

## **I. Female Masculinity Versus Patriarchal Norms in Hotel**

Arthur Halley's *Hotel* presents the defiance of male created society by the multiple female characters in this novel. Characters like Christine Francis, The Duchess of Croydon and Marsha Prescott seems regularly crossing the threshold created by the male society. They defy such rules of do's and don'ts and follow their own conscious way of rules and abhor the male norms. The female characters of this novel do not fall into the circumstances as is designated by male characters in order to sustain their struggle in self-hood and contestation with male dominated social inhabitation

*Hotel* is the story of an independent New Orleans hotel, the St. Gregory, and its management's struggle to regain profitability and avoid being assimilated into the O'Keefe chain of hotels. The St. Gregory is supposedly based on the Roosevelt Hotel, although the old St. Charles Hotel is also cited as the basis for the novel. The novel features multiple unfolding plot lines which take place over a period of five weekdays, Monday through Friday. Some days feature self-contained episodes exploring particular elements of the routine of a large hotel in detail.

Curtis O'Keefe, the one who owns a large hotel chains plans to buy St. Gregory hotel in New Orleans as the O'Keefe chain did not have a hotel here. They had offered to pay the two million mortgages due and one million dollar and living accommodation to Warren Trent as well. However Warren did not want to lose the hotel which he had nurtured for so long. Warren Trent meanwhile decided to mark a deal with Journey man Union who wanted to enter the hotel Industry for long. Royall Edwards of St. Gregory had been appointed by Warren Trent to study and work with the two officers, if required all night, so that they complete the whole of study. However upset with the denial of entry to Negro man in the hotel, which became the

headline of newspapers, Journeyman Union broke the deal. Warren Trent had no option but to give in to Curtis O'Keefe. Christine is the secretary to Warren Trent in the novel. The story moves around Peter and Christine. They have a liking for each other. They share many things in common and feel they could be happy together. Christine is loving and caring by her nature.

Arthur Hailey is known for his in depth research of the topic at hand. He usually chooses one field to base his story on and does an in-depth study of the same.

This makes reading his books a very entertaining as well as informative activity. The story moves around one of the city hotel which is facing its financial crisis and how they manage to put it back in the business. The novel also pictures the problem and prospect of contemporary socio-economy. The characters are portrayed in such a manner that it comes alive while reading the book.

Christine Francis is shown as a woman of caliber having a quality to walk step by step with her male counterpart in her job. She is shown as a character who subverts the popular belief of a woman i.e. of a passive and demure persona; rather she is an active lady who knows how to compete with her male counterpart in this cut throat period of age. She even takes the pattern of the male designed life and subverting the rigid regime of the society. She even shows least hesitation to light a cigarette in front of her boss. She supports the person who is in difficult circumstance. Purely, she has independent psychology. Being active in romantic situation is her next appreciative quality which questions the patriarchal norms.

Duchess of Croydon is shown as a haughty and strong character, she rather places orders to her husband and her husband instead follows her rule. She is shown a character who defies the female character of being emotional and rather impulsive, the traits which is associated with the feminine gender. She is unlike the weak sex;

rather she shows prudence in any tough situation. She is not instantaneous rather she is shown as a calm woman who makes effective and wise decision, instead of taking any hasty decision. Even in the death of her husband in the accident, she seems unmoved and instead of suffering from a melancholy and deep distress, she is shown as character of enduring such female anxiety.

The third important character in this novel Marsha Prescott though belonging to an aristocratic family defies her father's reputation and sets out with her male friends to an unknown hotel. She is shown as a bold character that withstands such an attempted rape and moves on with enthusiasm in her life. Though being a victim, she is shown valiant enough to meet the people who have tried to spoil her life. She can manipulate to fulfill her personal preferences. She doesn't hesitate to propose personally for marriage who she loves.

From the very publication of *Hotel*, the work has received tremendous amount of criticism for portraying such bold characters. The female characters in this novel try to subvert the male created boundaries and are confident to search and create their own identities. Patriarchy is not always as single-sided as the belief that all men always benefit from the oppression of all women. In "Hailey's Commentaries: Best Selling Views on Latter-Day Organizations" Peter Savage writes:

Hailey's heroes and heroines are people who are not in conflict with their society. They are the cowboys of organizational life, conscious of but not swayed by the moral plexities of their times, who ultimately win out if they hold on long enough. (185)

The character like Christine Francis in the novel *Hotel* doesn't count with Peter's view. That is why a genuine research from the theoretical tool needs to carry out. Patriarchy always imposes curtailment or a boundary towards women's freedom.

Peter further in his article views:

Hailey may be simplistic about his characters but he is surely knowledgeable about the working of the organizations in which he sets them. Thus the potential pay-off with Hailey comes from his ability to take the reader behind the scenes for the inside information about the organizations in which his characters, large and small, play out their destinies. And while they are doing this, they tell you what it is like on the inside and how things work. In this way Hailey tries to tell it like it is by giving the reader the inside story with a smoothness that teases the appetite. (186)

Halley is still not for us despite this particular virtuosity. The superficiality, suited to his purpose, gets in our way again. While he may engage our emotions momentarily as he describes, Duchess of Croydon is not the one to mess with in the novel, she asks for the detail report for this misconduct to the manager of the hotel. Turning to Peter she snapped, “I insist on a full report being made to Mr. Trent, and you may inform him that I expect a personal apology” (18). Though the idea of feminism itself seeks to study the existence of women in the patriarchal society, Simone de Beauvoir raises this issue regarding woman who has been essentialized in the society with certain stereotypes like woman as a ‘flesh’, ‘related to nature’, ‘vase of blood’, and ‘open rose’. Beauvoir’s central attack is on the attitude of the scholars and writers towards woman’s position. In *Of Women Born*, Adrienne Rich exemplifies the idea of patriarchy explicitly and views as:

Under patriarchy, I may live in purdah or drive a truck; I may rise my children in a kibbutz, or be the sole breadwinner for a fatherless family... I may serve my husband his early-morning coffee within the

clay walls of barber village or march in an academic procession; whatever my status or situation, my derived economic class or my sexual preference, I live under the power of the fathers, and have a access only to so much of privilege or influence as the patriarchy is willing to accede to me, and only for so long as I will pay the price for male approval. (58)

They especially concern the patriarchal ideology maintains that the primary element of patriarchy is the relationship of dominance. Christine Francis is not the one to mess with in the novel, she is meticulous about her environment and she is shown not to allow any misconduct to her. Regarding feminism, it is divided into two waves: First wave feminism which is also known as liberal feminism and the second wave feminism also known as radical feminism. Anna Snitow in “A Gender Diary: Conflicts in Feminism.” views as “Women as subject; on equal pay for equal work on the necessity for women to be better representer in political life, the media, history books etc” (18). Moreover Liberal feminism had an emancipator Orientation. As Chris Beasley notes:

On compensatory reversal which masculine bias was exposed and women's theorizing and objectives were rescued from obscurity. The aim for the most part was to emancipate women from their past neglect and marginalization, to make women part of the social landscape, to assimilate women into society, which would necessarily transform that society. (19)

Here, Beasley argues that the first wave feminism rebels against the marginalization of women and demands access to positions that require knowledge and confer power. Furthermore liberal feminist asserts a commonality between men and women which

requires women to become the same as men.

In *Sexual Politics* a modern feminist Kate Millet's signifies a significant stage in 'political' feminist writing on literature. Millet's use of the term "patriarchy" (9) described the cause of women's oppression. Men enjoy power through constraint women. The feminist analysis of politics, therefore, rose from the fact that women have been excluded from the exercise of political power. There in the novel, Christine Francis's condition is exactly like those who are still under represented in decision making bodies worldwide.

Thus we can say that these above review of the novel and ideologies regarding Radical Feminism and the condition of being a radical feminist suits to the lady protagonist, Christine Francis as a lady ready to walk neck to neck with male members of society which is the valiant part of the novel. Even, we can assume by this valiant move of the female protagonist in *Hotel* that she demands equality in male dominated society. Radical feminism in simpler forms also indicates that women are not docile and they are not going to tolerate any misbehaving from the male society. Equality is what their demand is. So if they are treated badly then sudden outcry of protest is what we witness. We can see the same situation in this novel.

