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Considered to be one of the greatest American novels is F. Scott Fitzgerald's *The Great Gatsby* (1925). This exemplary novel illustrates American society and culture from the 1920s, but is still relatable today by illustrating the act of chasing after the American Dream. This theme of grasping onto this institutionalized ideal of success can be further analyzed and broken down. First, we can ask, what persuades James Gatz to create Jay Gatsby, and pursue wealth and success? What is the motivational drive that one feels is expected of them in reaching glory and dominance in the eyes of others? My suggestion is to look closely at gender, specifically what is considered to be manhood. In this essay, I will analyze masculinity through the lens of Judith Butler's *Gender Trouble*. Although Butler's *Gender Trouble* is used mainly in feminist discourse, her theories apply to gender and sex in the broader sense, and I will analyze the dynamics and workings of masculinity in *The Great Gatsby* using her philosophical idea that gender is a social construct. By focusing on the performative nature of gender, we can see how masculinity in *The Great Gatsby* is defined by wealth, success, and being the dominate-in-control figure. This is significant because the novel reveals the social expectations such as success and dominance in the gendered-male, and that there are certain perceptions to masculinity in regards to how the body and its external appearances are structured.

The first thing I want to analyze in this essay is how the body informs us of gender, and in relation to masculinity, Tom Buchanan is a perfect example of this analysis. When Nick sees Tom after a period of a few years, he gives us a detailed description of him:

Two shining arrogant eyes had established dominance over his face and gave him the appearance of always leaning aggressively forward. Not even the effeminate swank of his riding clothes could hide the enormous power of that body. . . you could see a great pack of muscle shifting when his shoulder moved under his thin coat. It was a body capable
of enormous leverage -- a cruel body. His speaking voice, a gruff husky tenor, added to the impression of fractiousness he conveyed. There was a touch of paternal contempt in it. (7) I will label this as a “text-book” construct in relation to masculinity. I believe we could all agree that this description of Tom Buchanan informs us of his character; the dominant, machismo-male figure. One crucial aspect to this passage is Fitzgerald's language, specifically his use of the word *leverage*. I stated this as Fitzgerald's language, but it's also Nick's language too since he is the narrator. So through the eyes of Nick, the bondsman, Tom's body is capable of enormous *leverage*. The term has two dimensions to it: financial, and personality, but both convey power nonetheless. In financial terms, Tom is the embodiment of wealth, and what wealth can do, and this will be analyzed later. In terms of personality, Tom's enormous stature has the power to influence and control anyone, or any situation he sees fit. What I want to point out, too, is that Tom behaves this way in our favor – he fulfills our expectations of being the aggressive, dominate male character in the novel. An example of this is how Tom talks and acts toward Wilson when he and Nick stop by Wilson's garage:

“Hello, Wilson, old man,” said Tom, slapping him jovially on the shoulder. “How's business?”

“I can't complain,” answered Wilson unconvincingly. “When are you going to sell me that car?”

“Next week; I've got my man working on it now.”

“Works pretty slow, don't he?”

“No, he doesn't,” said Tom coldly. “And if you feel that way about it, maybe I'd better sell it somewhere else after all.”

“I don't mean that,” explained Wilson quickly. “I just meant ----”

His voice faded off and Tom glanced impatiently around the garage. (25)

I highlight this dialogue because it illustrates the way we *expect* Tom to behave. In this scene, we see
how Tom exercises dominance by controlling the situation. After Wilson tries to make a simple, friendly jest, Tom goes all alpha-male, and breaks contact, thus holding some leverage over Wilson. Nick even describes Wilson in this manner: “He was a blond, spiritless man, anaemic, and faintly handsome. When he saw us a damp gleam of hope sprang into his light blue eyes” (25). Wilson's physical appearance is notably weaker, especially in relation to Tom's. Because of the dynamic we see between the two, the jovial slap on the shoulder at the beginning of the passage suggests a subtle, physical gesture of dominance on the behalf of Tom.

