

I. Introduction

Of Mice and Men, a masterpiece by John Steinbeck, presents two opposite characters; George the intellectual and oppressive part, whereas Lennie the dumb and submissive part. These two are the major characters in the novel, on whom the whole novel revolves, nonetheless Curley's wife is another major character who is the cause of the end of the novel. The novel gently depicts the crushing patriarchal dominance by the male superior norms imposed on the female and less intelligent male. As the story unfolds, we begin to realize the male norms and restriction and its rigid rules; but we can also view the counter-attack or we can say the side to side defiance of the patriarchal norms by the dominated ones.

Curley, the son of the ranch owner prohibits his wife to enter and interact with the male workers. But Curley's wife, who defies the set of norms imposed by Curley and interacts with the male workers time and again, shows the trace to break away with the shackles of "patriarchy". Her activity continuously shows the vigor to fight against the male dominance and conglomerate with the male workers to set free her inner-desire which must have been hindered by Curley who represents the harsh male authority. She, in a way challenges the whole male norms. In a way the character of Curley's wife shows the rebellious female in the 1930s when the novel has depicted.

Steinbeck's novel depicts the story of 1930s until then there was no such recommendable trace of female uprising. They were subdued and passive on the expense of male society. They were confined to their house chores and active participation in outside-work or business for them was taboo. In such period, Curley's wife and her courageous move to defy the male created norms and values; entering the bunkhouse full of male-workers, without caring much for the consequences of her action shows us the common desire of female in the ongoing world. Her move in a

way shows us that female too are not submissive though they may be physically weak but their action speaks louder and if the chain of domination continues they too can break away from the shackles by such kind of rebellious move. They too have same desires as males have; only the restriction had made them mute. So the male society should consider their feelings with equal value and respect, rather than only providing lip-service to their demands, action must be applied.

Radical Feminism which is a theory flourished mainly in the 1960s is used as a methodology in this project. It depicts the male domination imposed towards female livelihood. Radical Feminism mainly tries to eradicate the patriarchy, which is the common set of rules of do's and do nots to the feminine gender. The project mainly tries to subvert the male made norms that female should be confined only in the four walls of the house. And their feelings and desires should be under male surveillance. In many countries female are kept literally in a veil of etiquette. Radical Feminism came in front to show the pain of the females and their experiences, enlisting them in the common sisterhood. It looks forward to tear the veil imposed by the patriarchal society. Likewise, their demand is equality in each and every sector with the males and if needed to eliminate the patriarchal rigidity.

John Ernest Steinbeck, American novelist, born in California, took his native state as the background for his early short stories and novels described the lives of those working on the land with realism and understanding. Steinbeck is distinguished for his lucid prose, engaging naturalistic descriptions, forceful symbolism, and the examination of the myth of America as Edenic paradise. Sympathetic to the plight of the impoverished and downtrodden, his Depression-era fiction offers poignant depiction of socioeconomic conditions and human realities in the American West during the 1930s. Though controversial for the over socialist views evinced in much

of his work, he continues to receive critical acclaim for his bestselling novels, several of which were adapted into successful motion pictures and plays. The distinctly American perspective and journalistic realism of Steinbeck's social protest novels struck an emotional chord with the reading public and exerted an important influence on contemporary literature.

Not only was Steinbeck prolific but also he had a wide range of talent as any writer America had produced. The novels themselves are varied in theme and style. But there was much more than the novels. Steinbeck had also written some excellent short stories, especially those that make up *The Long Valley*, and there was a number of nonfiction books, like *The Sea of Cortez*, which tells of a scientific expedition to *The Gulf of California*, and *Travels with Curley*, which describes a trip made with a poodle in a camping truck to the four corners to the United States, "in search of America" (582).

After graduating from Salinas High School, Steinbeck enrolled as an English major at Stanford University. He took many writing courses and also electives in science, but he did not graduate. Having already decided that he wanted to be a writer, he left the college in 1925 for New York. His first job, however, left him no time for seeking publishers, no time for anything but eating and sleeping. He wheeled cement, seven days a week, for the construction of Madison Square Garden. His next job as a reporter for the *New York American*, was somewhat less consuming of his physical energies, but he was even less well prepared for it than he had been for wheeling cement, and he was soon fired. None of his fiction sold either, and he returned to California as a deck hand on a ship, a very disappointed young man.

But he wanted to be a writer, and for the next several years he remained in California, pouring all the energy he could into his fiction. Even his commercial

failure of his first three novels—*Cup of Gold* (1929), *The Pastures of Heaven* (1932), and *To a God Unknown* (1933) did not turn him away from his goal. The fourth novel was *Tortilla Flat* (1935). It is a humorous celebration of poor but spirited everyday folk, the book had great appeal to a reading public still suffering the effects of the Great Depression. It appeared on best-seller lists for months and won an award for the best novel by a Californian. With *Tortilla Flat*, Steinbeck's career as a popular writer had begun.

But unlike many writers who follow up their successes with more books in the same vein, Steinbeck refused to be typed. Next he published *In Dubious Battle*, a serious novel about the role of Communist agitators in an agricultural laborer's strike. In theme, in style, in tone, it is markedly different from anything Steinbeck had previously written. It is a good novel, however, in which to see some of the author's most characteristic attitudes. His next two novels represent him at the height of both his power and his popularity. The first of them, *Of Mice and Men* (1937), was an immediate success, and in its play version won the 'Drama Critics' Circle Award. The second novel, which won the Pulitzer Prize, was *The Grapes of Wrath* (1939). It has been aptly described as nothing less than a national event. It was banned, it was burned, and it was debated over national radio and criticized on the floor of Congress. And it was the number one best seller in 1939 and remained among the top ten books in the following year. Both books may be classified as a social protest literature, for both are concerned with the explanation of migrant workers. But looking at the novels today, we can see that they are much more than criticisms of social conditions of their day.