*Hotel*, presents the story of three main characters who are the female protagonists in the novel, Christine Francis, Duchess of Croydon and Marsha Prescott, who throughout the novel seems subverting the male norms and value, the male construction of a female identity i.e. of a docile and submissive female persona is defied time and again by these three female characters throughout the novel. The other character as Peter McDermott is suppressed by the owner of the hotel, who is his boss.

Female masculinity came in to being in direct opposition to a more generalized discussion of masculinity within cultural studies that seems intent on insisting that masculinity remains the property of male bodies. It is a full attack on the idea that masculinity is exclusively or even primarily the property of men. On the contrary, women have been practicing their own, alternative, masculinities for at least two hundred years. *Female Masculinity* aims to help restore a sense of butch pride, and to validate the entitlement of women to their own masculinity. There is so much to debate and disagree within female masculinity. While talking about female masculinity, rebellious attitude of women who openly dare to challenge the monolithically charged patriarchy and its material effects in the life of women by dismantling the so-called traditional roles assigned to women. They not only pour their wrath against the patriarchy but also carry out such activities which were exclusively regarded as of males. In *Female Masculinity* Judith Halberstam takes aim at the protected status of male masculinity and shows that female masculinity has offered a distinct alternative to it for well over two hundred years. Providing the first full-length study on this subject, Halberstam catalogues the diversity of gender expressions among masculine women from nineteenth-century pre-lesbian practices to contemporary drag king performances. Through detailed textual readings as well as empirical research, Halberstam uncovers a hidden history of female masculinities while arguing for a more nuanced understanding of gender categories that would incorporate rather than pathologize them. She rereads Anne Lister's diaries and Radclyffe Hall's *The Well of Loneliness* as foundational assertions of "female masculine identity" (Judith Halberstam 13). She considers the enigma of the stone butch and the politics surrounding butch/femme roles within lesbian communities. She also explores issues of trans sexuality among "transgender dykes"-lesbians who

pass as men-and female-to-male transsexuals who may find the label of "lesbian" a temporary refuge. Halberstam also tackles such topics as women and boxing, butches in Hollywood and independent cinema, and the phenomenon of male impersonators.

Female masculinity signals a new understanding of masculine behaviors and identities, and a new direction in interdisciplinary queer scholarship. Illustrated with nearly forty photographs, including portraits, film stills, and drag king performance shots, this book provides an extensive record of the wide range of female masculinities. And as Halberstam clearly “demonstrates, female masculinity is not some bad imitation of virility, but a lively and dramatic staging of hybrid and minority genders” (17).

Halberstam makes a compelling argument for a more flexible taxonomy of masculinity, including not only men, who have historically held the power in society, but also women who embody qualities that are usually associated with maleness, such as strength, authority, and independence. Fleshing out her argument by drawing on a variety of sources such as fiction, films, court documents, and diaries, Halberstam calls for society to acknowledge masculine lesbian women and value them.

Female masculinity strives and aspires to subvert the monolithic male masculinity. As subversion refers to an attempt to overthrow structures of authority, as in the case of feminists, it is an overturning or uprooting the power structure of patriarchy. As feminist writers have prescribed a very broad form of subversion which is not, directly, the governing realm which should be subverted in their view, but the predominant cultural forces, such as patriarchy, and male masculinity.

The present research makes an attempt to unfold the actual ability of female. The first chapter "Female Masculinity Versus Patriarchal Norms in Hotel." tries to depict the female masculinity which questions the patriarchal norms. The second

chapter “Audacity of Patriarchy” challenges the claim made by the sexist philosophers who opine that male is superior to female. It logically clarifies the misrepresentation of female done by patriarchal ideology. Also, it questions the lack of masculinity by female. Furthermore, it emphasizes on the victimization of one male by next male. Finally, the last chapter “Defiance of Patriarchal Norms” demonstrates the actual ability of female with the consciousness of equality and equity which is indeed beneficial for the progress of the society.

## II. Audacity of Patriarchy in *Hotel*

*Hotel* depicts the defiance of female characters against the male imposed norms and values. It shows the female tendency to revolt against the male created society. The female characters in this novel seem to disobey the male rigid norms and live their life in their own way. Threatening their male imposed values and tries to subvert all the methods which are used for the domination for the weak sex. The novel shows the boldness of female characters. In a way it has significantly presented the challenging nature of female characters. They are logical in their action. By their behavior, they can't tolerate any practices of gender inequality and it must be possible because of their consciousness regarding equality. They never think that they are weaker in comparison of male. Furthermore, masculinity can be seen in their nature. They prove that masculinity is not determined by sex.

Mary Wollstonecraft claimed women's rights through her remarkable essay *A Vindication of the Rights of Women*. Similarly, Virginia Woolf's role in the modern context is a significant one. Her *A Room of One's Own* and other important essays and fictions on women authors as well as on cultural, economic and educational disabilities raised women's awareness against what she called the 'patriarchal' society. Another most important precursor of feminist theory was Simone de Beauvoir. Simone de Beauvoir, in *The Second Sex* (1949), established with great clarity the fundamental questions of modern feminism. According to her, all the male writers assume the females as a negative 'objective' or other to man who is supposed to be the dominating and defining subject. Subject, here means that man is supposed to represent humanity in general. Not only this, the book also deals with the great collection of myths of women especially in the works of many male writers. Commenting on her classic work M.H. Abrams says:

A much more radical critical mode was launched in France by Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex*, a wide ranging critique of the cultural identification of women as merely the negative object, or 'Other' to man as the defining and dominating 'subject' who is assumed to represent humanity in general, the book dealt also with "the great collective myths of women in the works of many male writers. (230)

Simone de Beauvoir said that "One is not born a woman, one becomes one" (*The Second Sex* 13). The term "gender" is used to refer to the social and cultural construction of masculinities and femininities. It does not refer to biological difference, but rather cultural difference. She opines that formation of gender is not natural rather it is cultural. Further, Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* disclosed the myth and reality of the universal understanding of masculinity/ femininity depicted mostly by male sociologists. Anthropologists argues in her ground breaking book that in pastoral and nomadic period men and women had same work, mostly hunting, gathering and fishing. Both of them had no desire of children, as they were burden for both to carry around and no specific place to protect from wild animals. Then most of the children were either killed or left to survive on their own. Only those who were strong survived. When human beings thought the need of fixed settlement and a house then only the concept of family and protection of children were given importance. When they entered in to agricultural period, they realized the need of children, family and community by which they could yield more and more support each other in various ways. Beauvoir believes that in the beginning of the agricultural period women had a very high position as the people used to work in the field and the woman was seen as miracle of reproduction. Most of the societies at this stage were matrilineal. Children were given mother's title. Mother had more power

and rights; she could mate with anybody and bore all the responsibilities of the children. Later on, men's nature to take risk and show physical strength began to conquer individuals and groups. Because of this nature of risk taking he conquered nature, started constructing and innovating new tools and technologies. Dr. Samira Luitel says:

Women as bearer and rearer of children mostly worked inside household and were kept away from his inventions. Her outside activities was constrained die to her physical nature and also man's reluctance to involve her in his private business. With the advancement agricultural and small scale industries, woman was still limited to her own housestead. (13)

The female autonomy within the household was also gradually taken away with the establishment of modern industries mostly based on patriarchal values. The role of women was seen most important as mother and caretaker than the manager of household. Men, with the development of civilization thus, enslaved women as it advanced. This example "applies most prominently in the industrialized societies than the small preliterate society" (Luitel 13).

Thus, in the due course of time in order to fulfill their vested interests males began to subordinate females for which, according to feminists, there are several factors such as economic, farming force and violence and others. Yet feminists believe that non- gender societies are possible. They strongly pose the argument about the existence of non- gender societies and insist "they have existed and will exist again".

