

A Feminine Encounter of Power

ZAINAB AKRAM

Assistant Professor, Department of English
Sardar Bahadur Khan Women's University Quetta.
Email: zainabmazhar1509@gmail.com

Dr. FOUZIA REHMAN KHAN

Assistant Professor, Department of English
Sardar Bahadur Khan Women's University Quetta.
Email: fozia.wu@gmail.com

Dr. SAIMA RAUF

Associate Professor, Department of English Literature
University of Balochistan Quetta.
Email: prof.rauf2014@gmail.com

Dr. SUMAIRA SHAFIQ

Assistant Professor, Institute of Kashmir Studies
University of Azad Jammu & Kashmir, Muzaffarabad Azad Kashmir.
Email: sumi_raja@yahoo.ca

Abstract

*The fairy tales are supposed to be tales of fantasy and imagination, with a happily ever after. But several grim disguised aspects are also interlocked in main themes. Mostly interwoven in hegemony power acts are the cloaked counter hegemony actions that occur side by side. The fairy tales transmit power ideologies in everyday scenario, unlike any magnificent magnitude, which are constantly countered through implicit and explicit endeavors of the characters. These everyday counter hegemony acts may seem trivial, but they possess the capacity to transform a character. Thus, the study uses the theoretical framework proposed by Gramsci (1971) to evaluate the counter hegemony acts of characters against power and hegemony. The characters of Golilocks, Trollbella and Alex Bailey, from Colfer's (2013) *The Wishing Spell* are thematically analyzed. The findings reveal that counter hegemony could occur at a personal level against everyday hegemony that might cause hindrances to a person's potential of action, growth and contentment. The counter acts against power found in the text were not politically initiated under an organized leadership. However, the findings also reveal that the counter hegemony acts lead towards establishment of a new power status on a different level. Furthermore, this process could be scrutinized as a sign of continuity in life.*

Keywords: Fairy Tales, Hegemony, Counter Hegemony, Characters.

Introduction

The existence of several kinds of weird flows and caprices of the playful stuff in fantasy literature could easily be ignored as fake appeals for atypical audience. But, the thoughtfully appealing hegemony encounters to readers who are already trapped in one, could not be overlooked. The fairy tales grasped the

readers like a picture or poem, which reflects back to them through dialect, looks and trope. Essentially, the mirrors conversed the imageries, which are reflected, and fairy tale literature likewise offers the readers with a reminder of their thought structures, along with social and psychological struggles.

The fairy tale characters conform to a prevailing standard and a power structure. However, there is no certain anarchic struggle to disrupt the structure, as the persons' thoughts subconsciously surrender to an authoritative power center. Though, the fairy tales are drenched with existing culture, additionally, the profusion of psychological and social structures, along with subversive potential valences of contemporary fairy tales, are overpowering.

The contemporary fairy tales, however, are breaking the conventions and frequently make up the reader's experiences to non-traditional literary realms. Therefore, the post structural and contemporary authors seemed to occupy the readers' imaginings and propose subversive and counter hegemony considerations of the established power structures and conventions. The terms hegemony and counter hegemony by Antonio Gramsci (1971) presented a complex organization of hierarchal superstructures that function through social groups in the leading body's authorized control.

Thus, the undertaken study ventured to highlight in *The wishing spell* (2013), the inevitable hegemonic structures, countered by the characters in everyday power and authority at personal level. However, the specific kind of power in superstructures that treacherously domineers the institutional societal level, is not the premises of the study.

Literature Review

Power of Hegemony and Counter Hegemony

Hegemony has been the supreme and subservience in the power relational field. But, hegemony preserved power and ideological impact by exercising social power. Hegemony did not emerge directly from thinking or action, but, the leading group set the limits mentally and physically in the inferior groups and make things appear logical to endure the ascendancy of the ones who rule over them (Rivkin & Ryan, 2004; Johnson, 2007).

