

BETWEEN THE SPECIES

Heganism

ABSTRACT

An emblematic association exists between meat consumption and the gender identity hegemonic masculinity. This association is so strong that men who pursue meatless diets (especially vegans) are likely to be socially ostracized. Heganism is a diet/gender identity that aims to reconstruct hegemonic masculinity with the goal of removing these stigmas attached to male veganism. Yet heganism fails to do this, and, in fact, worsens the marginalization of male vegans. Therefore, heganism ought to be rejected. Instead, an alternative option for reducing the marginalization of male vegans could be found in the emergent literature on non-hegemonic masculinities. By rejecting hegemonic masculinity and publicizing the range of other masculine identities that exist, there is an opportunity for men to utilize their agency and interpret masculinity in their own way—especially with regards to dietary preference. In this way, focusing on non-hegemonic masculinities offers an encouraging avenue for reducing the social stigmas attached to male veganism.

THOMAS E. RANDALL
University of Western Ontario

Volume 22, Issue 1

Fall 2018

<http://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/bts/>

Introduction

This article offers a critique on the diet/gender identity *heganism*. Specifically, this article aims to explain the social conditions that gave meaning to the ideas that heganism intended to describe and embody, and, furthermore, explore whether these ideas are valuable. Coined by Kathleen Pierce in her 2010 *Boston Globe* article, heganism is a linguistic mix of the pronoun “he” and “veganism”. The term sought to describe and embody a set of ideas that challenged the social stigmas faced by male vegans, especially in Anglo-American and Western European cultures. What are these stigmas, why do they exist, and does heganism offer a valuable contribution to overcome these stigmas? If not, what other relevant options might there be? This article hopes to provide some answers to these questions. Of course, this article does not claim the answers offered are the only explanations that exist; nor is it a complete analysis of gender theory and dietary preferences given. This article only means to contribute one perspective toward comprehending the wider sociological picture on how our gender and dietary preferences fluidly interact.

This article argues the following points. First, the emergence of heganism can be suitably contextualized within the sociological literature that has documented an emblematic link between meat consumption and the gender identity *hegemonic masculinity*—a gender identity that expresses traditional masculine traits of strength, robustness, and virility (Schösler et al. 2015; Rozin et al. 2012; Adams 2010). A major source of social stigma toward male vegans lies in the influence of this emblematic connection: a man who decides to pursue a dietary preference that excludes all animal products (let alone meat itself) is likely to be ostracized and labeled by their meat-eating counterparts as effeminate and/or following an unnatural

THOMAS E. RANDALL

masculine lifestyle (Potts and Parry 2010). Heganism is best understood as a counter-hegemonic discourse that emerges to challenge this emblematic link. Second, though heganism was championed as a solution to removing stigmas from male veganism, this article argues the opposite is the case: the ideas behind heganism actually worsen the marginalization of male vegans. Third, while heganism may not offer a solution, an alternative option that avoids the problems of heganism could be found in the emergent literature on non-hegemonic masculinities. Through the possibility of non-hegemonic masculinities, men can liberate themselves from the demands of hegemonic masculinity (dietary and otherwise) and, thereby, the stigmas hegemonic masculinity attaches to male vegans.

Meat and Hegemonic Masculinity

Food consumption is “frequently linked to identity and to who we are as individuals” (Calvert 2014, 18). This is especially the case with gender identity. Indeed, much sociological research has documented an emblematic connection between meat consumption and the gender identity hegemonic masculinity. This section argues that this emblematic link is a major source of the social stigmas faced by male vegans. To understand why social stigmas toward male vegans exist, this section first elucidates what hegemonic masculinity is and what this gender identity demands of men who identify with it. This will then provide an appropriate context from which to explain the social conditions that gave heganism and its ideas and meaning.