Daniel Dennett contends that "modern humans have inherited natural traits that were adaptive in a prehistoric environment; including traits that had different

advantages for males versus females" (110). Evolutionary theory of sex considers gender differences as a result of distinct specialization of the sexes, performing relationship with preceding generations and with the environment.

In the very beginning of the novel, the active and possessive role of Duchess is described in relation to the success and achievement of the Duke. Arthur Halley describes:

Within the past decade, and aided by his Duchess- herself a known public figure and cousin of the Queen- he had become ambassador- at-large and successful trouble shooter for the British government.... the shadow over the duke was minor and temporary, and that the Duchess had the situation well in hand. Supporting this second view were predictions that the Duke of Croydon might soon be named British Ambassador to Washington.

It is crystal clear by the regular defiance of three important characters: The Duchess of Croydon, Christine Francis and Marsha Prescott that they are hell-bent to take their stand and to fight for their self female identity. Also, it cleverly portrays the head male dominating the minor males.

Gender identity is a person's own sense of identification as male or female. The term is intended to distinguish this psychological association, from physiological and sociological aspects of gender. Gender identity is "how one personally identifies is or her gender regardless of his or her sex characteristics" (Luitel, 25). It does not have to be either man or woman, but can be a combination of feminine, masculine and androgynous feelings. However, it is now thought that the innate gender identity, although powerfully influenced by the sex of the genitalia and the gender of rearing, is not determined by these factors. There is evidence that "sex

differentiation of the brain may be inconsistent with other sex characteristics, resulting in individuals dressing and/or behaving in a way which is perceived by others as being outside cultural gender norms; these gender expressions may be described as gender variant” (Luitel, 33).

Gender Identity does not refer to the placing of a person into one of the categories male or female; but without including the concept of interaction with society at large the term has no meaning. As social beings there should be reciprocal relationship between the sexes, which has become the immediate demand of feminists today. Females today are striving and aspiring to get their identity and self-esteem.

One can sense in the opening page of the novel that Christine Francis is such kind of character, who will stamp over the male created norms of etiquette, she subverts the norm that only male persona’s are subjected to smoking. I can see her haughtiness and courage to accept the cigarette from Peter McDermott as the novel goes forward like,

“Coming forward, she accepted a cigarette and McDermott lit it, and then did the same for himself. He watched as she inhaled” (7).

Christine nature has similarities with Valerie Bryson's words echo that feminist thinking "seeks to understand society in order to challenge and change it"(1). Such female awakening as Bryson and others opine got impetus from the ideas of feminist critics like Mary Wollstonecraft, Kate Millet, Elaine Showalter, Virginia Woolf, Simon de Beauvoir, Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar, sand so on. It further suggests the women's conscious coming out from the earlier boundaries created by male domination. Identifying their exploited situation within male culture and values, such feminists have attempted to break such traditions to reshape and reconstruct them. They have challenged earlier male-dominated psyche and practice of society by

upbringing the marginalized women into center. Hence M.H. Abrams analyzes:

The often-asserted goal of feminist critics has been to enlarge and reorder, or in radical instances entirely to displace, the literary canon—that is, the set of works which, by a cumulative consensus, have come to be considered "Major" and to serve as the chief subjects of literary history, criticism, scholarship and teaching. Gender identity is a person's own sense of identification as male or female. The term is intended to distinguish this psychological association, from physiological and sociological aspects of gender. Gender identity is "how one personally identifies is or her gender regardless of his or her sex characteristics" (Luitel, 25). It does not have to be either man or woman, but can be a combination of feminine, masculine and androgynous feelings. However, it is now thought that the innate gender identity, although powerfully influenced by the sex of the genitalia and the gender of rearing, is not determined by these factors. There is evidence that "sex differentiation of the brain may be inconsistent with other sex characteristics, resulting in individuals dressing and/or behaving in a way which is perceived by others as being outside cultural gender norms; these gender expressions may be described as gender variant" (Luitel, 33). Gender Identity does not refer to the placing of a person into one of the categories male or female; but without including the concept of interaction with society at large the term has no meaning. As social beings there should be reciprocal relationship between the sexes, which has become the immediate demand of feminists today. Females today are striving and aspiring to get their identity and self-esteem.

Masculinity is manly character. It specifically describes men and boys, that is, personal and human, unlike male which can also be used to describe animals, or masculine which can also be used to describe noun classes. When masculine is used to describe men, it can have degrees of comparison—more masculine, most

masculine. The opposite can be expressed by terms such as unmanly, epicene or effeminate. A typical near-synonym of masculinity is virility and the usual complement is femininity. This is simply a repressive ideology which says its belief as something natural but its intention is immensely guided by the vested interest of patriarch.

Femininity is also called womanliness or it refers to qualities and behaviors judged by a particular culture to be ideally associated with or especially appropriate to women and girls. Distinct from femaleness, which is a biological and physiological classification concerned with the reproductive system, femininity principally refers to secondary sex characteristics and other behaviors and features generally regarded as being more prevalent and better suited to women, whether inborn or socialized. In “traditional Western culture, such features include submissiveness, gentleness, patience, and kindness” (Tyson 115). These are often perceived as being associated with personality traits such as nurturing, life-giving qualities, creativity, and openness, or yielding, to other people. The modern social stereotype of a woman is perceived as the complementary opposite of a man. A feminine woman may have physical attributes different from those of a masculine male. These attributes result from the relationship between an individual's biology and the socialization she receives as a result of that biology. However, theories of femininity explored in the field of Gender Studies propose that femininity and masculinity are essentially constructed or 'performed' through a process of social construction.

Such rebellious nature of the feminist practices against the dominant culture, social norms and institutions aims to replace the earlier canons with the marginalized women. Rather than giving same space to the mainstream considered history, criticism, scholarship, the feminist critics center their study on what were absent about

women in such practices. She doesn't hesitate to do the activity that is done by male because she never feels herself as inferior just because of different sex. Also, she can challenge the difficulty as male. She is unlike traditional woman by her way of doing which is possible because of her radical nature. Her logical ability is noticed primarily because she does not follow the patriarchal norms blind rather she challenges or protest any sort of gender inequality. Also, she has not confined herself with household work. Simply speaking, she prefers independent life for her identity.

These other categories of oppression may include, but are not limited to, oppression based on gender identity, race, social class, perceived attractiveness, sexuality, sexual orientation, and ability. Patriarchy is not always as single-handed as the belief that all men always benefit from the oppression of all women. The element of patriarchy is the relationship of dominance, where one party is dominant and exploits the other party for the benefit of the former. Radical feminists have often claimed that men use social systems and other methods of control to keep non-dominant men and women suppressed.

Radical feminists believe that eliminating patriarchy, and other systems which perpetuate the domination of one group over another, will liberate everyone from an unjust society. The influence of Radical Feminism can be seen in the adoption of these "personal" issues by even liberal-feminist.

Radical feminism in simpler forms also indicates that women are not docile and they are not going to tolerate any misbehaving from the male society. Equality is what their demand is. So if they are treated badly then sudden outcry of protest is what we witness. I see the same situation in this novel. When a small accident occurs in the hotel, when a waiter over talks with the Duchess of Croydon, she came out with a sharp protest against this misconduct:

Our entire evening has been ruined,' the duchess insisted. My husband and I decided to enjoy a quiet evening in our suite here, by ourselves. We were out for a few moments only, to take a walk around the block and we returned to supper- and this! (17)

Patriarchy always imposes curtailment or a boundary towards women's freedom.

Thus, for example Adrienne Rich's account of patriarchy in *Of Woman Born*

explicitly abstracts the position of women from any social context. She says:

Under patriarchy, I may live in purdah or drive a truck; I may rise my children in a kibbutz, or be the sole breadwinner for a fatherless family... I may serve my husband his early-morning coffee within the clay walls of barber village or march in an academic procession; whatever my status or situation, my derived economic class or my sexual preference, I live under the power of the fathers, and have a access only to so much of privilege or influence as the patriarchy is willing to accede to me, and only for so long as I will pay the price for male approval. (58)

Duchess is not ready to accept the any aspects of patriarchal values. She deals the problem logically. She is practically forward to prove her importance among other people. She is not the one to mess with, she is meticulous about her environment and she is shown not to allow any misconduct, if anything like such occurs she instantly comes in a belligerent mood to defend her identity. As I can see in the novel she asks for the detain report for this misconduct to the manager of that hotel.