Not long after the publication of *The Grapes of Wrath*, it became apparent that a much larger cause than the exploitation of migrant workers was going to have to

occupy the center of Steinbeck's attention of all other Americans who cared about democracy. Steinbeck also participated in World War II in several ways. Perhaps the most direct contribution was the book-movie *Bombs Away*, which told the story of "the kind of quality of our [American] Air Force, of caliber of its men and of the excellence of its equipments" (584). In addition, Steinbeck gained some firsthand experience of the war. Becoming a correspondent for the *New York Herald Tribune*, he spent a good part of 1943 abroad, writing articles from England and North Africa. Years later, his war dispatches were published in a book, *Once There Was a War* (1958).

Finally, there was the "war novel" *The Moon Is Down* (1942), written as a result of conversations of the Steinbeck had with a colonel in the office of Strategic Services. The novel is said to have been very popular among those involved in resistance movements in Nazi-occupied countries, and the king of Norway decorated Steinbeck for its contribution to the resistance. Like many sensitive persons, Steinbeck detested most of what he saw when he was directly involved in the war, and that feeling perhaps played a major role in his next three novels—*In Cannery Row* (1944), *The Pearl* (1945), and *The Wayward Bus* (1947): though none of them is directly about war, all show a strong distaste for what might be regarded as typical persons or practices of our [American] civilizations. His philosophic epic, *East of Eden* (1952), is most important of the five novels published in the fifties and sixties. His last work of fiction is *The Winter of Our Discontent*, a study of the corrupt moral climate of modern America, a novel, which is neither optimistic nor very successful. Steinbeck was a man who insisted that one should see not what one wishes or what one expects, but what is.

Of Mice and Men, presents the complex character of two friends. George the intellectual and oppressor, whereas Lennie the dull and suppressed. It shows clearly the patriarchal domination of male over female and from head male to their counterpart. "Patriarchy" which comes from Greek word "Patriarchs" refers to the "head of tribes". Radical Feminists posited that the root cause of all other inequalities is the oppression of all women, and from the head male to their subordinates. Patriarchal theory is not always as single-sided as the belief that all men always benefit from the oppression of all women. Patriarchal theory maintains that the primary element of patriarchy is a 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. 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. So, we can assume that the domination of George over Lennie gives us the idea that patriarchy is eminent in this novel. George, throughout the story, imposes his authority over Lennie. We can trace evidences of female oppression as the ranch-owner's son Curley not allowing his wife to converse with other male-workers in the bunk-house. The female character even doesn't have had her proper name to point out; rather she is summoned as "Curley's wife". It is sheer male domination where the female don't have their own identity and they are identified by their husband's name, and curbed in their day to day activities, by giving them rules of does and do not's. The story shows the desire of both the oppressed character's Lennie and Curley's wife to break the shackles of the domination force and find freedom. Lennie wants freedom from George and wants to have his solitary life with a farm and petting alfalfa and

rabbits, whereas Curley's wife regularly visiting the male bunk-house defying the male-norms set by the society indicate that she wants to break free or in a sense Curley is not man enough to satisfy her inner-desire. She is forbidden by Curley to interact with any male-worker in the bunk-house but she in contrast regularly visits the bunk-house chasing Slim and Lennie.

The book has received tremendous amount of criticism since its publication in 1937. Jonathan Leaf says that, "the book has every message contemporary pseudo-intellectual requires, universal victimhood, nature as the true divine" (85). All the characters are crudely rendered and unbelievable, Jonathan further contends:

The center of this struggle is the unnamed woman. She spends most of the book popping in and out, coming on to the other entire workman. By implication we are led to believe that her husband, born into modest wealth, may be impotent. It is the simplest left-wing cliché: The poor men are the real men and sexually potent, and women married into a higher station are most often promiscuous and full of desire for these true sons of earth. (85)

Jonathan, here, talks about the possible reasons behind Curley's wife's betrayal towards her husband must be an over rigid rules imposed by her dominating husband and her inclination towards the working class people must be assumed as her sexual desire which is not fulfilled by her husband.

Leaf further says about the novel that, "Steinbeck introduces us to the character of Curley's wife as a mis-fitting character, as no one relates to her. This essay will go on to examine the character of Curley's wife and how characters attitudes towards other people. The way she looks and acts leads other characters in the novel to see her as a "tart". George makes his opinions, "Jesus what a tramp" (35).

She just wants someone to talk to. Male workings at the ranch don't like her because they think she will get them into trouble. They make judgments without getting to know her first. They judge a book by its cover. There are no other females on the Ranch that we know about. Half of the men in the novella rarely encounter females and the one they meet, when they go into town to a "whore-house". This shows the men's stereotypical view on women as that of a "whore". Curley's wife says "I never get to talk to anyone. I get awful lonely". This shows that being the only apparent female leaves her with a lack of companionship, especially with the other characters attitudes towards her. She is an easy character to understand, like other desiring women. Steinbeck hasn't named her this could be for a number of reasons. He may have wanted her to be seen as lonely therefore not naming her shows no one gets close enough to her to call her by her first name. He may have done it to show the other characters only to present her as the wife of Curley rather than an individual. He may also have done it to show the male attitudes towards females. Curley's wife also helps to provoke mixed emotions in the reader. We often feel sorry for her such as when she talks of her loneliness. Most of Steinbeck's characters are stereotypical, or have some form of stereotypical view towards them and Curley's wife is no exception.