Hegemonic masculinity is a gender identity that dominates social perceptions for a man’s gendered performances. To traditionally be perceived as masculine, one must at least manifest the following qualities: robustness, strength, and virility, often

THOMAS E. RANDALL

typified in “sporting, military and mythopoetic images” (Gelfer 2013, 78; cf. Kheel 2004, 330). These characteristics of hegemonic masculinity have become so socially engrained they are near-essentialized to a man’s very being. The archetypical image of this essentialism is depicted in the idea of “man the hunter” (Luke 2007; cf. Sobal 2005). This romanticized illustration celebrates “a primitive masculinity [...] normalizing aggressive characteristics by tying them to male, gendered (‘natural’), behaviors” (Calvert 2014, 19). As such, not only are these characteristics demanded of a man’s gendered performance, they are accepted as part of a man’s intrinsic behavior. Consequently, “Men who find it difficult or objectionable to fit into the patterns of traditional masculinity often find themselves castigated and alienated” (Craig 1992, 3).

That these characteristics are so socially engrained reveals why this form of masculinity is described as hegemonic. Drawing upon the thought of Antonio Gramsci (1971, 248), hegemony refers to where an ideology, belief or specific cultural custom of a particular group gains public legitimacy from “the entire society.” This public legitimacy allows for a belief-system to achieve domination over other relevant belief-systems to become the societal norm. Public legitimacy is not necessarily gained through coercion and violence; distinctive to Gramsci’s thought is how public legitimacy can also be attained “through culture, institutions, and persuasion” (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005, 832). This does not imply public legitimacy is always overt; the central point Gramsci makes is how a belief-system retains hegemonic status through a society’s inadvertent reinforcement of it, achieving conformity through a variety of social pressures (Lears 1985, 572). Given the normalization of hegemonic masculine expectations in Western culture, this form of masculinity has achieved dominant, hegemonic sta-

THOMAS E. RANDALL

tus, against other masculine alternatives (and femininities). By becoming the norm, the gendered expectations of hegemonic masculinity appear as the “natural” way for how men ought to perform, not as a choice amongst others.

A highly visible performance of a man showcasing his masculine identity (and thus demonstrating “normal” behavior) is the act of consuming meat. The “man the hunter” image, as aforementioned, explains why this dietary association has been established. Hegemonic masculine traits of strength and power exert into an anthropocentric worldview: men are expected to dominate “other species in nature, acting as carnivores who engage in aggressive acts to bring home food” (Sobal 2005, 137). Hunting, killing, and consuming one’s prey do not just reflect actions of robustness and force but also a desire to control the surrounding environment (Luke 2007). Consequently, the act of consuming meat has become synonymous with hegemonic masculine traits; this is especially the case with red meat, given its bloody connotations.

These theoretical speculations have been empirically documented. A recent psychological study that showcases the perceived “naturalness” of hegemonic masculine traits in men is Hank Rothgerber’s (2013) investigation into how men justify their meat-based diets. Rothgerber found in his male sample a pervasive denial of animal suffering, “congruent with male norms of stoicism, toughness, and emotional restriction. Masculine men are not supposed to relate to the less fortunate, to display sensitivity or empathy, or to discuss their feelings” (2013, 365). Indeed, as Jeffrey Sobal’s (2005, 137) earlier study corroborates, this suppression of emotion “is a useful attribute for the hunting, killing, butchering, and eating of animals.” Men are socially expected to remain steadfast in the face of

THOMAS E. RANDALL

animal slaughter, even if they have the resources to pursue a meatless diet (Gal and Wilkie 2010).

If only to reinforce this above gendered connection, meatless diets have in turn become associated with femininity and women. Carol Adams (2010, 15), who laid much of the early groundwork for a feminist-vegetarian critique, posits, “because meat eating is a measure of a virile culture and individual, our society equates vegetarianism with emasculation or femininity.” Adams’ theoretical work on this topic has since been bolstered in the psychological literature. Matthew Ruby and Steven Heine (2011), for instance, have found that omnivorous men do perceive vegetarian men as more effeminate. However, this perception is not merely descriptive: defining a man as effeminate also holds negative connotations, because it is an unnatural gendered performance for a man not to eat meat. As such, men that pursue meatless diets become ostracized for apparent feminine performances. Hegemonic masculinity thus defines femininity not only as a converse gender identity, but also as an inferior gender identity. Significantly, this discounting of femininity exposes the darker normative side of hegemonic masculinity: the historical, institutionalized subordination of women (and effeminately perceived men) through the endorsement of male (political, economic, and social) power and control.