Furthermore, a radical viewpoint is needed for the worker to be unfettered of the philosophical shackles of the cultural administrations of the presiding group (Johnson, 2004). However, the irresponsiveness of the masses to the requests of the radicals conveyed their subordination, to the state force state and ruling class. Thus, the consciousness of being a part of a certain hegemonic power is the chief phase to a gradually advanced self-consciousness, in which philosophy and practice eventually join.

Counter hegemony, thus, was a mindful plan to destabilize the agreement or common sense, upon which rests the ruling world view. Common sense was the starting point of a counterhegemonic strategy. It was neither univocal, nor complete or consistent, rather, exposed to numerous and diverse types of communal ideas and radical plans (Wills, 2014). Thus, counter hegemony was not a scientific form of thought, but turned the existing activity into a critical one.

The counter hegemonic strategy reworked or refashioned elements constitutive of the leading hegemony. Counter hegemonic teaching needed to be engrained in subaltern affectivity. Reed (2012) suggested that the organic intellectuals instead of rejecting the subaltern, should control its passion, and tutorially occupy it to challenge the hegemonic social status from the bottom-up. It was important for an emotional pedagogy to understand emotions and affects as secluded individual experiences (Carroll & Ratner, 2010). Counter hegemony needed a disseminated passion to promote positive attitudes to boost the radical intellectual and emotional changes to rebuild (Gustavo et al., 2017; Howson, 2005). Thus, the implicit activisms strategies and critical emotional reflexivity, interrogated the emotion-laden beliefs (Zembylas, 2013).

Thence, through the affective turn strategy and the ideational component, the body and mind, emotion and reason, are blended.

Counter hegemony caught the attention of researchers by applying the concept in diverse fields and dimensions. To mention a few would be, Gillis (2011); Zembylas (2013); Kandil (2011) and works done by Chiengkul (2015), Wills (2014), and Ncube (2010).

Gramsci's Power Structure and Hegemony

For hegemony power, the social group represented the universal interests of the society by realizing the interests of the subordinate masses and winning their consent (Gramsci, 1971). It's not by force, rather ideology that was validated by materialization, that the concrete interests between dominant class and subordinate groups are managed (Sitrin & Azzellini, 2014). The profits must not be too large to make capitalist's benefits realized at the expense of workers (Zembylas, 2013). A reasonable profit must be used to improve material conditions of workers too.

In light of above discussion, the withdraw of the masses consent to hegemony was not immediate to develop a hegemonic crisis. As a matter of fact, when the power mode of production contradicted, the under privileged are provoked into a revolutionary encounter (Kioupkiolis, 2018). Thus, the under privileged, needed a decisive movement of political, intellectual and moral leadership in the superstructures to become a universal class (Gramsci, 1971). Moreover, the masses detached from the traditional ideologies and passed to an activity. Therefore, the power could rule only by changing the mode of hegemony, replacing spontaneity by constraint. Gramsci elaborated the situation as the old died and the new was not born.

Thus, when the power could no longer lead, but ruled, and the alternative leading forces were not mature enough to replace the hegemony, catastrophic equilibrium occurred leading to a passive revolution, which included cultural or ideological reorganization (Carroll & Ratner, 2010; Ahmed et al., 2010).

Gramscian Counter Hegemony

Though, Gramsci did not write overtly about counter hegemony because of prison censorship, however, different literatures on Gramsci try to interpret counter hegemony. Most of the interpretations suggested that counter hegemony could be established by means of cultural or ideological dominance of the anti-capitalist forces. Although, Gramsci, stressed the formation of proletarian hegemony before the socialist rebellion, his thoughts about the appropriate strategy for the working class to challenge hegemony earlier to the attainment of power, are blurred (Stavarakakis, 2014). For Gramsci, a hegemony power was always challenged by the continual class struggles that also created hegemony, and thus, won, protected and repeatedly fortified.

Thence, counter hegemony was the conceptual and political removal from power before winning state power (Gramsci, 1971). But, constrains occurred in strategy for counter hegemony, as lacking potential to lead a counter hegemonic struggle, the under privileged face the trench system of power hegemony. Thus, they turned to, "no destruction without construction" says Gramsci (p. 168). However, for counter hegemony, Gramsci focused the need to construct counter hegemony than destruction of power hegemony.