Thus, we can see the novel as a tussle of these two characters Lennie and Curley's wife against their antagonistic forces. In nutshell, this study seeks to establish that female too had their hidden desires and their desires should not be neglected and they should be given equal rights and their feelings should be heard, they should be given the proper treatment and patriarchy which domination should be minimized and it must not be seen as the male norms only, they too are humans and

so they must be treated and given equal rights rather than proclamation action must be taken to preserve those rights only than their living conditions will get better.

The first chapter shows the major characters in the novel along with the portrayal of the hypothesis and the statement of problem, which the project is concerned with. Then it shows the writers introduction and his works and literature review. In the second chapter the tool or the theoretical modality which is applied in the project is shown, whereas the third chapter is the textual analysis, like-wise the fourth and the final is the conclusion of the project.

II. Radical Feminism

The term “Feminist” came into use in English during the 1880’s, indicating support for women’s equal legal and political rights vis-à-vis to men. Radical feminism was first fully articulated in the late 1960’s and it argues that men’s patriarchal power over women is the primary power relationship in human society. Radical feminists in Western society believe that the root cause of all other inequalities is the oppression of women; some radical feminists acknowledge the simultaneous and intersecting effect of other independent categories of oppression as well. 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.

Patriarchal theory is not always as single-sided as the belief that all men always benefit from the oppression of all women. Patriarchal theory maintains 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.

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. Redstockings manifesto of 1984 reads that radical feminism "got sexual politics recognized as a public issue", "created the vocabulary [. . .] with which the second wave of feminism entered popular culture", "sparked the drive to legalize abortion", "were the first to demand total equality in the so-called private sphere" (housework and child care [. . .] emotional and sexual needs), and "created the atmosphere of urgency” that almost led to the passage of the Equal Rights

Amendment (2). The influence of Radical feminism can be seen in the adoption of these "personal" issues by even such liberal-feminist groups as the National Organization for Women (NOW).

As a form of practice, radical feminists introduced the use of consciousness raising groups. These groups brought together intellectuals, workers and middle class women in developed Western countries to discuss their experiences. During these discussions, women noted a shared and repressive system regardless of their political affiliation or social class. Based on these discussions, the women drew the conclusion that ending patriarchy was the most necessary step towards a truly free society. These consciousness-raising sessions allowed early radical feminists to develop a political ideology based on common experiences women faced with male supremacy. Consciousness rising was extensively used in the National Organization For Women (NOW) during the 1970s.

The feminism that emerged from these discussions stood first and foremost for the liberations of women, as women, from the oppression of men in their own lives, as well as men in power. This feminism was radical in both political sense (implying extremism), and in the sense of seeking the root cause of the oppression of women. Radical feminism claimed that a totalizing ideology and social formation—patriarchy (government or rule by fathers) dominated women in the interests of men. At the beginning of this period, heterosexuality was more or less an unchallenged assumption. Among radical feminists, the view became widely held that thus far the sexual freedoms gained in the sexual revolution of the 1960s- in particular, the decreasing emphasis on monogamy-had been largely something gained by men at women's expense. This assumption of heterosexuality would soon be challenged by the rise of political lesbianism, closely associated with Atkinson and "The Feminists".

Radical feminism was not only a movement of ideology and theory. Radical feminists also took direct action. They demand in literature an expression of female sexuality which will burst through the bonds of male logic with a poetic power that defines the tyranny of logocentric meaning. Besides sexual oppression, radical feminists often view other forms of power, for example, unequal power relations within capitalism-as derived from patriarchy. Radical feminism describes sexual as the or at least a fundamental form of oppression and the primary for women. They state the most strongly of all feminist traditions that men as a group are the main enemy.

This approach wants to bring about radical changes in the social configuration in which the position of women is not only redefined but also re-established as a respectable and important, commonly suggesting that the position of man be in a position of power relative to all women, and possibly some men. They have a strong interest in recovering or discovering positive elements in femininity asserting in essence that it is good to be a woman and to form bonds with other women. This school of feminism usually presents a historically continuous clear-cut difference between men and women.

This theory generally advocates a revolutionary model of social change. The agenda of radical feminist writings is to counter women's supposedly natural, biological inferiority and subordination within patriarchal society by asserting their at least equal status in relation to men. A crucial aspect of that agenda is for women to gain control over their own bodies, biology and to value and celebrate women's bodies.

Modern feminist based in United States took their impetus from civil rights, peace and other protest. 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 underrepresented in formal political institutions and decision making bodies worldwide.

Political feminists believe that politics has been historically dominated by the masculine to express their identity implicitly or explicitly. Women have been driven to private sphere. Despite their active participation in French revolution, post-revolutionary regime excluded them from full political citizenship.

Though the idea of feminism itself seeks to study the existence of women in the patriarchal society, existentialist feminism founded and elaborated by 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 a 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 attend by men. They project woman as

inherently demure creature and man powerful and virile so that the later can achieve transcendence. Some male critics attribute mystical to woman.

Myths are overwhelmed with an idea of femininity, eroticism and seductiveness. Beauvoir discloses the ambivalence of man's nature towards woman as he calls a Muse, a Goddess or Beatrice on the one hand while he associates her with demon, death, cruel stepmother on the other. Paternalism claim women are projected as 'other' subordinate being. This othering, according to Beauvoir, mystifies woman's qualities and pushes her into isolation.

