly characteristics incorporate being benevolent, profound, thoughtful, mindful, delicate and compliant. Ladies having these attributes are viewed as ideal in our customary cultural design. In any case, these brand name characteristics which are evened out for the entire ladies class are not viewed as "optimal characteristics" in the standard area of human culture.

Corresponding Author:
Sabrata Manzoor
Department of English,
Barkatullah University,
Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh India

Female characteristics for which a lady turns into a certified lady are not thought as commendable enough to remain at standard with manly characteristics. Standard male centric culture has consistently misjudged and viewed such female qualities as basically auxiliary, unimportant and substandard. Subsequently, a conspicuous inquiry emerges, "Are ladylike characteristics (moved by women) non masculine nature?" I go to the inquiry later.

We get a picture of the existence of patriarchal culture even in literary works. In the "Seven Ages of Man" (Shakespeare, 1964, 266) ^[9]. Shakespeare wonderfully portrays the world as a stage in which all men and women are mere players. There he describes the different stages of an individual's life in the line of a man's stages, where a women's role remains only as a lover, for whom a man sings ballads of love. On the contrary, a man's role in different stages of life is seen as a brave and courageous agent who is able to make rationally wise and just decisions. This sort of hierarchy between men and women envisages in every part of human society. Beauvoir claims.

Society enslaves Nature, but Nature dominates it. The Spirit flames out beyond Life, but it ceases to burn when life no longer supports it. Women is justified by this equivocation in finding more variety in a garden than in a city, in a malady than in an idea, in a birth than in a revolution; she endeavours to reestablish that reason of the earth, the mother, dreamed by Bachofen, in order to become again the essential in phase of the inessential. But as she, also, is an existent having transcendence, she can give value to that domain where she is confined only by transfiguring it: She lends it a transcendent dimension instead of taking up her existence: She contemplates in the clouds the pure Idea of her destiny; instead of acting she sets up her own image in the realm of imagination: That is, instead of reasoning, she dreams. (Beauvoir, 1953, 630) ^[1].

In a male centric culture, it is by and large thought to be that a lady's job is very unique. Ladies are best considered to take up the job of a specialist who really focuses on others and feels worry for others. The basic properties of care are mindfulness and empathy. Actually care is a sort of value generally connected with others (particularly between two unique people): The person who is minded and the carer. Here we track down a kind of segregation among the two gatherings included. The individual who is really focused on is certainly underestimated to be a male in our man centric culture and is, hence, mentally remembered to be in a progressively unrivalled and predominant position. Our male centric culture has universalized this thought that a man will deservedly get care from a lady (the carer) and has taken it to be valid for all times. Going against the norm, the characteristics of being mindful and caring have become normal and very natural (as surmised by the male centric culture) characteristics of ladies.

We can think about care as a goodness of rationale or understanding. In the event that we think profoundly, we will see that the nature of care, usually viewed as second rate (Freudian view as Freud examines a lady in his Therapy as a masochistic, denied, and deceitful being) assumes a critical part in human relations. For Freud, a young lady can't easily obliterate their Oedipus complex, while a kid can commit it without any problem. The origination of super inner self among young ladies and young men are not same. The super self-image of ladies relies upon the connection, dread and reliance. Accordingly, ladies have confidence in

widespread guideline is so flimsy also, they attempt to examine equity from the degree of individual connection and so on. Freud writes.

I cannot evade the notion (though I hesitate to give it expression) that for women the level of what is ethically normal is different from what it is in men, their super ego is never so inexorable, so impersonal and so independent of its emotional origins as we require to be in men. (Freud, 1991, 342) ^[2].

Freud's analysis seems to me more prejudice as it comments on women's life and psyche from a deviant level and aims to show that women's moral voice is sub marginal in complain to men heterosexual standard. However, let me focus on main concern. Care, as an inherent quality in all men and women helps to strengthen and deepen any relational bond. Even we can consider it as a moral concern that upholds itself to form a unique knot in our society. Virginia Held considers.

The ethics of care builds trust and mutual responsiveness to need on both the personal and wider social level. Within social relations in which we care enough about each other to respect each other's rights, we may agree for limited purposes to imagine each other as liberal individuals, and to adopt liberal policies to maximize individual benefits. (Held, 2002, 168) ^[5].