Tom's behavior, though, is derived from a social construct. With the physical appearance of his body, it's expected for him to be dominate and aggressive. In regards to this idea that the body “informs” us of gender, Butler states, “The sex/gender distinction and the category of sex itself appear to presuppose a generalization of 'the body' that pre-exists the acquisition of its sexed significance. This 'body' often appears to be a passive medium that is signified by an inscription from a cultural source figured as 'external' to that body” (175). What is demonstrated through Tom is that his body conveys his masculinized gender. Butler suggests that this is a performative act of gender. Tom's powerful, impressive physique enables this idea of social expectations in the way Tom should act and behave, and this creates/shapes his aggressive, alpha-male persona. Masculinity often determines dominance in our culture, and the more “manly” a body is, the more we expect dominance and aggression from it.

Making gender-like assumptions based off of external appearances is nothing we're unfamiliar with. They are ideas that are implemented within us that come off as second nature. We can even look to Fitzgerald as a verification of this notion. In Matthew J. Bruccoli's book Fitzgerald and Hemingway: A Dangerous Friendship, a book compiled of notes and journal entries between the two authors, what comes to surface is Fitzgerald's sense of inferiority. In Chapter II, Bruccoli notes how when the two writers first met, Fitzgerald was already an established author. He had written: This Side of Paradise, The Beautiful and Damned, The Great Gatsby, Flappers and Philosophers, and Tales of the Jazz Age.
Hemingway on the other hand had only published two things, and was just getting started. “Yet from the inception of their friendship there was a role reversal. The famous author was awed by the apprentice” (Bruccoli 20). There are a couple of factors at play in this. The first is that Fitzgerald did not go overseas during World War I, and he felt he had missed a test of his manhood (Bruccoli 20) while Hemingway was known as being a war hero. It's important to note that Hemingway was not injured in battle, but as Bruccoli states, “[this was] a reputation he [Hemingway] did not discourage” (20). The second is that Fitzgerald was a failed athlete. “Fitzgerald was a disappointed athlete who admitted that he sought literary recognition to compensate for his failure at football. At five feet seven inches Fitzgerald was too small for football” (Bruccoli 20). It's interesting to observe that Fitzgerald's inferiority complex stems from the fact that his body was too small and not powerful enough to play football. Hemingway was the opposite of Fitzgerald in terms of body composition. “Hemingway looked like an athlete; he seemed bigger than he was at six feet and 190 pounds” (Bruccoli 20). As Bruccoli mentions, Hemingway promoted his reputation as being pugilist and claimed he had been trained by professional boxers in Chicago (20). It's worthy to point out the opposing figures of Fitzgerald and Hemingway because they both demonstrate the cultural conventions of manhood. Hemingway does not correct anyone of the rumors regarding his reputations as battle veteran and athlete, but let's his body speak on behalf of his reputations while Fitzgerald's body had “failed him as a man,” and this creates and shapes Fitzgerald's inferiority complex – something that he carried around within him. *The Great Gatsby* was written before Fitzgerald met Hemingway, and we see these similar masculine constructions, the one's that are absent from Fitzgerald, in Tom. Nick tells us when introducing Tom that, “among various physical accomplishments, had been one of the most powerful ends that ever played football at New Haven -- a national figure in a way” (6). As Bruccoli has laid out in Chapter II of his book, the social constructs of masculinity were prevalent during Fitzgerald and Hemingway's time, and we can see how social expectations are what produce the notion of the “body
informing gender” that we see in real life and in *The Great Gatsby*.