"Turning to Peter, she snapped, 'I insist on a full report being made to Mr. Trent, and you may inform him that I expect a personal apology.'" (18)

So it senses the strength in the character of the Duchess. She behaves in a

routine manner and she won't tolerate any misbehaving from any persona. She is out there to defend her stand. By nature she is not submissive towards the male needs and ready to battle any situation. Further, when Duchess protests against her husband that she takes the full control over her husband's life and she even engages herself in a conflict with him by scolding him bitterly:

You must have been insane,' the Duchess of Croydon protested.

'Absolutely, abysmally insane.' I was doing the best I could. The very best, after your incredible folly, to establish that both of us spent a quiet evening in the hotel. I even invented a walk that we went for in case anyone saw us come in. And then crassly, stupidly, you blunder in to announce you left you cigarettes in the car. (31)

The Duke seems suddenly in the back foot and apologizes for his drunken behavior and immediately asks for sorry for his folly. (30) The Duke is drunk and in his drunken rage tries to entice the Duchess and moves his hands towards her with some obscene words, but suddenly the Duchess burst into rage and protests his move and replies him: "Stop it! Stop it! You . . . you lecher!" Her face was white, her voice high pitched. 'I don't care if the police catch you hope they do! I hope you get ten years!' (31). This lines proves that she does not have any sympathy for her husband and she is not kind of women who will tolerate her husband, who is drunk all the time and asks a lot from her wife. She is beautiful but rather robust from within and she lacks the emotional quality of the weaker sex. She is such kind of female character who will take her own moral stand and fight even with her husband.

The deeply rooted patriarchal cultural foundations of the society are systematically questioned by Duchess of Croydon. She subverts the existing discrepancy between the sexes--male as privileged and female as unprivileged--to

maintain co-existence of women with men in the society. Patriarchy creates a boundary towards women's freedom. Adrienne Rich in *Of Woman Born* explicitly puts lights on the position of women in society. She says:

Under patriarchy, I may live in purdah or drive a truck; I may rise my children in a kibbutz, or be the sole breadwinner for a fatherless family... I may serve my husband his early-morning coffee within the clay walls of barber village or march in an academic procession; [. . .] I live under the power of the fathers, [. . .] I will pay the price for male approval. (58)

Like Adrienne Rich, if anything like such occurs, Duchess of Croydon instantly comes in a belligerent mood to defend her identity. Here, female voice emerges as alternative to male voice for the equal status of the women, who were long silenced in the patriarchy. The presupposed men centered ethos of the society is challenged after the feminist subversion against patriarchy. The unfathomably grounded men-centered patterns got deconstructed by the feminist movement of the 1960s. Conventionally omnipresent male values of the society, which restricted women within certain limitations are challenged by her to establish the recognition of women as an active human beings. Similarly, through the character Duchess of Croydon, Arthur Hailey redraws the boundary between men and women which were drawn unanimously by men to oppress the women in diverse aspects of human life. Hence, such redrawing the boundary of male-dominated social patterning resulted into feminist subversion against patriarchy to provide an equal position to women as men.

Valerie Bryson's words echo that feminist thinking "seeks to understand society in order to challenge and change it"(1). Such female awakening as Bryson and others opine got impetus from the ideas of feminist critics like Mary Wollstonecraft,

Kate Millet, Elaine Showalter, Virginia Woolf, Simon de Beauvoir, Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar, and so on. It further suggests the women's conscious coming out from the earlier boundaries created by male domination. Identifying their exploited situation within male culture and values, such feminists have attempted to break such traditions to reshape and reconstruct them. They have challenged earlier male-dominated psyche and practice of society by upbringing the marginalized women into center. Hence M.H. Abrams analyzes:

The often-asserted goal of feminist critics has been to enlarge and reorder, or in radical instances entirely to displace, the literary canon—that is, the set of works which, by a cumulative consensus, have come to be considered "Major" and to serve as the chief subjects of literary history, criticism, scholarship and teaching. (91-92)

Such rebellious nature of the feminist practices against the dominant culture, social norms and institutions aims to replace the earlier canons with the marginalized women. Rather than giving same space to the mainstream considered history, criticism, scholarship, the feminist critics center their study on what were absent about women in such practices.

Simon de Beauvoir, in her book *The Second Sex* (1949), has emphatically subverted the existing hierarchy between men and women. She defies the male conviction of othering women as not a natural fact but as a cultural construction. The definition of women as "other" and "the second sex" are mere fabrications of dominant patriarchal socio-cultural viewpoint. She resists, "One is not born, but rather becomes man"(7). Through this line, she tends to dismantle the long-standing dichotomy prevalent between men and women. The degraded or the "othered" woman is not what she is in real sense, but what she is at present is ideologically modulated.

Beauvoir intends to say the predicament of present woman as "other" is due to the omni-present patriarchal biases of the civilization which the conscious women should discard to exist themselves as independent human beings.

She believes that men and women are inherently equal, but discrimination was always there in the cultural, political, economic practice. So she questions the conventionally supposed beliefs for the harmonious environment in the society. She strongly opposed the tendency of viewing women as 'second sex' born to assist their male guardians. She believes that existence always precedes essence.

Beauvoir objects to men's attitude of discriminating between sexes as 'self' and 'other' men being the former and women the latter. Men writers have described women as 'flesh' the one related to 'nature'. She focuses upon pitiable conditions of women in patriarchal society stating that where a woman tries to define herself. She reveals the fundamental asymmetry between masculine and feminine by stating that "men define the human, not women. Woman is riveted into a lopsided relation with man, he is the one, she is the other" (Selden 135).

According to her, all the male writers assume the female as negative. In the book, the problems Beauvoir emphasizes is that women perceive man as self (as subject) and themselves as other. And she explicitly exposes the condition of women so that they could realize their existence. She says:

Women have been essential as the one born. To be a wife or a mother. But she is stripped off motherly rights because motherly rights overpowered by fatherly rights. A wife's duty is to be in the bed to gratify the husband's lust but the husband is not aware whether he is gratifying the lost of his wife. (145)

Therefore, the woman is inessential in the eyes of men who want to accept her as

“other”. She vociferously refutes the notion of female essence prior to individual existence and attacks the patriarchal myths of women that presume the false essence.

Similarly, Beauvoir heavily challenges the socially constructed myths. Myths always valorize patriarchy subjugating women. They create verticality between men and women. Man is primarily one and the woman is other. Man is subject, active and practical whereas woman is passive, object and impractical. She attacks the patriarchal myths of women presuming the female essence. In her own words, "the myth must not be confused with recognition of significance" (1997). Beauvoir makes a staunch appeal to falsify the male dominated myths. They are false; they hinder the way to transcendence to women and validate that they should remain silent and serve men. That is why, such culturally patterned myths should be deconstructed to rescue women from their male-designed peripheral location.