A prominent reason offered for why hegemonic masculinity perceives femininity as inferior, and therefore seeks to separate itself from femininity and its associations, is due to the contingencies of a woman’s biology. Pregnancy, menstruation, and childbirth have led women to be perceived as “mired in the realm of nature” (Kheel 2004, 332; see Beauvoir 1974). Men, without these biological contingencies, are deemed free

THOMAS E. RANDALL

to transcend the natural world and women with it. As Marti Kheel writes in this context, women become the “other” against which “masculine self-identity is established” (Kheel 2004, 332). Hegemonic masculine men therefore seek to avoid associating themselves with feminine expressions, fearing contamination and thereby a fall from their transcendence.

Of course, the dominance of hegemonic masculinity has not been without challenge. The strength of a hegemonic belief relies upon how successfully it is perceived to reflect the wider interests of society (Lears 1985, 571). Hegemonic beliefs are therefore always vulnerable to attack if subordinated groups persuasively make a case against it. As Walter Adamson (1980, 174) writes, given the challenge for a hegemonic belief to appeal to such a wide selection of people, it is “bound to be uneven in the degree of legitimacy in command and to leave some room for antagonistic cultural expressions to develop.” Indeed, there have been several influential social movements, especially following the Second-World War to the present, that have challenged hegemonic masculinity’s darker normative side. Examples include the women’s labor movement undermining male economic dominance in the workplace and the animal liberation movement questioning the hegemonic masculine desire to dominate over nature (for further detail and examples of these social movements, see Randall 2016; Calvert 2014; Rogers 2008). What is interesting about these social movements for the present discussion is how they have caused a “crisis in masculinity.”

This “crisis of masculinity” concerns how several social movements (including the two above-mentioned) have influentially marginalized many hegemonic masculine traits as negative social behaviors (especially behaviors that encour-

THOMAS E. RANDALL

age dominance over others and the environment). In turn, this marginalization has threatened the very identity of hegemonic masculine men, leaving them ostracized from expressing any meaningful gendered performances. Without any obvious alternative masculine identity to hegemonic masculinity, given its dominance, hegemonic masculine men have focused attention toward the few legitimate avenues they have left for visibly expressing their gender identity. Given its emblematic connection, the emphasis on meat consumption has intensified as one of these few visible expressions. With the domination of femininity and nature socio-historically interlinked with the consumption of meat, hegemonic masculine traits of strength and robustness become symbolically locked into the eating of meat itself. In this way, meat consumption has been fortified “as a means of restoring hegemonic masculinity in the face of threats to its continued dominance” (Rogers 2008, 282). Rothgerber (2013, 364) echoes this view: “compromised masculinity can be regained through meat consumption.” However, putting the spotlight on meat consumption as an expression of hegemonic masculinity has also intensified the stigmas attached to those men who choose to not eat meat. Vegan men in particular, through not eating any animal products whatsoever, face the harshest brunt.

An example of how intensified these stigmas have become is outlined in Annie Potts and Jovian Parry’s (2010) New Zealand-based study. Potts and Parry (2010, 53) investigated social reactions to the concept “vegansexuality,” defined as “vegans engaged in sexual relationships and intimate partnerships only with other vegans.” The reactions they documented to vegansexuality were largely hostile with most contempt coming from a single group: omnivorous, heterosexual men. Generally, this group branded all vegansexuals as “(sexual) losers, cowards,

THOMAS E. RANDALL

deviants, failures and bigots” (57). To understand why this adverse reaction took place, it is useful to examine the more specific comments that were directed separately toward female and male vegansexuals.