One main point to Butler's theory of gender is that gender is not necessarily informed by the sexed body: “gender is neither the casual result of sex nor as seemingly fixed as sex” (8). Masculine and feminine traits are interchangeable between the sexes, and not particular to one. Jordan Baker also gives us an understanding to how masculinity is used, and perceived throughout the novel. An example comes from the first Gatsby party that Nick and Jordan attend. When Gatsby asks Jordan to come speak with him, Nick says of Jordan when she gets up, “I noticed that she wore her evening-dress, all her dresses, like sports clothes -- there was a jauntiness about her movements as if she had first learned to walk upon golf courses on clean, crisp mornings” (50). What's interesting about this passage is the command that Jordan exercises. Nick specifically describes Jordan's movements as jaunty; he is distinctively noting Jordan's self-confidence. As for Jordan, it's no matter if she's in sports clothes or elegant attire, she takes control of her situations. It is also interesting that Nick compares her dresses to her sports clothes because this suggests that, no matter what circumstance Jordan is in, she is in competition, and ready for dominance. Nick even describes her face as arrogantly superior: “The bored haughty face that she turned to the world concealed something” (57). Jordan's haughty face hid, as Nick tells us, her dishonesty: “She was incurably dishonest. She wasn't able to endure being at a disadvantage. . . I suppose she had begun dealing in subterfuges when she was very young in order to keep that cool, insolent smile turned to the world and yet satisfy the demands of her hard, jaunty body” (58). What Nick reveals to us about Jordan is that her arrogantly, rude smile she puts on is there to indulge in certain expectations that would be associated toward her physique – expectations of dominance, and deceit is one thing she employs to achieve her goals. I would also like to point out that these expectations of dominance don't necessarily mean outside perspectives, but inward – Jordan's expectations to her own body. We can look back at the point when Nick first sees Jordan to get a sense of her body: “she turned a page with a flutter of slender muscles in her arms” (17), and “Her body
asserted itself with a restless movement of her knee, and she stood up” (18). Nick notes her muscles and how her body's language speaks in a confident and forceful manner. We get a slight, masculinized body in Jordan. I believe it is important to state how I don't believe that confidence, dominance, competitiveness, arrogance, sports, and having a muscly physique are traits that only belong to men, but what I'm bringing to mind is that these are the social constructs of “being a man”; these are the expectations tied to masculinity. To tie Butler back into this, Jordan demonstrates how masculinity can also be something a woman exercises, and this is the idea that the sexed body (female) doesn't create a feminized gender (or what we associate as a feminized gender). Jordan utilizes the expectations of a masculinized gender in order to be in control – to be the dominate figure.

When it comes to the body, we can examine its form and keep in mind the cultural gender-assumptions attached to it, and then question the validity of these assumptions that are linked to the bodily figure itself in order to expose any fixed ideas on body/gender relations. We get a sense of this when Nick sees Gatsby for the first time: “Something in his leisurely movements and the secure position of his feet upon the lawn suggested that it was Mr. Gatsby himself, come out to determine what share was his of our local heavens” (20). The body language that Nick sees Gatsby give off illustrates a man of power; he sees confidence and magnificence in his figure, and this is what Nick expects of Gatsby. He has heard the rumors of his massive wealth, and so Nick has some presumptions in the way Gatsby will behave and carry himself. This is why Nick never realizes that he is talking to Gatsby at Gatsby's party. When Nick does realize who he is talking to, he sees Gatsby's smile:

It faced -- or seemed to face -- the whole external world for an instant, and then concentrated on you with an irresistible prejudice in your favor. It understood you just so far as you wanted to be understood, believed in you as you would like to believe in yourself, and assured you that it had precisely the impression of you that, at your best, you hoped to convey. (48)
In this tableau, Nick is captured by Gatsby's elegance and is still under the presumption of a wealthy and powerful man. While Gatsby's persona doesn't convey dominance, it still enables this idea of the powerful male because as Nick sees the smile, the smile lets the recipient act the way they want to convey themselves so we see how Gatsby's smile actually lends power, and it's through this idea that Gatsby is the powerful male with the authority to influence others. The idea of Gatsby doesn't last though. As Butler expresses, “Any theory of the cultural constructed body, however, ought to question “the body” as a construct of suspect generality when it is figured as passive and prior to discourse” (175-76). Nick questions Gatsby's whole persona when the smile isn't present anymore: “Precisely at that point it vanished – and I was looking at an elegant roughneck, a year or two over thirty, whose elaborate formality of speech just missed being absurd” (48). The prior ideas that Nick held in regards to Gatsby vanished with Gatsby's smile. This exchange between Nick and Gatsby demonstrates how prior ideas of the body, or physical appearance do not inform any sort of gender identity, and how the body's movements and appearance often suggest something entirely different about creating an identity.

I have highlighted how social constructs create certain expectations of gender when we view and analyze the body. To reiterate, Judith Butler's theory on gender is that gender is a construct, and that the body doesn't necessarily inform or create gender, but that gender is often assumed, or shaped from social expectations. Tom's muscular, athletic physique gives us assumptions on how he will act and behave. The social expectation toward Tom is that he will be a machismo, male figure, and this is indeed how he acts – this is how masculinity is derived from him. Jordan Baker also has the athletic physique, and she carries herself, as Nick states, jauntily. Jordan assumes arrogance in her movements, and the way Nick takes note of her body is slightly masculinized. Jordan's masculinity is derived from her body, and her want to be dominant. Again, I must state that women don't need to act outside of these conventions in order to be a woman, but I'm bringing to mind how masculinity is perceived, and how it is a social construct. What Jordan Baker demonstrates is how a sexed body doesn't produce a
gender that “corresponds” to its body; Jordan Baker has traits that are often associated to the male sexed-body. So Jordan Baker reinforces Butler's idea in that she demonstrates the performative aspect of gender. Then Gatsby's external appearance demonstrates how physical appearance is a facade, and how any presumptions regarding the body should be analyzed and questioned in order to deconstruct the social conventions that create and shape gender identity.