So, on the off chance that we think about care as something sub-par and distanced from the manly characteristics, then all our own relations will lose and our social servitude will be debilitated. Accordingly, it would be inappropriate to consider care as a one-way connection had solely by a carer (ladies) who really focuses on a man. Any great relations, be it at the individual or cultural level, develops and grows just when the nature of care is traded among the carer and the minded for. Then, it no longer remaining parts a one-way connection; it ends up being both way relations where the quality is neither stifled nor treated to be of optional significance. That's what I trust there might be in the middle of between the considerations and articulations of man and a lady. However, this doesn't involve that there will be a distinction in their virtues of the characteristics like starvation characteristics or manly characteristics and so on. Differentiation and contrast concerning rank and ordered progression is strikingly seen among orientation relations like male/female, etc. In any case, the virtues play a few logical parts which are over this multitude of types of differentiations. Carol Gilligan thinks.

My research suggest that men and women may speak different languages that they assume are the same, using similar words to encode disparate experiences of self and social relationships. Because these languages share an overlapping moral vocabulary, they contain a propensity for systematic mistranslation, creating misunderstanding which impede communication and limit the potential for cooperation and care in relationships. (Gilligan, 1993, 173) ^[3].

As we know that language is a social phenomenon, so being a communicative being, humans try to express their thoughts in the realm of social practices. We find that in a patriarchal society, virtues are imposed in a dualistic manner where rationality is a sign of manhood and politeness is a virtue of woman. Because of the situation and social status, women cannot express their bravery and adventurous mood towards the society as it would lead to anti patriarchal norms. Similarly, a man can possess some qualities such as

politeness, gentleness, love and care, but he will be compelled to suppress all these as these qualities are considered contrary to mannish attitudes. Thus, all kinds of people attempt to offer their viewpoints which is not their own. Their way of behaving, mentalities, and articulations of temperaments are developed and recommended by the man centric culture. They are committed to stifle their own specific manner of considerations. Also, their common language can't catch their inward considerations as these are deterred by specific male centric accepted practices. Therefore, it makes a misconception and a correspondence hole that prompts the uncooperative connection among men and women. So, here, the natural circumstances don't smother the voice of the ladies or make their personality not set in stone by the standard society. In the event that we make a study of ladies' circumstance, we must observe that the ladylike qualities had been completely dampened by their social, practical circumstances, where she is constantly thought of and uncovered as "non-sense", "shameless", and "egotistical" being, even whose mind limits and the feeling of exactness are consistently lesser than a man's mind. The universes where female sexual orientations are banished consistently make a difference with the manly universe where men have administering power with putting together capacities. It is valid in the Beauvoirean sense that however ladies are an essential piece of the society, however they never develop an autonomous society or would never remain with their head high and express their voices without a second thought, due to being set apart as a lady. Indeed, even in the standard society, assuming that ladies join as one and guarantee for their freedoms, in such cases their solidarity or fortitude is many times described as inconsequential and piddling. In view of this, even today, ladies' freedoms are gathered in minority discussion. At the point when male centric culture offers assistance, numerous multiple times it shows that they help a gathering who are irrelevant and not deserving of living in any sense. Ladies have no private privileges, and it is the honourability of the male centric culture to offer them some right. The stage or the models on which ladies outline their privileges guarantee should likewise be as per the interests of the man centric culture. Juliet Mitchell says.

Women come into the movement from the unspecific frustration of their own private lives, find what they thought was an individual dilemma is a social predicament and hence a political problem. (Mitchell, 1971) ^[7].

Care, as a quality can develop from dual relationships to multiple relationships among different individuals, which can help in bringing about harmony and integration in the broader framework of society. I agree that the categorical framework and experiences of men and women are different in our day to day life cum works. Because, their life and thoughts are occasionally sensitive to the society and they have to face different situations according to their gender. However, it doesn't infer that a man's idea will be sane and more down to earth than a lady. A man and lady ought to regard one's sentiments. However, we acknowledge that there is a division of work depicted by male centric culture, considering the natural and mental instincts of a man and ladies, yet it would be outlandish to guarantee that the virtues of a lady's work are viewed as mediocre as men. As we probably are aware that man centric social orders endorse a few characteristics like pleasantness, care, cherishing, tolerance, and feeling are ideal lady

