

The Blend of Literary Terms Igniting Patriarchy

Trisha Tewari*

The literary concoction that has blotted the progress of gender-neutrality has propagated itself. Communication is our greatest asset. But, we have been belittling the potential of communication. Do we ever realise that the terms that we are frequently referring to are sanctimoniously levelling one gender and overlooking the presence of other genders? The patriarchy has gripped the language, or the language has been a propagator of masculine obsession is debatable. The introduction of gender-neutral language and its importance is sometimes rendered unacknowledged. Language is a strengthened tool of communication. It impacts the mindsets. The terms, the words, all of it gets ingrained in the minds and propagates from therein. The generalisation of the word "man" has been pedestalizing gender. The word "man" is often used to refer to humans in general, while the reference to other genders hasn't been considered needful.

The references such as a female doctor, or female police directly target the nurtured, propagated patriarchy. A doctor is a doctor irrespective of gender, but excruciatingly the word doctor directs its reference to males, and women need to be separately addressed. Another example pops out as we say "working mother". Do we ever feel the need to refer to fathers the same? Here, claps the patriarchy. It is entrenched in how we mingle and intermixes the words to portray the ever-existing chauvinism and in turn, it brims to the surface.

We have to knock the existing perspectives and the terms we are used to referring to. The use of the words like "chairman", "cameraman" wipes out the mention of accomplished females marking in this field. Instead, we ought to use a chairperson and a cameraperson. We need to address the sanctity of the potential person in this field and ought not to reduce it to mere negligence. To achieve a gender-neutral and gender-balanced world, we need to scratch the existing perspectives and adopt a new lens to view this world.

The definition of language is not confined to the medium of communication but it moulds the psyche and personality. The propagation of patriarchy through language has dug the wound deeper than ever. It conveys the perception, the avenues and hence the mindsets. When the language comes as a saviour to the existing stereotypes and prejudices, there the problem aggravates. Society has generalised prioritising and addressing the males first and keeping the women at the back seat and hindsight. The prejudicial mindset and stereotypes are served through language when we refer to the denizens of a country as "countrymen", "all the men of the country". In the context of the kitchen the default gender used is women. The usage of certain pronouns and terms in the context of the particular domain not only disregards the existence of a

* Ex-Student

Maiteriyi College, University of Delhi

particular gender in that field but also reinstates the non-possibility of the other gender in that niche or the unlikability of acknowledging the attendance of theirs. The stark example of this context is the usage of the words like “firemen” and “policemen”. This is highly paradoxical, for the thousands of women in this field. The conventionally believed system denies the sanctity of women in the male-dominated place and in the superior posts. Hence, the terms are in accordance with orthodox beliefs. The crowd least realises the pain inflicted on women when they put in intensive labour into their jobs and move unaddressed. The argument moves as the masculine term covers all genders, but it starkly portrays the obsessive perspective and biases towards the particular gender.

When we sobriquet the women to be “lucky enough” when their husbands can manage their own chores, or “help” them in household chores. Knocking patriarchy is welcomed with misogyny! The household chores or managing your own tasks is an individual’s prime responsibility. They are completing their share of work and not merely helping their better halves. The situation would be righteously attested when the tables would turn and the husbands would be bynamed as “lucky husbands” when their wives would be helping them in the household chores and also managing their own tasks. How weird, a brow-raising statement. This is the foremost exclamation that we expect in the second set of statements, while the first is considered acceptable. This is how the prevalence of the terms and language inflicts the mindsets and gets embedded therein. The men are never questioned for the management of fatherhood along with the career, while women are always in the crosshairs. Would the same society that has flamboyantly generalised the default usage of the word “men” accept the usage of the word women to cover all genders? Here misogyny and patriarchy glorify.

It is high time that we realise the need of introducing gender-neutral language in society to address the women and to train the juveniles about the gender-balanced abode. We have to knock the ever-existing perspectives and alter them according to righteousness. We cannot take it as acceptable as we have been accustomed to seeing and hearing this. Enough is enough! We need to knock the perspectives and adapt a new lens to view this world. The gender-neutral language has to seep in through the cracked walls of society. Let us substitute the words like “businessman” with entrepreneur, the policeman with the police officer and all the other words which have been incorrectly mingled and placed to fuel male chauvinism. We have to imbibe the changes to reach the goal of a gender-balanced abode. No more can we let the patriarchy bask in the Sun of language.

References

- www.forbes.com
- www.bbc.com
- www.writingcenter.unc.edu
- www.knowledge.insead.edu
- www.abc.net.au