Thus, in the counter hegemonic project, the future proletarian hegemony should solve all the class contradictions to attract the subordinate masses. The working class-in-hegemonic struggle should come up with all the answers about organizing economic, radical, and philosophical associations with other groups as a collective will.

Consequently, working class held the leadership in the counter hegemonic struggle in the future by transforming economic structure. To gain the purpose, inconsistent common sense needed to be altered into a lucid, united idea by educating and directing the masses and eradicating unimportant corruptions. The

counter hegemony was not the hegemony of the suppressed but, a kind of groundwork for yet another, hegemony.

Personal Hegemony

Gramsci (1971) elaborated that broadly, marginal people included diverse religions and cultures. This side of Gramsci's work is frequently ignored, as writers are mostly fascinated in Gramsci's political theory to analyze capitalism hegemony, by focusing only on the history of organized groups and their efforts. But, Gramsci claimed that hegemony comes from below, from opinions, views and activities of ordinary, at a personal level.

Gramsci claimed that people selected their existence in the world willfully (Smith, 2010). A person could shape and modify hegemony in the social milieu and created the norms and rules of existence and challenged the government with unique glitches, argued M'Baye (2011). Thus, thinking and being were aspects of everyday common sense that led to self-reflection into the conscious world and re-energizing and modeling one's character. Besides, Gramsci depicted complex forces that make human subjectivity and consciousness as basic to action. The individual begins from self-knowledge and challenges classifications and categories in everyday encounter. The dominated hegemonic state could close challenges to meaning and options of transformation or eradication.

However, Gramsci was strongly attracted to groups that were regarded challenging for the dominant, as collective alternative subjectivity (Maechelbergh, 2009). Gramsci's concept of subalternity analyzed a group's position, as an adverse state, built on a absence, which could be astounded by confronting the power structures. Gramsci keenly observed the ways people were made, and made themselves, linking to the circumstances they were born in, and affecting those situations. Thus, the suppressed might not be treated as victims, but, in a depoliticized or decontextualized state. Somehow, the power resistance blurred human capacity to clearly see the choices, and to act consequently, when the alternatives were made unthinkable and turning reformism into the norm. For a social transformation, the individuality and identity could not be ignored.

The Fairy Tale and Counter Hegemony

The social criticism needed to be cloaked to veil the subversive meaning. Fairy tales apparently exemplified this radical task by being subversive. The psychological perspective explained that pleasure reading suggested remunerations (Platt, 2007). A countering message could exceed the context, and its elucidation rested on the reader as a greatest accomplishments of the fairy tale (Mirsadjadi, 2012). Besides, Bottigheimer (2009) pointed out, that fairy tales reduced differences between child and adult, man and woman, powerful and powerless, leader and follower, as wrong structures.

The fairy tales reached the verge of obscuring the limits amid imaginary and realism. Bacchilega (2013) while pointing out that, "genre mixing" commonly befalls in, "counter hegemonic practices" of fairy tale retelling, high pointed in what way the genre mixing turned the textual feature of fairy tales into generating, "reality effects", and placed the fairy tale in, "new dynamics of competition and alliance with other genres" (p. 28). These works spread knowledge of counter actions against set norms, notions and views that add to the strength and firmness of long lasted ideas, creating the relationship between counter actions and fairy tale (Craven, 2017).

The contemporary versions of fairy tales contributed to the cultural capacity of turning fairy tale stories from timeworn production, emotional, and silly to valuable rebellious retellings (Bacchilega, 2013). Books like, *The wishing spell* (2013) diverted the stereotype of a fairy tale and presented a hegemony structure of power. Therefore, the undertaken paper pursued to magnify Gramsci's thinking in the personal level area, amid self and society. Although, it is not wrong that Gramsci did not define and developed the term, with no enunciation of a theory of hegemony, still the concept explains Gramsci's philosophical, radical and

social, writings in prison (Smith, 2010). Gramsci's definition and usage of the term contradicted each other too (Fontana, 2000).