Understanding gender construction in regards to masculinity we can now see how masculinity is perceived and defined in *The Great Gatsby*. We can ask the question, what makes the man, or more specifically, what is the idealized male figure? Wealth and success suggest a way in which to define manhood. Tom Buchanan is wealthy. As Nick points out, “His family were enormously wealthy ---- even in college his freedom with money was a matter of reproach” (6). Because of his family's fortune, Tom has always had power, and keeping his physical stature in mind, Tom's wealth is an extension of his masculinized body; his wealth gives him the ability to be in control much like his powerful stature (his conversation with Wilson). An example of this is the first time Nick goes over to Tom and Daisy's for a visit. Nick recalls the situation like this: “I've got a nice place here,' [Tom] said, his eyes flashing about restlessly. Turning me around by one arm, he moved a broad flat hand along the front vista, including in its sweep a sunken Italian garden, a half acre of deep, pungent roses, and a snub-nosed motor-boat that bumped the tide offshore” (7). We see how Tom actually uses his body to showcase his “empire” to Nick; it's as if Tom is connecting the dots for us and conveying the idea that his stature and his wealth are one in the same. Tom's wealth reinforces the idea of power and dominance, and this ties into the ideas behind masculinity so we can see from a cultural perspective how wealth could define manhood and set a standard definition in regards to masculinity.

If we look to Fitzgerald's lifetime, we can see the want and desire for wealth, and how it sheds light on these ideas of power and control that we see in Tom Buchanan. Fitzgerald's first job after his “failed” military service was in New York advertising, and he took this job in order to marry Zelda
Sayre. But, as Bruccoli notes, “she [Zelda] proved unwilling to wait or to live on his small salary” (19). The economic implications are clear to Fitzgerald; no money equates to no success – money is an extension to power and control to one's life. It's at this point that Fitzgerald quits his job and decides to rewrite the novel he wrote during his military time, *This Side of Paradise*, and in short, the novel became a success. Bruccoli states, “Published by Scribners, *This Side of Paradise* was a surprise success in 1920, selling 40,000 copies in its first year. Money poured in as Fitzgerald became a skilled writer of short stories for the slick magazines. His income for 1920, his first full year as a professional writer, was $18,500 – which had the purchasing power of more than $100,000 in 1994” (19). Fitzgerald married Zelda in the month of April 1920. I reiterate, the economic implications are clear, but this time money equates to success, power, and control. I feel it's important to state that because Fitzgerald had money doesn't mean that he had power, or domination, or control over Zelda. Also, I don't intend to use Bruccoli's chapter as a negative view towards Zelda Fitzgerald either because money was something to keep in mind during the early 20th century. I highlight this section of Fitzgerald's life because it reveals the importance of money, and how to a man this may be a measure of manhood/masculinity because money does illustrate power and most importantly control, and it seems to be an extension to masculinity. From Fitzgerald's success came the life of glamour: “Fitzgerald became a celebrity for his talent, handsome looks, and ebullient behavior” (Bruccoli 19). He and Zelda became the equivalent of a stylish, good-looking Hollywood couple; they became an ideal. It's this type of success that a standard is set; Fitzgerald manifested a type of the male ideal, though perhaps, lacking in the physical attributes department – the athletic body, but he showed to the public eye his charm, his success, and thus displaying a controlled, powerful lifestyle. Maybe he illustrated a romantic type of living at a time of rambunctious and “morally-loose” behavior, the 1920s. We can see how Fitzgerald's wealth and success creates a male, ideal model to “chase” after because this example is still seen today with our current celebrities. We still have standards to inform us of our masculinity and what is masculine.
There's always that man in the spotlight that we point towards to inform us of masculinity.