The categories with which men think of the world are established from their point of view as absolute. Myth has been utilized for man's purpose i.e. to look at women as luxury. It is a snare or false objectivity. It is a 'mirage' and one of those snares of false objectivity into which man makes his readymade valuations. Woman oscillates between one and the other. Finally Beauvoir realizes the bondages obstructing a woman's free path so it is difficult for them to accept their status as autonomous individuals and their womanly destiny. Yet this is a source of 'blundering' and 'restlessness' when men realize the situation that is coming into existence, women will be a full human being, a free.

In a way the radical feminist label has been applied in recent years to a confusingly diverse range of theories, it is the site for far-ranging disagreements at all levels of theory and practice. It is essentially a theory of, by and for women; such, it is based firmly in women's own experiences and perceptions and sees no need to compromise with existing political perspectives and agendas. It sees the oppression of women as the most fundamental and universal form of domination and its aim is to understand and end this; here 'patriarchy' is a key term. From this it follows that, women as a group have interests opposed to those of men; these interests unite them

in a common sisterhood that transcends the division of class and race, and means that women should struggle together to achieve their own liberation.

Finally, radical feminist analysis insists that male power is not confined to the public worlds of politics and paid employment, but that it extends into private life as the family and sexuality, both of which are seen as instruments of patriarchal domination, such ideas are not new, but it was not until the late 1960s that they began to be developed systematically as a self-conscious theory. The impetus towards this development came from women's experiences in the Civil Rights, anti-war, New left and student movements in North America, Europe and Australia.

Young women role was essentially that of secretary, housewife or sex object, servicing the political, domestic and sexual needs of male activists; any attempt at raising the subject of women's exclusion from decision-making was met with silence, ridicule or contempt. As Redstockings manifesto of 1969 reads:

Women are an oppressed class; our oppression is total, affecting every facet of our lives. We are exploited as sex objects, breeders, domestic servants, and cheap labor. We are considered inferior beings whose only purpose is to enhance men's lives [. . .] we have been kept from seeing our personal suffering as a political condition [. . .] the conflicts between individual men and women are political conflicts that can only be solved collectively[. . .] we identify the agents of our oppression as men. Male supremacy is the oldest, most basic form of domination. All men receive economic, sexual, and psychological benefits from male supremacy. All men have oppressed women. (598)

By the early 1970s these new ideas were reflected in a substantial body of literature that included Kate Millet's *Sexual Politics*, Shulamith Firestone's *The Dialectic of*

Sex, Germaine Greer's *The Female Eunuch* and Eva Figes' *Patriarchal Attitudes* (all first published in 1970); anthologies of some of the new manifestos, speeches and articles were also published in Betty and Theodore Roszak's *Masculine/Feminine* (1969), Robin Morgan's *Sisterhood is Powerful* (1970) and Michelle Wandor's *The Body Politic* (1972).

While all of these were important manifestations of the new movement, it is the second chapter of Millett's *Sexual Politics* that is of the most theoretical importance, as it introduced into modern feminist thought the key concept of patriarchy. Although Millett describes her work as simply "notes towards a theory of patriarchy" (*Sexual Politics*, 24) it provides a starting-point from which many later theories have developed and encapsulates many of the central concerns of radical feminist thought; her discussion of the concept is also considerably more rigorous and thoughtful than that of many later writers who have seized upon the term without fully examining its implications, so that many of the criticisms that have been made of the concept do not in fact apply to her original analysis.

The term patriarchy is not of course new to political theory, but the use to which Millett put it certainly was. Derived from the Greek patriarches, meaning 'head of the tribe', it was central to seventeenth-century debates over the extent of monarchical power; here supporters of absolute rule claimed that the power of a king over his people was the same as that of a father over his family, and that both were sanctioned by God and nature. Millett seems to take such familial power as her starting-point, so that "the principles of patriarchy appear to be twofold; male shall dominate female, elder male shall dominate young" (*Politics*, 25). It is, however, only the first of these principles that she explores, and she does not distinguish between male power within the family and in society as whole; despite the efforts of some

writers to restrict the term to strictly family-based power, its use as a shorthand for a social system based on male domination and female subordination has become standard amongst feminists.

According to Millett, “Patriarchy’s chief institution is the family” (*Politics* 33). Later, radical feminists have agreed that, contrary to the assumptions of conventional political theory, the family is indeed a central part of society’s power structure; as such it both sustains patriarchal power in the ‘public’ world and is itself a source of women’s oppression. Far from being a ‘natural’ arrangement based on mutual love and respect in which the emotional, sexual and domestic needs of adult partners are met and their children cared for, it is a social institution in which women’s labour is exploited, male sexual power may be violently expressed and oppressive gender identities and modes of behavior are learned.

Millett’s central claims are simple, and they essentially represent a formalization of the ideas that were already current in the new women’s movement. She argues that in all known societies the relationship between the sexes has been based on power, and that they are therefore political. This power takes the form of male domination over women in all areas of life; sexual domination is so universal, so ubiquitous and so complete that it appears ‘natural’ and hence becomes invisible, so that it is “perhaps the most pervasive ideology of our culture and provides its most fundamental concept of power” (*Politics* 25).

M. H. Abrams in his *Glossary of Literary Terms* mentions:

Western society is pervasively patriarchal, male centered and controlled and conducted so as to subordinate women to men all cultural domains: familial, religious, political, economic, social, legal and artistic. Patriarchal ideology pervades those writings, which have

been considered great literature. Most of them are thus male characters; Oedipus, Ulysses, Hamlet, Tom Jones, Huck Finn etc.