Therefore, the purpose of this research on counter hegemony was to reveal and analyze the unrecognized suppositions, power dynamic forces and social alteration aptitudes of different practices of confrontation, directed by non-conventional intents, contexts, resources and actors. Thus, the key debate of the study is to investigate the context and the counter hegemony actions of the selected female characters and how counter hegemony influenced them.

Methodology

The qualitative study sought to understand a particular phenomenon from the viewpoint of the one experiencing it (Speziale & Carpenter, 2007; Vaismoradi et al., 2013). The promising level of ludic elucidation of the undertaken qualitative study involved the thematic analysis of *The wishing spell* (2013) round a comprehension of how the apparently frivolous every day milieu engaged with counter hegemony acts. Moreover, thematic analysis has been used to identify, analyze and report patterns or themes in data (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 79). Hence, the endeavor played with the argumentative readings and re-readings of Colfer's text, with focus on characters of Goldilocks, Trollbella and Alex Bailey.

Analysis

This portion analyzed the context and acts of counter hegemony in selected female characters from *The Wishing Spell* (2013).

The Character of Goldilocks

Goldilocks of the three bear's fame is a grown-up woman now, who is a fugitive and at the top wanted list of the state soldiers due to multiple illegal enactments, crimes and allegations. Independent, defensive, skilled and proficient, she is well equipped to counter the gangs of culprits, humans and wolves alike, with her extra ordinary war skills.

The introduction of Goldilocks is the presentation of her appearance that, "something approached" on a, "cream-colored horse", was a cautious woman (p. 119). Though the description of her beauty is the typical gender description of perfection, but the, "Wanted poster for Goldilocks" depicted counter hegemony strategy (p. 119). The lady, employed implicit activism all alone, deep in the forest, signals a rebellion of the outlaw. This condition is explained by Gramsci (1971) who explicitly stated the difficulties of establishing proletarian hegemony before attacking state power. From the instant a minor crowd turns independent and hegemonic, into a novel kind of State, the need for a new rational and ethical command, a new society, develop universal concepts, developed and critical conceptual weaponries, seems necessary.

The confidence of being an outlaw, granted Goldie the confidence to counter the hegemony around. Fearlessly, she took the poster, and in a self-emotional pedagogy tore and crumpled it; and, "Her gaze was stern and determined" (Colfer, 2013, p. 120). Along with audacity, the lady had remarkable hearing. Besides, a large sword she drew, was symbolic of her resistance against power, as she, "raised it high in the air" (p. 120).

Goldie, without any aid, finally, used affective turn strategy by combining her mind and reason by putting them in body and physical actions and confronted the dual hegemony of the state and the killer wolves but, the woman clad in maroon coat did not panic and showed sword to the wolves, who, "gritted their teeth toward her" (p. 120). Goldie replied to wolves with unshaking courage, as she, "never lowered her sword". And when the wolf said his pack was hungry, Goldilocks replied that she had taught them lesson. "She

gripped her sword even tighter” (p. 121). Goldie used her talent towards the show of rebellion, as she was the best and quickest swordswoman.

Conner’s words expressed the truth that, he, “never expected a girl and her horse could be any match for six hungry wolves” and on his query that from where did she learn to fight, Goldilocks replied that from here and there. Goldie, using critical emotional reflexivity and explained to Alex on her query whether she was wanted dead or alive, that Alex should not, “believe everything you read” (p. 124).

Besides, Goldie’s gestures even attributed to counter hegemony of the five states law, who were after her. Like when she tossed a dagger on the ground from her boots, and hurriedly, “galloped off into the forest” (p. 125), leaving the twins stand motionless. Her repeated violation of the normalcy is an accepted gesture, as the wolf casually taunted her. Goldilocks established her identity as an outlaw, and it becomes tough for the ones to accept the truth who know her for her, big and blue eyes” and golden curls only (p. 119), as Alex uncontrollably exclaims, “is it really you?” (p. 124). It is the conception of a subaltern social group, in an dis-organic expansion, to stay below the level of hegemony over society (Gramsci, 1971). Only after the creation of the new state and position, the problem inclined towards a clear result.