This mythic characterization of woman as passive, object and impractical is questioned and challenged by the Duchess of Croydon. In the novel, Duke of Croydon is involved in an accident. By this incident both the Duke and Duchess are in grave trouble but she is shown as calm character who in any situation knows to maintain her composure. As these lines from the novel portrays her masculine character, “Even in moments of crisis the Duchess was accustomed to breakfasting well. It was a habit carried over from childhood at her family’s country seat of Falling brook Abbey where breakfast had always consisted of a hearty meal of several courses, often after a brisk cross-country gallop.(104)”

Further it is shown in the novel that she dominates even her brother Geoffrey, as when he puts forward that it will take a weeks to settle the accident issue, she erupts:

We simply cannot wait weeks,' the duchess insisted. You'll have to take my word, Geoffrey, it would be a ghastly mistake not to make an effort now.' What I'm asking is for the family's sake as well as our own. Surely you can accept my assurance on that. (106)

The Duchess is shown to have complete control over her husband and she never hesitates to participate in his habit of drinking and she too in the mid part of the novel is seen enjoying drinking with her husband, drinking which is said to be a complete male activity is completely ignored by the Duchess in the latter part of the novel. (108)

As her husband is involved in a car accident, she tries to negotiate the person who blackmails her regarding this accident by paying the asked sum, but she is seen more masculine in this negotiation too. Her husband is rather shown as a feminine character and doesn't talk much. The blackmailer Ogilvie has a habit of smoking cigar, so when he smokes in front of the Duke and the Duchess, she instantly points at the half-burned cigar in the fat man's mouth and made him aware "My husband and I find strong smoke offensive. Would you kindly put that out" (126).

Her husband tries to give his opinion in this matter which she disregards by saying:

You have completed your hysterical outburst, there was no answer, and she continued, 'May I remind you that you've needed remarkably little persuasion to act precisely as you have. Had you wished or intended to do otherwise, no opinion of mine need have mattered in the least. As for leprosy, I doubt you'll contract it since you've carefully stood aside, leaving all that had to be done with that man, to be done by me.(188)

She is such kind of woman, who knows how to keep her husband's health in order, if he drinks excessively then she will even throw her husband's liquor in the bathroom sink. And she orders him to have no more of drinks. (295)

The Duchess is shown as a strong character, who is not even scared with the state of the police as when Peter McDermott accuses her husband of being involved in the murder she retorts by saying:

Accusations are your business. You appear to specialize in them. I will, however, make one to the effect that this hotel has proved disgracefully incompetent in protecting the property of its guests. I assure you that you will hear a great deal more of this" (337)

Thus researcher can say that Duchess of Croydon is shown as a role model for the disapproval of male hegemony and exploitation, she is the role model to carry the torch of gender equality. Rosemarie Tong finds Wollstonecraft as a pioneering female heroine challenging male birth right, advocating women's equality and rationality. For Tong, she became able to liberate women from male violence and oppression by arguing against it. Tong says:

[. . .] Wollstonecraft did present a vision of a woman strong in mind and body who is not slave to her passions, her husbands or children. For Wollstonecraft, the ideal woman is interested in fulfilling herself it by self-fulfillment is meant any sort of pondering to duty distracting desires than in exercising self-control. (16)

Wollstonecraft never believed that women possess emotional, fragile and submissive nature only. For her, they can equally perform the reason. As patriarchy doesn't show sincerity in thinking, in turn, degrades and subjugates women, Wollstonecraft pours challenging anger.

She believes that eliminating patriarchy, and other systems which perpetuate the domination of one group over another, will liberate everyone from an unjust society.

similarly, Simone de Beauvoir argues that males are something superior and definite having separate identity but females are without separate identity and history. Seldon quotes Simone de Beauvoir:

When a woman tries to define herself, she starts by saying 'I am a woman'. No man does so. This fact reveals the basic asymmetry between the terms 'masculine' and 'feminine'. Man defines the human, not woman . . . Being dispersed among men, women have no separate history, no natural solidarity, they have not combined as other oppressed groups have. Woman is riveted into a lop- sided relationship with man, he is one she is the other. (135)

As pointed above women have to define themselves as a woman and as a human. Women have not their own history and culture. They are always dominated by the male member of the society. They are behaved as the second sex. That's why directly or indirectly females started revolting against the suppression and patriarchy.

In the novel other female characters too are shown defying the male code of conduct as Christine Francis is a bold character who copies the male way of living by getting into the male proclaimed activity, she smokes make love with her office senior and she doesn't hesitate to dine with a old person, who is rich and for some time she seems totally engrossed with the thought of this old man and starts to love him. She contemplates that she might be supposed to be a call girl by her fellow bell boy Herbie Chandler, in the hotel and she is flattered by this thought in the novel. (20)

She has a relationship with her senior Peter McDermott and mostly it's Christine herself who ignites him and starts the love making in their relationship. She is an active persona in this novel, who is a challenge towards her male counterpart. She plays the role of a seductress in this novel, which is never into two minds of playing games with any male persona. She is outright and straight forward to keep her words of passion and love, whenever necessary. Mostly she is the driving force in this novel. Her thoughts in the novel rather give us a vivid description of her character in the novel:

It isn't fair,' Christine objected. 'All we've talked about is me.' She was conscious of Peter's masculinity. And yet, she thought, there was gentleness about him too. She had seen something of it tonight in the way that he had picked up Albert Wells and carried him to other room.

She found herself wondering what it would be like to be carried in his arms. (61)

Her such thoughts presents that she is not a demure kind of woman rather she is an action oriented woman. She believes in the symbol and she is sheepish regarding the respect a woman must get in any kind of job. She makes notes and check whether a woman is exploited in the office or not.

Modern feminist, Kate Millet's *Sexual Politics* (1977) signifies a significant stage in 'political' feminist writing on literature. Millet's use of the term 'patriarchy' described the cause of women's oppression. Men enjoy power through constraint women. The feminist analysis of politics, therefore, rose from the fact that women have been excluded from the exercise of political power.

Women are still under represented in formal political institutions and decision making bodies worldwide. Millet devotes a large section of her book to

'deconstructing' the portrayal of sex in the work of four major twentieth-century writers (D.H. Lawrence, Henry Miller, Norman Mailer and Jean Genet) so as to reveal the crude sexual domination involved. Love, too, can be but a confidence trick, part of a patriarchal ideology designed to hide the realities of power; not until patriarchy has been overthrown and sexuality radically transformed can men and women relate in any ways as equal human beings.

Christine instead in this novel seems deconstructing the male norms. When Peter talks about a girl, fumbling in her handbag for the key to her apartment, she says that "It's a dual symbol, the apartment shows woman's independence, but losing the key proves she's still feminine. Here! – I've found it" (151).

From her comment done to the girl who is fumbling in her handbag for the key, she clarifies that every female might not have masculinity even after the consciousness of sexual equality. This must be the author's opinion.

She is a woman, who is not docile rather she knows better how to get a man and rather being a recipient like other woman, she is the first to make love with Peter. She doesn't wait for his love or his favor rather it is she who makes the first move as:

His arms reached out and she came to him, at first plainly, then with mounting, fierce excitement. Her lips formed eager, incoherent sounds and discretion fled, the reservations of a moment earlier dissolved.

Trembling, and to the pounding of her heart, she told herself: whatever was to happen must take its course; neither doubt nor reasoning would divert it now. She could hear Peter's quickened breathing. She closed her eyes. She felt herself kissed gently. He whispered, 'You were right.

Let's give it time. (153)

These lines show that she is rather active and igniting force in the love making

scenario. She is shown as a woman of substance, who walks step by step with the male society.

A society can be called patriarchal to the extent it valorizes male values at the cost of female ones and helps perpetuate the domination of women at the hands of men. Patriarchy, understood in its literal sense, means the rule of the father. This sociological and anthropological meaning retains its relevance in the political and philosophical movement of feminism too. Patriarchy has determined to a considerable and virtually indelible extent the nature and quality of human societies across the world irrespective of time and space, the values and priorities, and the place and image of women within the societies, and the relation between the sexes. Feminist critics, therefore, as socio-political movement aspires to enhancing healthy and just relations between the two sexes and expose how masculine's ideals have been dehumanizing, subordinating women on the basis of grossly unfounded myths and norms.

Though the idea of feminism itself seeks to study the existence of women in the patriarchal society, Simone de Beauvoir primarily focuses on Sartrean notion of existentialism: existence precedes the essence. Beauvoir raises this issue regarding woman who has been essentialized in the society with certain stereotypes like woman as a flesh, related to nature, vale of blood, open rose, siren, the curve of hill, the fertile soil, the sap, the material beauty and the soul of the world. Several essentialist thinkers believe that the woman is doomed to eminence but has a passivity to bestow peace and harmony. Beauvoir's central attack is on the attitude of the scholars and writers towards woman's position. According to them, woman is a 'privileged other'.