Female characters are given marginal and subordinate roles, represented as complementary in opposition to masculine desires. (84)

The patriarchal power of men over women is therefore basic to the functioning of all societies and it extends far beyond formal institutions of power. It overrides class and race divisions, for economic dependency means that women's class identity is a "tangential, vicarious and temporary matter", while "sexism may be more endemic in our society than racism" (*Politics* 38 - 39).

Some claim that it was the discovery of the male role in reproduction that was critical and first led men to seek to control women. Thus Rich writes that, "A crucial moment in human consciousness arrives when man discovers that it is he himself, not the moon or the spring rains or the spirits of the dead, who impregnates the woman; that the child she carries and gives birth to is his child, who can make him immortal" (60).

Chinese women who were from childhood deliberately and systematically crippled in the name of erotic attraction, able only to totter painfully as Dworkin say, "On the outside of toes which had been bent under into the sole of the foot. The heel and instep of the foot resembled the sole and heel of a high-heeled boot. Hard callouses formed, toe-nails grew into the skin; the feet were pus-filled and bloody; circulation was virtually stopped" (101).

Patriarchy is primarily maintained by a process of conditioning which starts with childhood socialization within the family and is reinforced by education, literature and religion to such an extent that its values are internalized by men and women alike; for some women this leads to self-hatred, self-rejection and an

acceptance of inferiority. Despite the success of this 'interior colonization', patriarchy also rests upon economic exploitation and the use or threat of force.

This means that its history is a record of man's inhumanity to woman and that the thousands of women who die in the United States each year as a result of illegal abortion are victims of the same system as the Indian woman forced to die on her husband's funeral pyre, the Chinese woman crippled by foot-binding and the African girl whose clitoris is cut out. In all societies too, patriarchy relies upon sexual violence and rape. In this context, sexual relations between men and women are but an expression of male power, and Millett 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.

Patriarchy always imposes curtailment or a boundary towards women's freedom. Thus for example Adrienne Rich's account of patriarchy explicitly abstracts the position of women from any social context:

Under patriarchy, I may live in purdah or drive a truck; I may raise 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 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)

Unlike most conventional political theory, radical feminism does not see state power as the central political issue. From this new perspective, the state is but one manifestation of patriarchal power, reflecting other deeper structures of oppression, and women's well-documented exclusion from its formal institutions is a symptom rather than the cause of gender inequality. Therefore although the radical feminist analysis of the state has tended to be implicit rather than fully developed in its own right, this neglect itself embodies a theory of state power which is seen as neither autonomous nor as reducible to the needs of the economy, but as inextricably connected to areas of life such as the family and sexuality that have usually been seen as private and non-political, but which are now seen as basic to all power relationships in society.

For Radical feminists, the exclusion of women from power is no unfortunate and easily remedied accident, for the structures and institutions of the state have been made by men and embody their interests rather than those of women. This means that feminist demands will never be readily conceded by the state but will encounter opposition that the liberal perspective has no means of understanding. It also means that legislation on its own can do little to improve the real situation of women, although it may disguise or legitimize their oppression by combining it with a formal equality. Indeed state intervention that is ostensibly aimed at improving the situation of women may in fact dangerously increase the power of this male state; for example, state provision of welfare services may involve new forms of subordination rather than independence for women.

For some radical feminists, the whole idea of the competitive pursuit of power is rejected as an embodiment of male values, and conventional politics is abandoned: organizational hierarchies are avoided, political struggle is relocated from the ballot-box to the bedroom, and separatism is favoured over participation in existing organizations or institutions, which are seen as a mere playground for male egoists. For others, however, the identification of patriarchal power within the state is an insight that can further the feminist cause by providing a more realistic assessment of political possibilities than that provided by the liberal approach.

From this perspective, the state is seen as an arena of conflict which is systematically biased against women but within which important victories can nevertheless be won; it is essential to understand the power relations that are involved and the tremendous obstacles that women face, but this need not lead to the pessimistic abandonment of conventional politics. Such an approach can also in principle recognize the existence of cross-cutting race and class conflicts that will help determine political outcomes and which interact with gender struggles in highly complex ways.

Griffin similarly sees women as closer to nature than men, and therefore more able to express and identify with its needs, while Collard states that:

Nothing links the human animal and nature so profoundly as woman's reproductive system which enables her to share the experience of bringing forth and nourishing life with the rest of the living world. Whether or not she personally experiences biological mothering, it is in this that woman is most truly a child of nature and in this natural integrity lies the wellspring of her strength (106).

Radical feminist suggest that sex with men is oppressive because it is unfulfilling, it is not freely chosen and it is used as a means of dividing and controlling women. For other feminist writers, it is more explicitly linked to male *violence* and the idea that patriarchy, like all other systems of power, rests ultimately on force. As Kate Millett says, "We are not accustomed to associate patriarchy with force. So perfect is its system of socialization, so complete the general assent to its values, so long and so universally has it prevailed in human society that it scarcely seems to require violent implementation" (*Politics* 43).