This group perceived the female vegansexual’s rejection of meat as an unnatural “misguided abstinence, beneath which powerful, ‘natural’ carnal urges roil unabated” (60). These “natural” carnal urges not only regard a female vegan’s suppressed desire for “real food” (a “natural” meat-based diet), but also a desire to be dominated (sexually) by a “real man” (a meat-eating male). Consequently, female vegansexuals are merely engaging in “a form of self-inflicted sexual sobriety” (60), even if they have sex with vegan males. “Sex” is therefore understood through the hegemonic masculine lens as “‘real sex’, meaning heterosex with a meat-eating man” (60). A direct implication of this hegemonic masculine reaction to vegansexuality is that it, therefore, deems homosexuality as “unnatural,” given it does not fit the “real sex” description.

Given the above definition of “real sex”, male vegansexuals were automatically regarded as “unmanly,” effeminate, and gay, regardless of their actual sexual preference. Homosexuality, as such, retains the connotations hegemonic masculinity attaches to it; despite the progress made by the gay rights movement, homosexuality continues to be mocked and held in scorn through the hegemonic masculine lens. Moreover, male vegansexuals were also considered weak and lacking the level of sex drive and virility that meat-eating males possess. Altogether, what Potts and Parry’s study demonstrates, as Laura Wright comments, is “men who choose to be vegan face immense social pressure to acquiesce and eat meat, or they risk

THOMAS E. RANDALL

experiencing ridicule, judgment, and ostracism by their fellow [meat-eating] men” (2015, 125).

A Conceptual Critique of Heganism

Heganism can be appropriately understood as emerging from this crisis of masculinity, especially as a reaction to the intensified social stigmas faced by male vegans. Heganism is a counter-hegemonic discourse that aims to “reconceptualize veganism as an alternative ultramasculine choice,” to prevent male vegans having to navigate a social minefield for retaining their masculine identity (Wright 2015, 124). The concept was coined in 2010 by Kathleen Pierce, writing for the *Boston Globe*, and has subsequently been used in many other popular media outlets; David Quick’s 2011 “Rise of the ‘Hegans’” article in the *Charleston Post and Courier* is another explicit example.

Pierce and Quick describe hegans in the following way. Hegans are men usually between 40 and 60 years of age, who choose to eschew eating meat to correct for an unhealthy past of excessive meat consumption. Indeed, much dietary research does report a link between extreme carnivorous behavior (especially with red meat—the pinnacle of the hegemonic masculine diet) and increased cholesterol and heart problems (Key et al. 1999; White and Frank 1994). With this focus on health, hegemonic masculinity is reinterpreted as a male being dominant not over others, but over their own wellbeing: practices of self-control “may contribute to more healthy food preferences with respect to meat” (Schösler et al. 2015, 158). Moreover, male desire for power can also be understood in a different light within this context. Instead of pursuing power for the sake of dominance, power can be seen as having the ability to protect those who are most vulnerable. As Rothgerber (2013, 372)

THOMAS E. RANDALL

notes, power is “a man’s responsibility to protect animals from harm - that real men protect those that are dependent on them.” In this way, men can retain the traits of hegemonic masculinity by being vegan without the negative social connotations.

This link of power over diet also interconnects with a man’s economic and social influence too. A 2010 article in *Businessweek* profiled what was called “The Rise of the Power Vegans”—business-owners who are already so financially secure they can retain a domineering hegemonic masculine status while choosing to be vegan. This rejection of meat-based diets by the very wealthy is significant for two reasons. First, hegemonic masculinity’s demand for dominance over others has historically linked consuming meat with male economic and social clout. Meat became “closely associated with power and privilege,” especially throughout medieval Europe: “a staple for the gentry and a rare treat for the peasants” (Ruby and Heine 2011, 448; see also Kheel 2004, 330). If class privilege is no longer associated with meat consumption, this symbolic connection is further broken. Second, having financial control over one’s lifestyle and dietary choices depicts a man secure in his masculine identity, not the opposite. As Wright comments, hegans “are something other than merely vegan; they are so ultramasculine as to be able to make that dietary choice manly as well” (2015, 126).