It's no wonder that James Gatz's vision of Jay Gatsby is to be a rich and powerful figure. When Gatsby tells Nick about the conception of himself, Jay Gatsby, Nick informs us of this: “The truth was that Jay Gatsby of West Egg, Long Island, sprang from his Platonic conception of himself. He was a son of God -- a phrase which, if it means anything, means just that -- and he must be about His Father's business, the service of a vast, vulgar, and meretricious beauty” (98). The most intriguing part of this passage is the specific description of the Platonic self because this details everything we need to know in regards to what is considered the most ideal from of the male figure in the novel\(^1\). The seventeen-year-old James Gatz finds a seemingly ideal of masculinity displayed through Dan Cody: “The transactions in Montana copper that made him many times a millionaire [also] found him physically robust. . . a gray, florid man with a hard, empty face – the pioneer debauchee, who during one phase of American life brought back to the Eastern seaboard the savage violence of the frontier brothel and saloon” (99-100). Dan Cody has the qualities that the young James Gatz desires; he has the wealth, and he has the physical attributes that Gatz is attracted to, and so he sees Dan Cody as a profound influence for the persona that he intends on inventing. So what Nick relays to us through Gatsby's story when Gatsby sees Dan Cody's yacht off the shore of Lake Superior is, “that [the] yacht represented all the beauty and glamour in the world” (100). The physical appearance of manhood is quite exquisite and romantic to the young James Gatz, and “So he invented just the sort of Jay Gatsby that a seventeen-year-old boy would be likely to invent, and to this conception he was faithful to the end” (Fitzgerald 98). It's these ideas of wealth and power that Dan Cody represents the ideal male figure, and that Gatz “added to the pattern of his fancies” (Fitzgerald 99) to shape the figure of Jay Gatsby. From the death of Dan Cody, Nick states that, “the vague contour of Jay Gatsby had filled out to the substantiality of a man” (101). It's in this past moment that Gatsby has obtained a definition to manliness.

\(^1\) Plato's Theory of Forms. For Further reading see Plato's Republic Book VII (The Allegory of the Cave), and Book X for insights into Plato's ideas about the Ideal state and mimesis.
One thing we can learn from Jay Gatsby is that these preconceived notions of masculinity (wealth, power, dominance, and the “manly body”) are only romantic notions, and not the ideal representations of masculinity. What we can gather from the downfall of Jay Gatsby is that there is no Platonic man, and so James Gatz created an inferior male figure. This links up with Butler's idea of gender being a social construct: “As a result, gender is not to culture as sex is to nature; gender is also the discursive/cultural means by which 'sexed nature' or 'a natural sex' is produced and established as 'prediscursive,' prior to culture, a politically neutral surface on which culture acts” (10). The romantic figure of Jay Gatsby is destroyed because of Gatz’s preconceived ideas of the ideal man. As Richard Lehan notes in his article “Inventing Gatsby” he states, “The romantic unfolding of self is inseparable from the romantic belief that the universe is alive and that fulfillment is a process of growth. The emphasis is on becoming rather than being, on expectation rather than reality” (192, my emphasis). Lehan points out in his article that in keeping up with these romanticized notions of the self, Gatsby crumbles. What I want to state is that the death of Jay Gatsby doesn't suggest that social constructs of gender are harmful, but what his death illustrates is that, in chasing/creating/inventing the Platonic self, we do see how there are preconceived notions to masculinity, and through the persona of Jay Gatsby these qualities are exaggerated through his performance, and this ultimately brings a greater attention to how masculinity is being constructed, shaped, and molded.

As an extension of power, or rather dominance, in the male figure is womanizing. We see this first thing in Chapter I when we learn about Tom's mistress, Myrtle. We literally learn everything about how Tom is a man in Chapter I so it is no surprise that we learn this mistress information when we just learned about his body composition. Myrtle is also known to Daisy, and so we get a sense in how womanizing is viewed as an extension of manhood. But, Tom is not the prime example of this because Gatsby sees this behavior in Dan Cody, his mentor, and so Gatsby mimics Dan Cody. Nick relates of Gatsby, “He knew women early, and since they spoiled him he became contemptuous of them, of
young virgins because they were ignorant, of the others because they were hysterical about things which in his overwhelming self-absorption he took for granted” (98). We see here how Gatsby mimics what he sees as manhood from his mentor, and this is all demonstrated before Gatsby meets Daisy. As negative as womanizing is, we do see how the characters see this as a masculine practice, especially Gatsby who directly mimics it from Dan Cody.