Her work *The Second Sex* is the narrative of women's existential otherness. A mark of otherness is one's inability to shape one's psychological, social and cultural

identity. Men believe that women cannot transcend because transcendence is a spiritual sublimity which can only be attained by men. They project women as inherently demure creatures and men powerful and virile so that the latter can achieve transcendence. Some male critics attribute mysticism to women.

But Christine is shown as a brave character in the novel that will fight back any wrong deed from his male counterpart; she even uses words of irony, when she suspects Peter two-timing her with Marsha Prescott. She lambasts him by:

Well, I can understand that. Who wouldn't be confused with so many women under foot? I hope you have a delightful evening. Speaking as a woman let me advise you that little Miss Prescott bears as much resemblance to a child as a kitten to a tiger. But it would be fun I should think – for a man – to be eaten up. (179)

The above paragraph shows that she is possessive regarding her man, though she is intelligent and asks him to be careful for the pitfalls with the next woman. Her clairvoyance towards Peter shows that she is not allowing giving her man easily to a third lady.

She is such kind of woman who dares to pay her own bills, it does not matter however rich her male counterpart is the line portrays it well:

I have a friend, who likes dining-room service- an elderly Gentleman named Mr. Wells. We'll be in for dinner tonight. I want you to make sure that his bill is light, though not so small that he'll notice. The difference you can put on my account. (272)

When she is waiting for Peter and he comes late, she warns him, "Don't marry a hotel man, there's never an end to it. It's a timely warning, I hadn't told you, but I've a crush on that new sous-chef. The one who looks like Rock Hudson. Do we have more

troubles?" (53).

Thus, it can be guess by her statement that, she is not demure kind of woman rather she believes in making her own decision, paying her own bill and facing her male counterparts by her own intuition.

The quality which are claimed to be possessed by the male only according to the patriarchal norms can be noticed in Marsha Prescott too. She assures that masculinity is not determined by sex. Absence of masculinity is not her characteristic.

Also, she can manipulate to bring the situation in her favor. Significantly, in *Female Masculinity*, Judith Halberstam takes aim at the protected status of male masculinity and shows that female masculinity has offered a distinct alternative to it for well over two hundred years. Providing the first full-length study on this subject, Halberstam catalogs the diversity of gender expressions among masculine women from nineteenth-century pre-lesbian practices to contemporary drag king performances. Through detailed textual readings as well as empirical research, Halberstam uncovers a hidden history of female masculinities while arguing for a more nuanced understanding of gender categories that would incorporate rather than pathologize them. She rereads Anne Lister's diaries and Radclyffe Hall's *The Well of Loneliness* as foundational assertions of "female masculine identity" (13). She considers the enigma of the stone butch and the politics surrounding butch/femme roles within lesbian communities. She also explores issues of transsexuality among "transgender dykes"-lesbians who pass as men-and female-to-male transsexuals who may find the label of "lesbian" a temporary refuge. Halberstam also tackles such topics as women and boxing, butches in Hollywood and independent cinema, and the phenomenon of male impersonators.

The third character of this novel is a nineteen year old girl Marsha Prescott;

she is the daughter of an aristocratic father. Though she is rebellious towards her father's regime and she has the tendency to revolt time and again with her father's strict rules. She is introduced in the novel by the writer as a girl who is neither a spoiled child neither a demure and passive girl. Rather she is adventurous. She set out with her four friends into this St. Gregory hotel, where her friends try to rape her. But luckily she is saved by a black boy and later she took rests in Peter's room.

Later, one-sided relationship develops from her side. She is a bold character who herself proposes Peter. Peter is rather passive in this relationship and she is the active force. The novel introduces her in such way: "It had been a mistake to come here. But as always, and rebelliously, she had sought something different, which was what Lyle Dumaire had promised, Lyle whom she had known for years and dated occasionally, and whose father was president of one of the city's banks as well as a close friend of her own father" (36).

It is usual to assume that she is a girl who is seeking for company especially a male company. The writer further presents her character vividly to the reader as: Youth was a dull time, Marsha often thought, especially when you had to share it with others the same age as yourself. There were moments – and this was one – when she longed for companionship that was more mature. She is not a passive girl; rather she won't succumb towards the male force that easily, when the foursome try to rape her, she takes the offense root rather by biting one of the boy's hands fiercely. As she too felt her teeth go into flesh, meeting bone (42).

Kate Millet boldly questions the power holding role of patriarchy in her book *Sexual Politics*. She opposed the direct or indirect oppression of women by the male power. For her, 'sex' is a biological phenomenon, but gender is a concept which is culturally acquired sexual identity. She regrets all such cultural constructs. Raman Seldon

analyzes, "Millet and other feminists have attacked social scientists who treat the culturally learned 'female' characteristics (passivity, etc) as natural, [. . .]. Sex 'roles' as perpetuated in society are in her view repressive"(138). For her, one can't create hierarchy between men and women in the lines of society that the culture has drawn. Rather the imposed epithets are to be exposed as spurious. Wilfred L. Guerin and others overview, "[. . .] her reading of D.H. Lawrence, Norman Mailer, Henry Miller, and Jean Janet offered a powerful challenge to traditional social values of capitalism, violence against women, crude sexuality, and male power in general, while it also assaulted the reigning formalism in literary criticism of her day"(199). As the writers argue, women endured more severe treatment than other kinds of discriminations. Her identification of degrading representation of women marked the repudiation of the patriarchy, its ideology and culture.

In this regard, Marsha is valiant in making her own decision, after what she suffered she is recovering in Peter's room. Other day she is asked by Peter to left for her home. But she replies: "I'm sorry it took so long. So if you don't mind, I thought I'd stay on for tonight, at least. I am not sure. Maybe it's because I want to recover from what happened yesterday, and the best place to do it is here" (97).

But the real reason was that she was beginning to like Peter's company, so her heart was saying to be there for another day or two. Later as the plot develops she calls Peter for a candle light dinner in her home and proposes her. When Peter suspects her sudden muteness in the dining table he asks her: "You've suddenly become quiet.' I know. I was wondering how to say something.' You might try directly. It often works. 'All right. I've decided I want to marry you" (240).

These lines show that she is not waiting any action from Peter, rather she is courageous enough to propose herself, so that he might not get involve with someone

else. She wants to cash him as soon as possible. When Peter seems in disarray i.e. her father would be a worried man by her decision, she convinces him by saying that:

He always listens to reason and I know I could convince him. Besides, he'd like you. I know the kind of people he admires most, and you're one. There's something else. It isn't important to me, but it would be to him. You see, I know – and my father would too – that someday you'll be a big success with hotels, and maybe own your own. Not that I care about that. It's you I want. (242)

From the above extract, it can be concluded that she is a cunning girl. She knows how to manipulate the words for her own benefit. She knows the trick of getting something for her. Though she is only nineteen years of age, yet she sounds so mature and diligent in this statement. Later it is revealed by the maid in her house that, she had fabricated a lot of things only to acquire Peter. Peter is shocked to hear such revelation. Yet Marsha is shown as a rebellion in this novel.

In the male centered ideology, discourse and social reality, the women were supposed as body and men were esteemed as 'soul.' In Platonic term 'soul' transcends everything, whereas body is imminent, temporary and sensual, hence is valueless. So Elizabeth V. Spelman regrets:

What philosophers have had to say about women typically has been nasty, brutish and short. [. . .] Because philosophers have not said much about women, and when they have, it has usually been in short essays or chatty addenda which have not been considered to be part of the central body of their work, it is tempting to regard their expressed views about women as systematic: their remarks on women are unofficial asides which are unrelated to the heart of their philosophical

doctrines. (367)

From the ancient Holy books to the modernist and postmodernist writings of the twentieth century, the role of women has been denied, controlled and negatively manipulated. They have been blamed for lacking responsibility and intelligence. As a result, they are supposed to cause all the troubles in the world. The Holy Bible explicitly conveys that Eve insisted Adam to eat the apple from the forbidden fruit, and thereby causing the downfall of human beings. Pandora's opening of the box led to the spreading of the troubles in the human world. God's creation of Eve out of the ribs of Adam also supports to prove the fact that women were given subordinate role in the masculine supremacist world. For example, Apollo is worshipped as the symbol of knowledge and supremacy; Eros is considered to be symbol of jealousy and sensuality; and Venus is the symbol of beauty. So, Christianity and Judaism are the sexist religions which valorized and legitimized men by\degenerating and degrading women. On the consequence, the position of women remained flexible and subordinated, and is reflected as stereotypical, faithful and devoted wife.