Heganism therefore works in the following way. Hegemonic masculine men that have already secured their gender identity are able to break the connection with meat consumption without being ostracized. This is done by redirecting the dietary expression of hegemonic masculine traits that were symbolically tied to the meat product into the vegan diet. If veganism can satisfy the social expectations of hegemonic masculinity, then

THOMAS E. RANDALL

meat consumption becomes unnecessary. If anything, meat consumption becomes a less attractive dietary choice given the health concerns correlated with doing so. In turn, veganism becomes accepted by hegemonic masculinity. By making veganism an appealing dietary option to men, heganism was championed as potentially being able to remove the stigmas from male vegans.

However, it is unlikely this resolution will come from heganism. For one thing, references to heganism and its ideas have recently declined. Heganism has not had any major references since Wright's mention of the concept in her 2015 work *The Vegan Studies Project*. It is presently unknown what explains this loss of popularity. What can be commented on, though, is how conceptually persuasive heganism is on its own merits. In fact, a closer examination of heganism demonstrates that this diet/gender identity is actually unhelpful toward removing the stigmas from male vegans. This is for two reasons. First, for men to identify with heganism in the first place they need to have already established some kind of hegemonic masculine status before switching their diet to veganism. Both Pierce and Quick write how it is men who have already lived a life of excessive meat consumption (and achieved the hegemonic masculine traits figuratively tied into this diet) before they become vegans. This is clearer in the *Businessweek* article: only those secure in their financial and social dominance are manly enough to then switch to a vegan diet without being ostracized. For those men who have not already established hegemonic masculine traits (either through being physically strong, financially secure, or recognized for having excessive carnivorous behavior in their past), their switch to veganism is far more socially precarious.

THOMAS E. RANDALL

Second, heganism (inadvertently or otherwise) strengthens the marginalization of certain diet/gender identities, and not the other way around. For it appears that rather than making veganism more acceptable to men, heganism instead creates a new dichotomy between two masculine identities: the hegans and “unmanly vegans”; the latter identity here continues to be ostracized. For those men who are unable to perform hegemonic masculine traits, two major outcomes occur: either meat consumption will persist as an emblematic way for men to align with this gender identity, or unmanly vegans will still retain social stigma for their dietary preference. As such, heganism generates a “problematic dualism that marks a divide between the proposed vegan stereotype, ‘anemic hippie’ male vegans who are clearly considered weak, and a new variety of vegan, ‘alpha males’ whose masculine strength remains intact despite their decision to ascribe to a diet outside the norm” (Wright 2015, 126).

With heganism marginalizing hegans from unmanly vegans, heganism paradoxically reinforces the effeminate social connotations of veganism, too. If the only way to combat a femininely perceived diet is to be so hegemonically masculine your dietary preference is overlooked, then hegemonic masculinity does not lose its patriarchal values of dominance in any meaningful way. Instead, veganism without a hegemonic masculine interpretation is reinforced as feminine—far from trying to remove the idea of feminine “contamination” in certain diets, heganism only draws stronger attention to it (Wrenn 2016). The choice to be vegan thus remains an unequal one between men and women. For women, non-meat diets are still perceived as their “natural” diet, while men have to become ultra-domineering in order to overcome their “natural” meat-eating diet. Through creating this new divide between hegans and

THOMAS E. RANDALL

unmanly vegans, heganism only worsens the marginalization of non-hegemonic masculine vegan males, as well as women and femininity. For these reasons, we ought to not lament the disappearance of heganism and its ideas.