The rebellion was at its height when, “The soldiers immediately took hold of Goldilocks and escorted her to the dungeon”, and Jack protested against her arrest. But, Goldie, courageously and determined, faces the hegemony for her implicit activism, and asks Jack to go home, as, “With good behavior, they should let me out in a few decades” (p. 401). The rebellion is also highly expressive when Jack urges her to let him escort her, but Goldilocks’s would not allow her, “Her head was filled with reasons and excuses not to let him do this. She wanted to convince him to stay and live his life” but something inside her heart wouldn’t let her (p. 409). Thus, she was brave enough to take decisions for the man she loved by taking Jack’s hand and riding away with him. Goldie, counter the hegemony and had, “broken so many laws” that the soldiers were, “determined to take her into custody by any means necessary” (p. 332).

She, in spirit of rebellion, threw away the woman ostentatious dress which she believed would distract her from achieving her motive, and using ideational component, “Her eyes were staring down at the ground, but she was blind with rage. She stood up, threw off the blue gown, and redressed in her own clothes, sword and all” (p. 337). In this scenario, hegemony was not to be considered as mere domination, rather an exploration of the numerous effects on human thought and action. Multiple social relations like, family, site, religion, labor and culture, sexuality, gender, customs, race, age and subcultures, cultural interests or identities, made human beings. Thus, particular social relations did not determine people. Human nature and self were the terrain of conflict, which were not made by invisible power, without the consensus of people (Gramsci, 1971).

The Character of Trollbella

Trollbella is the princess of the underground criminal territory of Goblins and Trolls. She, however, is fed up of the gross and uncivilized manners of the inhabitants, who are filthy and dirty too. She dreams of a human boy who could rescue her from the gross, dark under world life.

The event was the imprisonment of the twins by the trolls and goblins and they were on a wagon taken underground into the trenches. On their way down, they saw a troll girl, who seemed to be using war of position and appeared as she seemed bored and uninterested (Colfer, 2013). Trollbella’s condition is explained as a period of dictatorship which is at the beginning of every great sociopolitical transformation, the duration of which depends on the dictatorship ability to endorse common approval of the change in the economic structure. Gramsci (1971) emphasized on cultural or ideological struggle even before the conquest of state power. As a hegemonic force, a class enjoyed dominant position in economy, and the real proletarian hegemony is not possible before socialist revolution. The proletarian ideology or culture cannot acquire the status of universality, unless legalized by materialization and reinforced by political power.

She counters the hegemony by breaking the norms of the place, moves towards counter hegemony through emotional pedagogy by flirting and showing interest in Conner which was contrary to her kind, as she declares with flirty eyes that she hated that place and the troll boys (Colfer, 2013). Trollbella's confession gives her the courage to counter hegemony of her own territory, and employing affective turn strategy, she said that she could give them freedom in exchange or else, the twins, "are going to be slaves forever" (p. 252). Trollbella's rebellion was an ideational component to her own call, and she demanded something beyond decency limits, with a grin, but, if her desire is not granted, her counter hegemony attitude would turn into a hegemony of its own kind, as, "Trollbella's nostrils flared up. She didn't like negotiating. She turned around and disappeared without saying a word" (p. 253).

The Character of Alex Bailey

Half human half fairy, granddaughter of the famous fairy god mother, Alex is an extra ordinary girl of 12, who is brave and courageous to face unexpected the hurdles and unwelcoming power structures at fairy land.

The event is the class discussion about fairy tales. The teacher discussed that the solution to almost every problem is found in the fairy tales, which are life lessons veiled with colorful characters and situations. Mrs. Peters told them about the magic in some words, the gateways that welcomed all. The rebelled against the common attitude of her class mates and contrarily showed displayed special heartily interest through the "war of position" (Colfer, 2013, p. 12), and with wide eyes, she nodded and shook head. She countered the hegemony of the behavior of the class fellows through implicit activism and tried to depict her dissatisfaction with her classmates but, desolately, her anxiety was not reciprocal.