For some writers, existing sexuality is a symptom of patriarchal society the product of a world in which men have authority, women are economically dependent and male needs and desires set the agenda in all spheres. Heterosexuality, therefore itself was declared to be a political institution, as such it was imposed upon women for the benefit of men. The rejection of heterosexuality is therefore not just a matter of personal sexual orientation, but a political act that strikes at the very heart of patriarchy. This analysis has led some radical feminists to the idea of 'politically correct' sexual activity which precludes all relationships with men, for all heterosexual intercourse is seen as a form of rape that is irretrievably bound up with the system of domination and oppression to which it is central. This view is well illustrated in a pamphlet issued by the Leeds Revolutionary Feminist Group:

Only in the system of oppression that is male supremacy does the oppressor actually invade and colonise the interior of the body of the oppressed. Penetration is an act of great symbolic significance by which the oppressor enters the body of the oppressed. Its function and effect is the punishment and control of women. Every act of

penetration for a woman is an invasion which undermines her confidence and saps her strength. (44)

Sexual pleasure for women is therefore masochistic, while for men power is eroticized, men's prime motive for oppressing women may be the sexual satisfaction derived from domination. Mackinnon says, "Women bound, women battered, women tortured, women humiliated, women degraded and defied, women killed- or, to be fair to the soft core- women sexually accessible, have- able, there for them, wanting to be taken and used, with perhaps just a little of light bondage" (326-7).

The radical feminist approach to the state can, therefore, give us a simplistic picture of a monolithic institution that can be written off by feminists as an instrument of patriarchal oppression; it can also provide the basis for a more sophisticated approach that recognizes the complex nature of the power struggles involved and the interconnectedness of the different patriarchal structures. This allows us to recognize both the importance and the limitations of conventional politics and legislation.

For example, a law that gives a woman the right to leave an abusing husband is not in itself enough to protect her from marital violence, for it will be enforced by a sexist police force within a culture in which sexuality and domination are inextricably linked, and she is unlikely to have the economic resources to maintain herself. If, however, the law is passed in the context of feminist struggles to make such violence visible and unacceptable, to increase the accountability of the police, to provide safe houses for battered wives and to improve educational and employment prospects for women, then it can represent a significant victory.

For radical feminists, therefore, state power is not to be understood in its own terms, but as part of a ubiquitous system of patriarchal power. This means that it is not a neutral tool equally available for women and men, and that it will not automatically

respond to the dictates of reason or justice; it also suggests that its nature cannot be changed by simply changing the incumbents of the positions of power, for political outcomes are structured by society-wide power relations, not by individual decisions. For some, the patriarchal domination of women by men is the central and defining feature of state power; for others however the concept of patriarchy allows scope both for conventional political struggle and for an analysis of related structures of class and race oppression.

Thus, every movement and its demands has its own merits and demerits, but the rebellion against the male supremacy and patriarchy is the essence of Radical Feminism. Therefore, the main objective of this research is to prove the female suppression by the male society.

III. Defiance of Patriarchal Restrictions Set by the Male-Society

Of Mice and Men simply depicts the submission of female by the male; it also cleverly portrays the head male dominating the minor males. In a way we could see the tendency of Radical Feminism hatching in the story. It is crystal clear by the regular defiance of Curley's wife to the order given by Curley to her. She wants freedom from the trap of Curley. She demands equality but her voice is unheard always because she is the weaker sex and according to the male norms, she must follow certain etiquette. She is even forbidden to talk with other persons, throughout the novel. It is visible in the words of Curley's wife, the pathetic condition by which she was going through, "I get lonely", she said, "You can talk to people, but I can't talk to nobody but Curley. Else he gets mad. How'd you like not to talk to anybody?" (95)

Curley's wife in a sense is treated with inhuman-attributes. Her freedom is seized by her husband. She asked Lennie to be-fitted in her shoes so that Lennie might know the agony she is suffering from. One can easily understand the pathos Curley's wife is going through. We can only guess how a person can feel when he/she is not even allowed to interact with other person. Such person is like a look alike as a set of furniture in a room. We could only point out the male submission of Curley and possessiveness of getting mad if his wife interacts with others. So Curley's wife's bold move in defying the male hegemony and interacting with the male worker Lennie provides us her desire to break away from the mundane and rigid law imposed by her husband. In a sense she proclaims her freedom from her husband's strong clutches. Curley as a whole represents the whole male patriarchal society, whereas Curley's wife represents the female docile part. Though she tries to defy the norms for

her subsistence and freedom, throughout the novel and interacts with other male workers obliterating the male orders.

Her daunting statement is proof enough that she was not happy with Curley, “Well, I ain’t told this to nobody before. May be I ough’n to. I don’t like Curley. He ain’t a nice fella” (97).

Curley’s wife was not happy living with him and she wanted freedom, as she was kept like a slave in her house without enough freedom. She was told to follow every order given by her husband, but she was not going to take things for granted and her behavior was like of a rebellion to defy him.

Steinbeck craftily depicts the 1930s situation, when women’s conditions were worse, they even lack their own identity and they were identified by their husband’s identity. As we see the female characters in the novel is identified by their husband name. Women were confined by their male-counterparts in every aspects of their life and they were termed as objects and were stereotyped. Like-wise in the novel the male worker in the bunk-house had termed women mostly as whores. They lacked proper respect for woman as we could guess from the interaction between George and Candy that woman had such degraded reputation in the time-being, they were merely seen as sleazy and cheap persona. George and Candy could be talking about Curley’s wife nature:

“Purty?” he asked casually.

“Yeah. Purty . . . but-“

George studied his cards. “But what?”

“Well she got the eye.”

“I seen her give Slim the eye. Slim is a jerkline skinner. Curley never seen it. An’ I seen her give Carlson the eye.

“Well, I think Curley’s married a tart.”

“He ain’t the first,” said George.