Non-Hegemonic Masculinities

Where heganism goes wrong is in its reinforcement of hegemonic masculinity as the only expression men have of their gender identity. Yet if heganism's ideas are not valuable to resolving this crisis of masculinity, might there be others? Perhaps to overcome stigmas of male vegans we should avoid appealing to hegemonic masculinity altogether. Instead we ought to explore whether there are alternative non-hegemonic masculinities that can be publicized. If other masculine identities can be expressed that do not rely on the gendered performances that hegemonic masculinity demands, then perhaps one's masculine interpretation of dietary preference can become more relaxed and less reliant on meat. In turn, the crisis of masculinity that intensified stigmas toward vegan males may be resolved and the stigmas slowly removed. This last section explores a developing literature that focuses on documenting a wide-range of non-hegemonic masculinities.

Given the dominance of hegemonic masculinity, it initially seems difficult to perceive other substantial ways one can identify as masculine: "The dominant form of socially constructed masculinity, hegemonic masculinity, tends to subordinate femininity and *other forms of masculinity*" (Newcombe 2012, 392; emphasis added). This is to such an extent that "our society currently regards masculinity in opposition to femininity" (Sumpter 2015, 105). We ought to question how legitimate this dichotomy between masculinity and femininity is. The contin-

THOMAS E. RANDALL

ued subversion of hegemonic masculinity (as with the above-mentioned social movements examined) is creating a much wider negotiating space for determining how one chooses to interpret their own masculinity—especially a masculinity that may diverge from the hegemonic norm. Publicizing these non-hegemonic masculinities may offer novel non-marginalizing ways for men to pursue meatless diets.

R.W. Connell and James Messerschmidt have both provided important sociological work individually (Connell 2005; 2009; Messerschmidt 2012) and together (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005) that presents how flawed societal perceptions are for believing there to be just one homogenous (hegemonic) masculinity that all men should identify with. In fact, given varying contexts of race, class, ethnicity, and so on, the “unique trajectories of men’s lives” means men must negotiate their own type of masculine identity within the smaller sub-cultures of society they find themselves in (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005, 845). As Messerschmidt (2012, 73) has recently argued, masculinity ought to be understood “wholly in plural terms” and to be analyzed at the “local, regional, and global levels.” This is corroborated by Angela Meah (2014, 193), who also writes, “gendered practice is more fractured and nuanced than currently allowed” through the categorization of hegemonic masculinity against femininity. What this literature suggests is that more emphasis needs to be placed on the dynamic nature of masculinities, in which “divergent versions of masculinity can coexist within a social context” (Sumpter 2015, 104). By being cognizant of and experiencing different variants of these non-hegemonic masculinities, the individual is granted greater agency to interpret his own masculine identity.

THOMAS E. RANDALL

Significantly, there are instances where multiple non-hegemonic masculinities have been documented in social spheres usually unassociated with hegemonic masculinity. Changing social and gender dynamics in the workplace and at home has engendered much “slippage” between “masculine and feminine subjectivities as individuals move between these spaces” (Meah 2014, 193). Though these shifts in gendered practices have created a performative instability that the crisis of masculinity highlights (Gregson and Rose 2000, 442-443), there are growing reports that these instabilities are being perceived as less of a threat to one’s gender identity after the individual has been exposed to non-hegemonic masculine identities over a period of time. Helene Aarseth’s (2009) 15-year study of gendered performances in the household aimed to document change for how domestic tasks were distributed between men and their partners. The study concluded that there was a change of “the administrative and emotional cohesion in the family’s daily life into a joint lifestyle project” (Aarseth 2009, 424). This reconfiguration of masculinity could in turn have significant effects on what food is chosen and prepared for consumption in the household.

Meah’s (2014) study on domestic distribution of foodwork, for instance, has challenged the hegemonic masculine perspective that men are emasculated when helping prepare and cook regular meals inside the house (and not outside on a barbeque). For some men, “the domestic sphere can represent an opportunity to retreat from the everyday pressures and expectation” of fulfilling a hegemonic masculine identity (Meah 2014, 199). The domestic sphere becomes a sanctuary from the crisis of masculinity. In turn, an opportunity arises for men to take control of their own interpreted masculine gender identity, liberating themselves from the social perception that there is just a

THOMAS E. RANDALL

single homogenous masculinity. The potential of this literature thereby lies in the recognition that masculinity can be flexibly perceived; publicizing this point can help create even larger negotiating spaces through a spillover from the domestic sphere to various parts of the public sphere (the workplace or social gatherings, for instance). By showcasing these non-hegemonic masculinities, more men will have greater resources and confidence to portray hegemonic masculinity as negative, acknowledging this gender identity's demanding social expectations. Moreover, de-gendering certain domestic activities also presents the prospect for women and femininity to detach from their objectification and association as the housekeeper.