Some of the major philosophers such as Aristotle, St Thomas Aquinas and Sigmund Freud seem to be sexist as they are illogical whatever they have claim about women. Women have been excluded from the public arenas. The philosophers have marginalized women from their philosophical discourse. Their assumption must be illogical because they must be victimized of patriarchal norms and indeed all of them were male. They were not able to make their way out from superiority complex. Instead of saying something for the women, they sketched women in a derogatory way.

Aristotle held that men are superior to women. Aristotle who claimed, "A woman is 'an unfinished man'. In reproduction woman is passive and receptive whilst

man is active and productive; for the child inherits only the male characteristics, [. . . .]" (116). The stereotypical representation that Aristotle and others did, established the hierarchy between man and woman. Such long-standing hierarchy showed men as the leaders, who imposed authority over female. The history of humans has been for the sake of males that caused to establish patriarchal norms, values and systems.

St Thomas Aquinas, in the middle Ages, stated that men were superior and godlike, and their intellectual ability easily impressed women. Gaarder explains Aquinas's views on women, "He opined that children only inherit the father's characteristics, since a woman was passive and receptive while the man was active and creative". Aquinas' words also echo with the Biblical myth of creation of Eve. The feminists revise all such views since the beginning of western civilization to the crucial historical periods as pervasively patriarchal. There are organized thoughts to perpetuate the subordination of women in diverse cultural domains.

For Freud, there are fundamental differences in the dream images seen by men and women. Freud finds men's dreams as egoist and ambitious whereas erotic dreams are related to women. Furthermore, Freud claims that woman's such destiny is an outcome of biology. Such patriarchal bias could also be found from some of the selected passages by D.H. Lawrence, Henry Miller, Norman Mailer and Jean Janet, who "in their fictional fantasies, aggrandize their aggressive phallic selves and degrade women as submissive sexual objects" (Abrams 88).

Having an in-depth nature of the three female characters of *Hotel*, i.e. Duchess of Croydon, Christine Francis and Marsha Prescott, all of them are not as such which was claimed by the sexist male philosophers and religion as well. They are as bold as other male characters. They do not have hesitation to express their feeling. They are often dominant in their decision and also can take the initiation of task. Risk bearing

potentiality of them also questions the claim of sexist philosophers. Being reasonable is not only the inborn quality of male. It is inherited by any sex. Simply speaking, sex never determines the logical ability of human beings. Despite being teenager, Prescott can manipulate to bring the situation in her favor. Indeed, portrayal of female characters clearly reflects the reason using capacity of the female. Rather than being emotional, they do their best to handle the very unfavorable situation with their mental capacity, neither they are submissive nor inactive. They protest whenever they see the wrong deed of male. Importantly, giving advice to other clearly illustrates that they are logical.

Three of them possess female masculinity which is in direct opposition to a more generalized discussion of masculinity with in cultural; studies that seems intent on insisting that masculinity remain the property of male bodies. It is a full-on attack on the idea that masculinity is exclusively or even primarily the property of men. On the contrary, women have been practicing their own, alternative, masculinities for at least two hundred years. Female Masculinity aims to help restore a sense of butch pride, and to validate the entitlement of women to their own masculinity. There is so much to debate and disagree with in Female Masculinity. While talking about female masculinity, rebellious attitude of women who openly dare to challenge the monolithically charged patriarchy and its material effects in the life of women by dismantling the so-called traditional roles assigned to women. They not only pour their wrath against the patriarchy but also carry out such activities which were exclusively regarded as of males.

Female Masculinity signals a new understanding of masculine behaviors and identities, and a new direction in interdisciplinary queer scholarship. Illustrated with nearly forty photographs, including portraits, film stills, and drag king performance

shots, this book provides an extensive record of the wide range of female masculinities. And as Halberstam clearly “demonstrates, female masculinity is not some bad imitation of virility, but a lively and dramatic staging of hybrid and minority genders” (17).

Halberstam makes a compelling argument for a more flexible taxonomy of masculinity, including not only men, who have historically held the power in society, but also women who embody qualities that are usually associated with maleness, such as strength, authority, and independence. Fleshing out her argument by drawing on a variety of sources--fiction, films, court documents, and diaries--Halberstam calls for society to acknowledge masculine lesbian women and value them.

Female Masculinity strives and aspires to subvert the monolithically emerged male masculinity. As subversion refers to an attempt to overthrow structures of authority, as in the case of feminists, it is an overturning or uprooting the power structure of patriarchy. As feminist writers have prescribed a very broad form of subversion which is not, directly, the governing realm which should be subverted in their view, but the predominant cultural forces, such as patriarchy, and male masculinity.

Patriarchal values are not always as single-sided as the belief that all men always benefit from the oppression of all women. Patriarchal values maintain that the primary element of patriarchy is the relationship of dominance, where one party is dominant and exploits the other party for the benefit of the former. Radical feminists have claimed that men use social systems and other methods of control to keep non-dominant men and women suppressed.

As the submission by the head male towards their fellow weak males are also condemned by the radical feminist. There in the novel Peter McDermott is being

subjected of domination by the owner of the hotel Warren Trent. Though Peter McDermott is a capable and well educated persona, he is paid meagerly and mostly dominated and kept mum by the owner. It can further be seen racial discrimination too in this novel, the superior whites dominating the blacks.

There in the novel that the case of superior male dominating the inferior is widely prevalent, as the novel unfolds. I see four white boys trying to rape a girl, and when a Negro boy comes to rescue her. He is been beaten badly by the whites. It is evident in the novel by the way Stanly Dixon address the black boy: "Take a look, fellas, Take a look at who's giving Orders. All right, nigger boy, you asked for it". (43) Even from Dixon statement that he was behaving the black boy like an animal. He has the attitude of being superior to the black boy so along with his four friends he beats the black boy very badly.

When the rape attempt is foiled by Peter McDermott and when finally the girl is saved from the savage, McDermott too accuses the black boy in the beginning, because in his view the boy is needlessly arrogant and supercilious, seeming to combine a distrust of any proffered friendliness with a perpetual chip on his shoulder. (45)

There is the domination of superior male towards the inferior continues throughout the novel. Warren Trent dominates Peter McDermott throughout the novel. Even when McDermott simply asks for Ogilvie, the chief house officer of the hotel, Trent rebukes him with by saying with red face:

You heard what I said. Forget Ogilvie! It makes things difficult if there's something to be done. Curtis O'Keefe is checking in today. He wants two adjoining suites and I've sent down instructions. You'd better make sure that everything's in order, and I want to be informed

as soon as he arrives. (75)

It is sensed by this statement that Trent was in a sense exploiting McDermott to follow his every other, and he was like a marionette to follow him. Even slightest opinion of McDermott was not counted in front of the hotel owner.

The case of such domination prevalent in this novel, as when fortune fluctuates, Warren Trent is close to being a bankrupt. He is offered a hefty price by a rich tycoon of hotel business Curtis O'Keefe. So as Trent lost his position he too is seen addressed churlishly by O'Keefe: "In any event, Warren, it's time you were of the hotel business" (146).