“There’s plenty done that.” (31)

The above talk presents the portrayal of women simply as a loose character. Male made common generalizations about all women which are largely false, and a trace of ignorance about women is seen spread in the novel. As there are no other female character in the ranch that we know about, half of the men rarely sees females and the ones they see are when they go into town to a “whore-house”. This shows the men’s stereotypical view on women as that of a “whore”. Simone De Beauvoir in her book *The Second Sex* has written about the common portrayal of woman by the male society as an: other, whore, orgy sometime and mostly as a delicate object. We could find such thoughts about women in the above lines between George and Candy. They conversed in the above dialogues as Curley’s wife as a loose character having extra-marital affair with many people. Their conversation denotes Curley’s wife excessive sexual desire, but they are ignorant from the fact that Curley is delimiting or prohibiting his wife to talk with anyone except Curly himself.

We could get a clue in another interaction between Curley and Lennie, when Curley’s wife is searching for Curley:

“Jesus, what a tramp,” he said. “So that’s what Curley picks for a wife.”

“She’s purty,” said Lennie defensively.

Yeah, and she’s sure hidin’ it. Curley got his work ahead of him. But she’d clear out for twenty buck. (35)

We could see the common false generalization made by George about Curley’s wife though George is shown intellectual in the novel he too falls in the false myth of

“judging the book by looking its cover”. George, by just going through Curley’s wife appearance and her soft talks evaluate her as a tramp. He forgets that she might be trying to be just friendly with all the male-workers and thus she must be seeking company to exchange her thoughts, because we knew earlier that she felt such lonely and dull living in the restrictions imposed by Curley.

The patriarchal society had seized proper rights from woman lives. Its sees women, only well for cooking and washing stuffs. Women are termed as object and taught since their childhood to serve their male counter parts. They are termed as an object to satisfy the male desires. So they must prepare themselves according to the male desire. Male consider them to a non-entity, though they talks about them in the fantasy, forgetting the facts that both male and female existence is necessary for each other in the evolution and subsistence of the universe. Male further think that they are the integral part of the society with the female inferior one. They boast that women are incomplete without man, for the existence, we could see in the talk of George and Whit, “I never seen nobody like her. She got the eye goin’ all the time on everybody. Every time the guy is around, seems like she can’t keep away from guys” (56).

We could interpret the last sentence said by Whit that she is just not-entity in the absence of guys. We could feel pity on the condition of Curley’s wife in the sense; she had to tolerate a lot from her husband. Sometime even small gestures give us a big clue. We could guess that Curley might be keeping his wife in enormous restrictions and if she doesn’t follows his commands she will get a whack or two. Like we could trace such evidence in the angry gesture of Curley, “Any you guys seen my wife?” he demands “She ain’t been here,” said Whit Curley looked threateningly about the room. “Where the hell’s Slim?”(59)

Curley's such behavior indicates that his wife had been kept in such volatile way and if she commits some mistake then the consequences might be hostile for her. It is noticeable by Curley's angry searching for his wife that if he meets her finally he will give her, the peace of his mind and who knows a beating too. The story cleverly presents the range of suppression and the desire to break away from such dominance. Curley wife is attributed with such courageous role that she plays in the novel. Time and after she pops in and out in the novel defying all the restrictions imposed by the male society. She care's too less about her husband's desire to not talk with other male worker in the ranch. She rather entangles herself in regular talks with other male character in the novel, and faces the challenges with audacity. She even makes her presence tangible while she talks with Crooks:

Crooks says, "May be you better go along to your own house now. We don't want no trouble."

"Well, I ain't giving you no trouble. Think I don't like to talk to somebody ever' once in a while? Think I like to stick in that house all time?" (85)

Curley's wife in Curley's guidance seems to us like a caged-bird, who is properly fed but has no rights to get out from the cage. We could give sympathy for her poor condition and salute her for defying her husband's orders. We could further see the evidence in next passage when she counter attacks Crooks statement with a furious reply:

"You gotta husband. You got no call foolin' around."

"Sure I gotta husband. You all seen him. Swell guy, ain't he? Spends all his time saying what he's gonna do to guys he don't like, think I'm

gonna stay in that two-by-four house and listen how Curley's gonna lead with his left twict, and then bring in the ol' right cross?" (85)

When Crooks tries to suggest her, she instantly fights back furiously. Crooks tries to remind her that she is a female and she had got a husband, whom she must follow, but she replies with her defiance to her husband's monotonous works and his rigidity to control her life. Curley here appears to us as a cruel and show-off rich man, who instead of doing some useful productive work spends his time boasting to his wife about the things, which he will do with the guys whom don't like. His days passes with the thought of picking up fight with other male persona as we could see his verbal entanglement with the jerkline skinner Slim and his useless entanglement and finally beating of Lennie when the latter was defenseless and passive.

We could further see Curley's wife is not a woman who will give up so easily. She will fight back with the male norms if subdued. Mostly women are kept by males in dreams and false promises but they were never granted proper freedom but Curley's wife seems more daunting to seek freedom from the male shackles imposed to her. We could see when Candy lie her about the truth of her husband broken hand:

"Awright", she said contemptuously. "Awright", "Cover him up if ya wanta, whatta ya think I am, a kid? I tell ya I could of went with shows. Not jus' one, neither. An' a guy told me he could put me in pitchers." She was breathless with indignation. Everybody out doing something. And what am I doing? Standing here talking to a bunch of bindle stiffs. (86)

Her statement is full of rage and anger hurled towards the male society, which is denying giving equality to the female desires. They are given promises but which never sees fulfillment. She seems courageous enough to face boldly with Crooks

when he tries to gain control over her, “I had enough,” he said coldly. “You got no fights comin’ in a colored man’s room. I ‘m gonna ast the boss not to ever let you come in the back no more.” She turned on him in scorn. “Listen, Nigger, she said, “You know what I can do to you if you open your trap?” (88)

It is quite visible that she is bold enough to tackle Crooks as he is made silent by her statement. Its seen that she must had tolerated enough of the male chauvinism so she had made her mind to fight back and to keep them silence instead. Radical feminism talks and demands about the equality of women in every aspects of life that man possess, which women too deserves but are denied. In the story the female character is marginalized from every aspects, she doesn’t have the permission to leave the house and to interact with other except her husband, but in contrast she fights for the domination laden to her till the end of the story. Curley’s wife thus demands for the equality and freedom of conversation in these lines, “What’s the matter with me?” she cried “Ain’t I got a right to talk to nobody? Whatta they think I am, anyways? I don’t know why I can’t talk to you” (96).