Relevant to this discussion, increased male agency through the construction of non-hegemonic masculine identities, especially within the household, has been shown to lower meat consumption. Jeffrey Sobal (2005, 148) comments that the complexity of multiple non-hegemonic masculinities "provides opportunities for marital partners to negotiate about gender and food choices." This negotiating space is then able to mitigate the extremes and excesses of meat-based diets. What this negotiating space then does is remove the necessity of consuming meat hegemonic masculinity calls for. Ultimately, this means men "have greater freedom and control in their food choices, and are less tightly bound by singular or hegemonic cultural prescriptions to consume meat" (Sobal 2005, 149). Emphasizing the agency available to men for expressing their gender identity in multiple ways dissolves hegemonic masculinity into a plurality of masculinities.

The promise this literature holds toward resolving the crisis of masculinity is by publicizing to men that masculinity is a fluid concept. The rigidity of hegemonic masculinity is unsus-

THOMAS E. RANDALL

tainable given the complex unique lives men lead. Indeed, this is where heganism failed: it only sought to reinforce hegemonic masculinity as the only masculinity available. If the need to express one's hegemonic masculinity is no longer as demanding because of this increased fluidity, the felt need to consume meat as a part of this expression may also be relaxed. In turn, the hope would be that the stigmas of male veganism would also lose their intensity. Of course, it is not expected this change in masculine identities would occur overnight; but as Aarseth's study showed, masculine gender performances can change into non-hegemonic forms over time. Publicizing already existing non-hegemonic masculinities ushers this change along.

Conclusion

This article intended to offer a critique on heganism. It argued heganism can be suitably contextualized within the sociological literature on the emblematic link between hegemonic masculinity and meat consumption. However, though heganism sought to remove the social stigmas attached to male veganism by undermining this emblematic link, it ultimately failed. Where we may see promise in the future for overcoming the stigmas attached to male veganism is the literature on non-hegemonic masculinities. By publicizing various non-hegemonic masculinities, men have an opportunity to liberate themselves from hegemonic masculine social expectations and utilize their agency to interpret masculinity in their own way. This, in turn, offers an encouraging avenue for reducing the social stigmas attached to male veganism.

References

- Aarseth, Helene. 2009. "From Modernized Masculinity to De-gendered Lifestyle Projects: Changes in Men's Narratives on Domestic Participation 1990-2005." *Men and Masculinities* 11 (4): 424-440.
- Adams, Carol. 2010. *The Sexual Politics of Meat*. 20th anniversary edition. New York: Continuum.
- Beauvoir, Simone de. 1974. *The Second Sex*. Trans. by H. M. Parshley. New York: Vintage Books.
- Calvert, Amy. 2014. "You Are What You (M)eat: Explorations of Meat-Eating, Masculinity and Masquerade." *Journal of International Women's Studies* 16 (1): 18-33.
- Connell, R.W. 2009. *Gender: Short Introductions*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Connell, R.W. 2005. *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Craig, Steve. 1992. *Men, Masculinity and the Media*. London: SAGE.
- Gal, David, and James Wilkie. 2010. "Real Men Don't Eat Quiche: Regulation of Gender-Expressive Choices by Men." *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 1 (4): 291-301.
- Gelfer, Joseph. 2013. "Meat and Masculinity in Men's Ministries." *The Journal of Men's Studies* 21 (1): 78-91.