characteristics, yet these characteristics are not thought of as reasonable for a man. We ought to initially get the origination free from oddity here. A conundrum is an explanation that obviously goes against itself, yet it very well may be viewed as evident. Here the mystery lies in the origination of the characteristics of a lady endorsed by men. The male centric culture doesn't acknowledge lady characteristics as important like that of men's characteristics. So we saw that the boundaries are not a similar which are evened out for an optimal male being. Be that as it may, assuming we call ladies as less a human being, then it would prompt an error of thinness of the meaning of human. So there is no method for denying the origination that ladies are likewise individuals. So their characteristics would likewise be called human quality like their feelings are human feelings. Additionally, assuming we consider man as a person, then they ought to likewise acknowledge these characteristics (which are generally viewed as moved by ladies) as human characteristics. Any other way, men would be dealt with as a less human animal which they are not. So now we can guarantee that care morals isn't as it were a morals for ladies, however a morals for all upright concerned creatures, as in a decent connection, care ought to be awry. It means that a lady should think often about a man and a man ought to value the consideration got by them. Similarly, a man ought to really focus on a lady and a lady should see the value in the consideration of man. It isn't what care the two provides for one another and who wins, however, that both ought to see the value in one another's consideration with adoration and gratitude. Nel Noddings thinks about that care is comparable with possibly complementary connections among man and ladies. Eco-woman's rights guarantees that the two ladies and nature are to be treated for the other. They need to feel worry for different individuals from the general public. So they become a lot more mindful and sympathetic. The basic piece of ladies in our general public lowers on the inspirational allure of care for other people. Man centric culture grabs away the moral development of ladies and propels them to adhere to indiscriminately specific guidelines to serve their male partners. The standard society fail to remember that we can't achieve a widespread moral rule regarding a bunch of rules, yet there needs a group of human sentiments like inclination, love, care that justifies maintainable advancement in our worldwide morals and public activity as well.

In the event that sanity is viewed as the main boundary of being a human, then we can well certify that man doesn't have this as an inborn quality (deduced). But some unmistakable organic highlights, there is no quality (from the feeling of virtues) that is given to human creatures specifically. All characteristics (moral and conduct characteristics) are socially developed, furthermore, these characteristics are subject to encounters and moral practices. In this universe of globalization, women's activist morals propel ladies to contemplate their judiciousness and orientation correspondence. Woman's rights don't give significance just to the standardizing norms of ladies in saying that care is uncommonly a higher worth that is moved by ladies. Rather, the women's activists attempt to fit moral and regularizing characteristics in worldwide guidelines, where people, creatures, nature-all are remembered for this domain. Characteristics like consideration, love, feeling (which are submersed by man

controlled society) are in a comparable situation with levelheadedness, equity, enthusiasm, and so on. Assuming we like to live calmly, we should guarantee this multitude of characteristics as most noteworthy moral characteristics that would be impartial. People need not to champion themselves from the orientation predisposition distinguishing proof; they ought to elevate themselves to the undeniable individuals, so that as an individual they can hold their own fate into their own hands.

Conclusion

This paper reveals the paradox within feminism by critiquing patriarchal culture, which has historically celebrated male superiority while relegating women to subordinate roles. Feminist critique highlights how patriarchal structures have devalued traditionally feminine qualities and reinforced gender-based power imbalances. The inherent qualities of care, empathy, and nurturing, often associated with women, are undervalued compared to masculine traits. This disparity in recognition and valuation contributes to ongoing gender inequalities. The feminist movement seeks to dismantle these entrenched norms, advocating for equal recognition of all human qualities, thereby fostering a more equitable society.

References

1. Beauvoir DS. *The Second Sex*. London: Vintage Classics; c1953.
2. Freud S. *On Sexuality*. London: Penguin; c1991.
3. Gilligan C. *In A Different Voice*. Cam, Mass, London: Harvard University Press; c1993.
4. Hamington M. *Embodied Care: Jane Addams, Maurice Merleau-Ponty and Feminist Ethics*. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press; c2004.
5. Held V. *Feminism and Political Theory*. In: Simon RL, Ed. *The Blackwell Guide of Social and Political Philosophy*. Oxford, Mass: Blackwell Publisher; c2002.
6. Kant I. *The Foundation of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Translated by Beck LW. New York: Liberal Arts; c1959.
7. Mitchell J. *Women's Estate*. London, New York: Penguin; c1971.
8. Noddings N. *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics & Moral Education*. Berkeley, LA, London: University of California Press; c1984.
9. Shakespeare W. *As You Like It*. In: Alexander P, Ed. *The Complete Works*. London & Glasgow: The English Language Book Society & Collins; c1964.