It's worthy to bring attention to the narration of *The Great Gatsby*. The novel is famously known as being told through Nick's perspective. This is significant because Nick is the one who delivers everything addressed in this essay. What Nick brings attention to are the social constructs of masculinity. He is the observer of everything that goes on in the novel, and it's his language that has shaped the masculinized ideas brought up in this essay. The intriguing factor to Nick's narration, though, is how he reveals these social constructs of masculinity and questions them through the actions and behaviors of the other characters. In the opening of the novel Nick states, “for the intimate revelations of young men, or at least the terms in which they express them, are usually plagiaristic and marred by obvious suppressions” (1-2). This passage is directly due to Gatsby's Platonic ideal of himself, but we see how it extends to Tom as well. The actions and behaviors of both men are called into question, and it is Nick who observes all of this; Tom almost loses the women in his life thus exposing his aggressive, manly personality, and Gatsby's ideal man crumbles under the weight of its own romantic notions. Nick is quite drawn to the absurdity of Gatsby's character. When Gatsby tells Nick of his past, like being from a wealthy family from the midwest, but saying San Francisco instead, being educated at Oxford, and living like a young rajah in Paris, Venice, and Rome, Nick has to restrain himself. He states, “With an effort I managed to restrain my incredulous laughter” (66). The Gatsby persona is too constructed on the point of absurdity. I reiterate that Gatsby's persona is an exaggerated persona with exaggerated qualities, and they drive home the point of how these masculine notions are simply of the performative nature. Whether Nick is a reliable narrator, or not doesn't matter
because he tells the story as he sees fit, and no matter what the verdict is, he still illustrates the ideas surrounding masculinity in regards to power, wealth, success, and dominance.

Gender acts like a script by demonstrating a determination to act a certain way. By analyzing gender in *The Great Gatsby* the social constructs and the preconceptions to manhood are put on display. The most revealing of these preconceptions are revealed through Gatsby, or rather the idea of Gatsby because of his exaggerated qualities, but through this exaggerated persona he informs us of what is perceived to be a successful male. To quote Judith Butler she states:

> On some accounts, the notion that gender is constructed suggests a certain determinism of gender meanings inscribed on anatomically differentiated bodies, where those bodies are understood as passive recipients of an inexorable cultural law. When the relevant 'culture' that 'constructs' gender is understood in terms of such a law or set of laws, then it seems that gender is as determined and fixed as it was under the biology-is-destiny formulation. In such a case, not biology, but culture, becomes destiny. (10-11)

While the idea is to deconstruct the constructed notions of gender, and reveal that it isn't as fixed as the sexed body, or determined by the sexed body, we can see in the novel how this idea presented by Butler shows how culture is what shapes 'destiny' as she calls it, or shapes the outcomes of life. What *The Great Gatsby* does is verify these notions that Butler brings up in *Gender Trouble* through upholding any of culture's masculinized notions like aggression, power, success, and dominance. The novel even gives the example of the non-masculine character of Wilson, who, as Nick tells us, is known by the other characters as “his wife's man and not his own” (136). Wilson is the male who doesn't exercise dominance, and from this his wife is cheating on him. But, these notions of gender aren't only limited to fiction. We still have expectations of what it means to be a man today. These expectations may not be the exact same as they were in the 1920s, but from the interaction between Fitzgerald and Hemingway they are still relatable. Bruccoli even gives an account on the tolerance of
alcohol between the two writers: “One of the renowned alcoholics of American letters, Fitzgerald actually had a low tolerance for alcohol. Hemingway was a functioning alcoholic with a large capacity for alcohol” (21). The interactions between the two authors are still relevant to today, especially with TV shows like Mad Men. Mad Men is another example where the qualities of masculinity are displayed, but are influencing audiences today, and so we can see how culture heavily influences identity even though the TV show is set in the 1960s. To close, this essay isn't about defining masculinity, but demonstrating how culture defines it and using The Great Gatsby to illustrate these defining qualities of masculinity. Also, by using Butler's ideas on the performative nature of gender, we can see how gender isn't a natural occurrence, but rather a cultural occurrence. It is culture and its social constructs that shape and invent gender identity.
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