THOMAS E. RANDALL

- Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Translated and edited by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Gregson, Nicky, and Gillian Rose. 2000. "Taking Butler Elsewhere: Performativities, Spatialities and Subjectivities." *Environmental and Planning D: Society and Space* 18 (4): 433-452.
- Key, Timothy J., Gwyneth K. Davey, and Paul. N. Appleby. 1999. "Health Benefits of a Vegetarian Diet." *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society* 58 (2): 271-275.
- Kheel, Marti. 2004. "Vegetarianism and Ecofeminism: Toppling Patriarchy with a Fork." In *Food for Thought: The Debate Over Eating Meat*, edited by Steve F. Sapontzis, 327-341. Amherst: Prometheus Books.
- Lears, T.J. Jackson. 1985. "The Concept of Cultural Hegemony: Problems and Possibilities." *The American Historical Review* 90 (3): 567-593.
- Luke, Brian. 2007. *Brutal: Manhood and the Exploitation of Animals*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Meah, Angela. 2014. "Reconceptualizing 'Masculinity' Through Men's Contributions to Domestic Foodwork." In *Masculinities and Place*, edited by Andrew Gorman-Murray and Peter Hopkins, 191-208. London: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

THOMAS E. RANDALL

- Messerschmidt, James. 2012. "Engendering Gendered Knowledge: Assessing the Academic Appropriation of Hegemonic Masculinity." *Men and Masculinities* 15 (1): 56-76.
- Newcombe, M.A., M.B. McCarthy, J.M. Cronin, and S.N. McCarthy. 2012. "'Eat Like a Man': A Social Constructionist Analysis of the Role of Food in Men's Lives." *Appetite* 59: 391-398.
- Parasecoli, F. (2005) "Feeding Hard Bodies: Food and Masculinities in Men's Fitness Magazines." *Food and Foodways* 13: 17-37.
- Potts, Annie, and Jovian Parry. 2010. "Vegan Sexuality: Challenging Heteronormative Masculinity Through Meat-free Sex." *Feminism and Psychology* 20 (53): 53-72.
- Randall, Thomas E. 2016. "Meat and the Crisis of Masculinity." In *The Routledge Handbook to Food Ethics*, edited by Mary C. Rawlinson and Caleb Ward, 72-81. New York: Routledge.
- Rogers, Richard. A. 2008. "Beasts, Burgers, and Hummers: Meat and the Crisis of Masculinity in Contemporary Television Advertisements." *Environmental Communication* 2 (3): 281-301.
- Rothgerber, Hank. 2013. "Real Men Don't Eat (Vegetable) Quiche: Masculinity and the Justification of Meat Consumption." *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* 14 (4): 363-375.
- Rozin, Paul, Julia M. Hormes, Myles S. Faith, and Brian Wansink. 2012. "Is Meat Male? A Quantitative Multimethod

THOMAS E. RANDALL

- Framework to Establish Metaphoric Relationships.” *Journal of Consumer Research* 39 (3): 629-643.
- Ruby, Matthew B., and Steven J. Heine. 2011. “Meat, Morals, and Masculinity.” *Appetite* 56: 447-450.
- Schösler, Hanna, Joop de Boer, Jan. J. Boersema, and Harry Aiking. 2015. “Meat and Masculinity Among Young Chinese, Turkish and Dutch Adults in the Netherlands.” *Appetite* 89: 152-159.
- Sobal, Jeffery. 2005. “Men, Meat, and Marriage: Models of Masculinity.” *Food and Foodways* 13: 135-158.
- Sumpter, Kristen C. 2015. “Masculinity and Meat Consumption: An Analysis Through the Theoretical Lens of Hegemonic Masculinity and Alternative Masculinity Theories.” *Sociology Compass* 9 (2): 104-114.
- White, Randall, and Erica Frank. 1994. “Health Effects and Prevalence of Vegetarianism.” *Western Journal of Medicine* 160 (5): 465-470.
- Wrenn, Corey Lee. 2016. *A Rational Approach to Animal Rights: Extensions in Abolitionist Theory*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wright, Laura. 2015. *The Vegan Studies Project: Food, Animals, and Gender in the Age of Terror*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.