Alex's condition could be compared to the one of masses against bourgeois hegemony of her class mates. The bourgeois hegemony cannot be upheld forever, by vigorous and intentional consent of the subservient masses. As the masses never consented and the state forced power "legally" and imposed castigation (Gramsci, 1971, p. 12). The hegemony was always, "protected by the armor of coercion" (p. 263). Although, in normal conditions, the coercion elements were hidden in the hegemony, but were manifested when consent was insufficient to replicate capitalist affairs. Gramsci clarified that hegemony and dictatorship were indistinguishable, and force and consent were equal. She failed to establish a connection with her fellows on a similar ground with other kids. Finally, Alex managed to exclaim about the learning and future prevention with fairy tales. As embracing fairy tales was easier, "to find happily-ever-after" (Colfer, 2013, p. 14).

Alex tried to mix in with the girls in class, the more they drifted away from her. She wanted to become one with the class mates, but, "Alex was lonely" and she was treated as a freak, because her singularities made Mrs. Peters facial expression, "very proud" for Alex. So, Alex knew she was singled out because of her intense interest, therefore, at the next question, she put her hand up, unlike a, "teacher's pet" (p. 15).

Alex would always seek the help of her father when she was in trouble at school. The sour memories of school made her tired and wished not to be smart. To that her father narrated the story of a curved tree, which was saved from being cut, as it was tree. The confidence Alex gained helped to counter hegemony as her father realized that his daughter, "amazed him" (p. 33). Thus, on father's attempt to critical emotional reflexivity, that if the kids at school teased her, Alex, confidently replied that they were insecure because of home neglect. Alex's positive use of emotional pedagogy, with the help of her father's correct directions, and affective turn strategy, enabled her to act in controversial to her gender by confronting the hegemony of the fellow students and tackling them through the psychological explanations.

Besides, Gramsci (1971) suggests that the goal was not to stay in flight, rather, persistently pursue a goal under leadership that could challenge between center and periphery. Just then, like a true leader, Alex motivated the captives with an emotional speech, under critical emotional reflexivity, uttering that they should try to get the freedom back. Alex's ideational component, by magic of words must have inspired

them, because they all gathered around her (Colfer, 2013), proved to be the war of position which the prisoners had always wanted. The role of intellectual and through motivation, “We can do this; just be as careful as possible” made the escape possible (p. 255).

Alex empathized with the Evil Queen but soon detached herself. It was a gesture of counter hegemony by denying the identity with the subject and demanding one’s own recognition. Alex, used emotional pedagogy, and countered the hegemony of the Queen by telling her that only if the Queen had a heart she, couldn’t had done horrible things as she still was Evly. However, the Queen under critical emotional reflexivity, suggested that the hegemony of the world was the way to choose convenience over reality, and hate, blame, and fear but understand the truth.

Findings and Discussion

The findings revealed that the everyday counter acts were scattered and regular, likely to challenge power without being marked as resistance at all. Thus, the everyday counter acts were a different kind of resistance which stood apart from the continued, organized, political counter acts, which were utilized by the similar actors in other space, time or links. Therefore, *The wishing spell* (2013) seemed to confront hegemony not in its superficial liveliness, but as this playfulness meets the status quo below which it functions. It is found that everyday counter and resistance against hegemony were not easily acknowledged, like the resistances in public and collective revolts or protests. Rather, the counter acts were found to be hidden or disguised, individual and personal, and not politically manipulated. The findings further depicted that Colfer’s understanding efficiently addressed the issue of hegemonic restraint of the real world through his characters.

Moreover, Gramsci’s (1971) theory of hegemony enabled to conceive the characters on individual level, favoring a change. The findings seemed to infer that the characters undertook counter acts when their identity, contentment and individualization were threatened. They employed some strategies, but not in a linear, rather suitability mode. The findings also revealed that characters’ awareness, realization and subjectivity, which sensed a threat was answered by counter hegemony to negate the deterministic categories.