The hotel rule is to not let Negro person any suite in the hotel. Dr. Ingram who is a Negro is denied any room by the hotel staff so he feels offended and had to live the hotel in hurry. Though Peter McDermott is aware of the situation, he too is helpless and he too can't change the rules with proper consent, anyone can understand with his statement:

What was said a moment ago is unfortunately true. A delegate to a convention in this hotel, with a confirmed reservation, was refused accommodation. He was a dentist – I understand, a distinguished and incidentally a Negro. I regret to say that I was the one who turned him away. (372)

Thus it can be assumed that, domination of lower race was a rule of St. Gregory hotel. There was no law for the wellbeing of Negro people. They were doomed to face the unjust behavior and hatred by the whites and they were not allowed to take a room in this hotel, only for being black by birth.

Warren Trent is represented as a rich and bully persona in this novel dominating and behaving very badly to his employee. He is shown as person who is

cold-blooded business man, with no emotions for his employee Tom Earlshore, to whom he is friends of thirty years. In the latter part of the novel Trent is there to meet Earlshore in the bar where it is seen total disrespect for the old man and accuses him of stealing drinks from the bar and fires him:

It's the last drink you'll ever mix in my hotel. Don't con me, Tom,  
You've cheated and you've stolen and like all cheats and thieves  
you've left a trail behind you. You've done that long enough. Now get  
out of the hotel and don't ever come here. (194)

This indicates that Trent could hire and fire his employee with his free will. Rather than judging a person from his good work, it's Trent's opinion to succumb to his own mood. I see a sheer dominance which does not fall under the judgment of fairness. Earlshore an old employee in that hotel did deserve a fair treatment, which he was denied by Trent.

Andre Lemieux despite being better chef has been guided under the tutelage of M. Hebrand. He has been doomed to follow M. Hebrand's rules, though denied to think about the betterment of the hotel. It is seen in the latter part of the novel when Lemieux pours his gloomy thoughts to Peter McDermott:

I am a good chef; others would tell you. But it must be that a good chef  
is happy at what he does or he is no longer good. Yes, monsieur, I  
would make changes, many changes, better for the hotel, for M.  
Hebrand, for others. But I am told -as if an infant – to change nothing.  
(210)

Lemieux had been deprived from his work. He was not enjoying his work, of chef, which is a passion for a chef. He was been sidelined by the upper management. He aimed to change the rules of the hotel. But much to his chagrin, he was suffering from

a mental anxiety due to the domination from his upper staff.

Curtis O'Keefe's remarks his employee whenever something is misplaced. He fumes with anger and forgets the social code of conduct and lambasts towards his staff, "Oh yes! Of course you'd see it that way. Disloyally! Stupidly! I'm surrounded by fools! Fools, fools, fools! You're a fool! It's why I'm getting rid of you. Replacing you with someone else" (288).

Reader assumes that Curtis O'Keefe is a character, who believes in use and throw rule. Whenever he likes some person, he took them as his employee and when mood is swings he fires such person out from his company. Like this the story of three main characters who are the female protagonists in the novel, Christine Francis, Duchess of Croydon and Marsha Prescott, who throughout the novel seems subverting the male norms and value, the male construction of a female identity i.e. of a docile and submissive female persona is defied time and again by these three female characters throughout the novel.

### III. Defiance of Patriarchal Norms

Arthur Hailey in his novel *Hotel* presents the bold female character and also the suppressed male character with equal sympathy. He cleverly presents us the hidden domination imposed by the patriarchal society and the female character's defiance to obey such rules, gives us a trace of radical feminism. Domination and defiance both occupy the center stage of the novel either it is domination of female characters like Catherine Francis, Duchess of Croydon or Marsha Prescott, the novel witness the continuous backlash from these lady characters in the novel, to ask their existence and identity in a male dominated society. The domination of Peter McDermott by the owner of the owner Warren Trent too suggests that, the former is waiting for an ideal opportunity to break through from this domination.

Female characters are presented in this novel as valiant women, who fought with this male society with determination in order to achieve their freedom. They are not like the women, who succumb easily with male values, rather they are presented as a fighter and as a determined character, which has the trace of masculinity in their character and they have the guts to walk step by step with the male dominated society. In short it can be said these three women's represents the new woman. Catherine Francis is shown as a character, who denies to submit with the male desire, rather she is such kind of woman who will keep her desire as the primary over the male desire. She chooses her partner with her on consent, rather than being passive spectator, she is ready to prance and make the first move towards her man. Duchess of Croydon is shown as the character which consists of strength and etiquette. She is reluctant to take orders from her husband, Duke; rather her husband is shown as the docile and submissive character throughout the novel. She is seen dominating each and every scene in this novel. Though initially one might mistaken her for being an arrogant

aristocratic women, who is hell bent to take her desirable thing by any means. But latter in the story I am forced to accept it that she is rather a shrewd woman, who knows the pros and cons of this male dominated society. She is shown as an unorthodox female character in the male dominated society. From feminist perspective I can say her rather as robust and shrewd character, who takes her own decision without her husband's consent. .Marsha Prescott is a teen character who is in the threshold from a child turning a woman. She is rather shown as an active character, who in order to get her desirable man, could go to any extent. She is fearless to hide the truth and tell lie to achieve her man. Thus to conclude, these three woman's are the main protagonist of the novel, they are shown as a quintessential figures to defy the male norms and set their own rules, whereas Peter McDermott is a character who is continuously dominated by the owner of the hotel in this novel, which vividly presents the domination of the inferior male by the superior.

Thus, the three female characters in this novel are valiant women, who fought with this male dominated society with determination in order to achieve their freedom. They are radical in their nature. They are not like women, who surrender easily to male values. These women are determined character, who has the trace of masculinity in them and they have the guts to walk step by step with the male dominated society. Continuously they counter the patriarchal norms, in next words, they are the new women.

## Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Bangalore: Prism Books, 2004.
- Adams, Hazard. Introduction. *Critical Theory since Plato*. By Adams. Ed. Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers, 1992. 1-9.
- Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.
- Beasley, Chris. *What is Feminism?* Sydney: SAGE Publications, 1999.
- . -. *Gender and Sexuality: Critical Theories, Critical Thinkers*. London: Sage, 2005.
- Beauvoir, Simon de. "The Second Sex." *Critical Theory since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers, 1992. 993-1000.
- Bryson, Valerie. *Feminist Political Theory*. New York: Paragon House, n.d.
- Figs, Eva. *The Patriarchal Attitudes*. London: Faber and Faber, 1970.
- Gaarder, Jostein. *Sophie's World*. London: Phoenix House, 1995.
- Guerin, Wilfred L., et.al eds. *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*. 4th ed. New York: OUP, 2004.
- Hailey, Arthur. *Hotel*. New Delhi: Rupa, 2005.
- Halberstam, Judith. *Female Masculinity*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Mautner, Thomas. *A Dictionary of Philosophy*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 2004.
- Millet, Kate. *Sexual Politics*, Chicago: Uillinois, 1968.
- Moi, Toril. "Feminist literary Criticism." *Modern Literary Theory*. Ed. Ann Jefferson and David Robey. London: B.T. Batsford Ltd, 1998. 204-221.
- Morgan, Robin. *Sisterhood is Powerful*. New York: Vintage, 1970.
- Rich, Adrienne. *Of Women Born*. London: Virgo, 1977.

Savage, Peter. "Hailey's Commentaries" *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 39.2

(Mar.-Apr., 1979) 184-187.

Seldon, Raman. "Feminist Criticism." *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary*

*Theory*". 2nd Ed. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1981. 134-154.

Snitow, Ann. *A Gender Diary: Conflicts in Feminism*. Eds. Marianne Hirsch and

Evelyn fox Keller. New York: Routledge, 1990. 10-26.

Spelman, Elizabeth V. "Women as Body: Ancient and Contemporary Views."

*Feminist Studies* 8.1 (Spring 1982): 367-376.

Tong, Rosemarie. *Feminist Thought*. San Francisco: West View Press, 1989.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. "A Vindication of the Rights of Women." *Critical Theory*

*Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College  
Publishers, 1992. 394-399.

Woolf, Virginia. "A Room of One's Own". *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard

Adams. Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers, 1992.

817-825.