The finding also seemed to suggest that hegemony and counter hegemony are interlocked and the points where one begins and other finishes, are blurred. Thus, the former led to the latter and the latter, then, has no limits and an end. Furthermore, in true Gramscian fashion, the infinite processes continued, and as Alex’s character analysis reveal, that every minor seemingly counter action, built the bigger and major one. Goldie, was found to be countering hegemony of the state and soldiers, actually at the edge to defend her honor and name, which was dragged without evident crime, which she now ventures to protect under the stake of her reputation. And Trollbella, was already tired of hegemony activities and does not let got the chance to counter it, under the very roof of hegemony. The three characters did not necessarily counter the feminist hegemony, but rather, it was the long-term breaking norms of the society and behavior of the people against which the three characters venture to establish their own identity.

Besides, the hegemonies countered by the three characters were necessarily not against the feminine issue, or to relegate a great state political structure, rather, the effects were seen in the actions that depicted them as autonomous and expressive. As further effects, these characters did not desire to turn over the political set of norms, but their actions were quite effective to produce some cracks in the set system which might not even feel the tremors of their rebellious counter hegemony actions. Thus, the characters were prepared with confidence to confront the upcoming challenges. But, interestingly, the characters on gaining success after countering a hegemony, do not stay in the realm of subversive acts only, rather appear to enjoy the victory of being and stepping into another state of hegemony, made with their conscious consent.

Consequently, the implication could be that the counter acts were performed in a regular way, seldom politically projected, but normally typical and semi-conscious activities, in a non-dramatic, non-challenging or unfamiliar way to challenge some form of power, without revealing the actor or the act. Otherwise, the acts were non-political. Besides, the acts were done by individuals or small groups without a formal leader or organization, rather, stimulated by an attitude or hidden cause.

Conclusion

Thus, it is concluded that counter hegemony acts are a practice in everyday life. The counter acts entangle with everyday power that is not separate or independent. Moreover, the counter acts are found to intersect the powers rather a single power. Therefore, the nature of these counter acts is heterogenic in variant contexts and situations. Besides, there is no universal strategy behind the counter acts, but an active and sensible preparation and a will for the counter hegemonic acts.

Accordingly, the undertaken fairy tale also suggests that fancy permits persons to escape the submission to the force that restricts its mobility. Hegemony is dangerous as it controls the way people ponder and act, but is threatening too as it forbids the capability to envision results by interpretation of difficulties. Additionally, an identification of the counter hegemony acts is a tough target to achieve, as too many other expressions appeared to be resistances too. Thence, difference, deviation, or individuality could not be labeled counter act. Therefore, an inclusion of every act would turn out to be less interesting or useful.

The undertaken characters from the book, challenge hegemony restraint, by favoring an inventive and nuanced reliance to correct the world in their own vision. Thus, the undertaken fairy tale is found to symbolically reflect norms that reinforced a hierarchical civilized process in society that are challenged through counter hegemony.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the study could be extended by a comparison of counter hegemony acts of selected male and female characters. This would widen the approach of characters influence by the variant contexts they belong to and their mental, moral, psychological and intellectual approaches.

References

- Ahmed, Z., Hopper, T., & Wickramasinghe, D. (2010). *Hegemony, counter hegemony and NGO accountability change: BRAC in Bangladesh*. Paper presented at the Sixth Asia Pacific Interdisciplinary Research in Accounting Conference, Sydney, Australia.
- Bacchilega, C. (2013). *Fairy tales transformed?: Twenty-first-century adaptations and the politics of wonder*. Detroit: Wayne State UP. Print.
- Bottigheimer, R. B. (2009). *Fairy tales: A new history*. Excelsior ed. Albany, NY: State of New York.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual. Res. Psych*, 3, 77–101.
- Carroll, W. K. & Ratner, R. S. (2010). Social movements and counter-hegemony: Lessons from the field. *New Proposals: Journal of Marxism and Interdisciplinary Inquiry*. 4(1), 7-22.
- Chiengkul, P. (2015). *Hegemony and counter-hegemony in the agri-food system in Thailand (1990-2014)*. (Master Thesis). University of Warwick, Department of Politics and International Studies.
- Colfer, C. (2013). *The wishing spell*: Little Brown and Company.
- Craven, A. (2017). *Fairy tale interrupted feminism, masculinity, wonder Cinema*, Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang AG, International Academic Publishers:
- Fontana B. (2000). Logos and kratos: Gramsci and the ancients on hegemony. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 61(2), 305-326.

- Gillis, P. L. (2011). The big four in China: Hegemony and counterhegemony in the development of the accounting profession in China.(Doctoral thesis). BA, Western State College MS, Colorado State University.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. New York: International Publishers.
- Gustavo, A., GarcíaLópez, Velicu, I., &D'Alisa, G. (2017): Performing counter-hegemonic common(s) senses: Rearticulating democracy, community and forests in Puerto Rico, capitalism nature socialism, DOI: 10.1080/10455752.2017.1321026. Routledge, Taylor and Frances.
- Howson, R. (2005). *Challenging hegemonic masculinity*.London:Routledge,
- Johnson, R. (2004). Masculinities on a New Frontier? Bush, Blair and the War on Terror. *Soundings* 28(winter): 75–86.
- Johnson, R. (2007).Post-hegemony? I Don't Think So. *Theory, Culture & Society*. SAGE, London, Los Angeles, New Delhi, and Singapore), 24(3), 95–110
- Kandil,H. (2011). Islamizing Egypt? Testing the limits of Gramscian Counter Hegemonic Strategies. *Theory and Society*, 40 (1), 37–62.
- Kioupkiolis, A. (2018). Movements post-hegemony: how contemporary collective action transforms hegemonic politics.*Social Movement Studies*, 17 (1), 99-112
- M'Baye, B. (2011). The myth of post-racialism: Hegemonic and counterhegemonic stories about race and racism in the United States. *Australian Critical Race And Whiteness Studies Association*, 7, special issue: Post-Racial States. 2-24.
- Maechelbergh, M. (2009). *The will of the many. How the alterglobalisation movement is changing the face of democracy*. London & New York, NY: Pluto Press.
- Mirsadjadi, T. S. (2012).Unbreakable glass slippers: Hegemony in Ella Enchanted. (Bachelor thesis). Scripps College.
- Ncube, C. (2010). *Contesting hegemony: Civil society and the struggle for social change in Zimbabwe, 2000 – 2008*. (Thesis). International Development Department School of Government and Society. The University of Birmingham.
- Reed, J-P. (2012). Theorist of subaltern subjectivity: Antonio Gramsci, popular beliefs, political passion, and reciprocal learning. *Critical Sociology*, 1-31.
- Rivkin, J. &Ryar, M. (2004). Hegemony introduction. (Ed.). J.Rivkin and M. Ryan. *Literary Theory: An Anthology*. 2nded. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Sitrin, M., &Azzellini, D. (2014). They can't represent us. Reinventing democracy from Greece to Occupy. London & New York, NY: Verso.
- Smith, K. (2010). Gramsci at the margins: subjectivity and subalternity in a theory of hegemony. *International Gramsci Journal*, 2, 39-50.
- Speziale, S. H.,&Carpenter, D. (2007). *Qualitative Research in Nursing: Advancing the Humanistic Imperative* (4th ed.). Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams and Wilkins.
- Stavrakakis, Y. (2014). Hegemony or post-hegemony? Discourse, representation and the revenge(s) of the real. In A. Kioupkiolis& G. Katsambekis (Eds.), *Radical democracy and collective movements today* (pp. 111–132). Farnham: Ashgate.
- Vaismoradi, M., Turunen, H., &Bondas, T. (2013). Content analysis and thematic analysis: Implications for conducting a qualitative descriptive study. *Nursing and Health Sciences*,15, 398–405
- Wills, J. J. (2014). The world turned upside down? a critical enquiry into the counter-hegemonic potential of socioeconomic rights praxis in global civil society.(Doctoral Thesis).School of Law College of Arts, Humanities and Law University of Leicester.
- Zembylas, M. (2013). Revisiting the Gramscian legacy on counter-hegemony, the subaltern and affectivity: Toward an 'emotional pedagogy' of activism in higher education. *Cristal,Critical Studies in Teaching and Learning*,1(1), 1-21.