She just demands company and equal participation in interacting and thus transmission and sharing of thoughts, because it is an evident thing that when people don’t have any conversation with other persons they get alone and this could lead to madness. Such was the case of Curley’s wife; she had a solitary living without proper communication more of living like in a jail. Her life was like most of the poor women whose fate was deceived by their male partners. She was promised by a guy to lend her role in a movie but he never show up again, “Another time I met a guy, and he was in pitchers. Went out to the Riverside Dance Palace with him. He says he was gonna put me in the movies, Says I was a natural he was gonna write to me about it,” I never got that letter” (97).

The men gave her false promises and false dreams which made her sad and broken-hearted. Likewise male always bestow women with promises and dreams but mostly the fulfillment of such promises remain always denied. We could see the male domination rampant over the world and women had to be passive and submissive over such domination. Women are not only dominated physically but mentally and emotionally too. Their desires are crushed and aspirations are burnt. They had to remain in silence and fight back was never expected. In most parts of the world they are even not granted proper education and they are taught from childhood that they are just born to serve their husband. But in the 21st century such women are doing equally better to men and they are proving themselves that they are only physically weak but mentally they can compete with men in every area of human life. Education and social awareness had made their suppressed desires sprung out from underneath their heart.

They are demanding proper attention and equal rights in every front and sector. We could see the desire to break away from the patriarchal norms in the heart of Curley's wife and the inherent hatred enmeshed for Curley who represents the whole male norms, and when she hears Curley is hurt, she feels that the whole male norms had been threatened and it can be brought down to its feet. She even praises Lennie who was responsible for Curley's condition, "I'm glad you bust up Curley a little bit. He got it comin' to him. Sometimes I'd like to bust him myself" (90).

It indicates that Curley's wife has been keeping lots of rage and hatred for Curley in her heart, so we could hear such comments from her. It must be the patriarchal domination that must had made her angry over her husband. As it is said whatever one sows that he reaps. It was inevitable in Curley's case, as his treatment to his wife was disgusted, so we couldn't expect good feedback from her side too. In

earlier society talking against her husband was termed as a taboo, fearing of punishment women used to shut their mouths up. But in this new century women are not going to tolerate any unjust behavior from her husband. Radical Feminism always opposes such condemning acts from the male-society. Disclosing such vile-acts to the society and enlightenment about women's pain and experiences are some concerning subjects of it. Radical feminism thus advocates about the injustice and brings the women's pathos in light and tries to rectify the social injustice.

Inherent Domination of Lennie in the Novel

Radical Feminism not only voices for the female agony and pain only of women, rather it cares about the domination of inferior male too, by their counter parts, we could say superior male. As the submission by the head male towards their fellow weak males are also condemned by the radical feminist. We could see in the novel the intellectual part George giving commands and dominating his fellow the dumb and weak Lennie throughout the novel. He is always reminded as the animal part and weak link by George. George place orders to Lennie and in a sense rules over him, sometime committing even life threatening commands. It is sheer domination though promised equality, Lennie is always duped by George denying him from his rights. We could see from the beginning of the novel how George, the intellect part tries to interfere in each and every petty thing gone by Lennie, "Lennie, for God sakes don't drink so much. You gonna sick, like you was last night" (3).

It is mere George's reluctance to give Lennie proper freedom. He wants to control every move of Lennie's life. Though physically Lennie is far stronger than George but he lacks the intellectual part so we could only guess George capitalizing in this aspect. But it doesn't mean that Lennie don't have any personal desires, he does like to have rabbits, ranch and his own peaceful world, which is promised by George

to him. Lennie had to follow George commands timidly without second thoughts whether it is beneficial or harmful for him. Inherently it is a male domination. Lennie is not given even the freedom to keep a mouse:

George held out his hand. "Come on. Give it to me. You ain't puttin' nothing over."

Lennie hesitated, backed away, looked wildly at the brush line as though he contemplated running for his freedom.

"Give you what George?"

You know God damn well what. I want that mouse. (9)

This gives us view how dominated Lennie was under the company of George.

Lennie's identity was limited to none by George. George used his voluntary decision over Lennie. Lennie under George guidance is seen merely as a puppet. Where George goes Lennie had to follow him and the latter had to stoop over each and every command given by George. Lennie's life was turned hellish by the restriction imposed by George. He used to make Lennie menial work, like mostly a husband compels to their wives. Lennie's identity was like of a slave he was ordered to do things which George could have done himself but he behaves like the authority and manipulates Lennie and compels him for the work, "You gonna get that wood?" George demanded. "There's plenty right up against the back of that sycamore. Floodwater wood. Now you get it" (11).

George such demands is merely seen as a male chauvinism aspect. George could work equally and together with Lennie instead of telling Lennie to go by himself to collect the woods. It is such pity that throughout the novel George nominally announces Lennie as his friend but in contrast he never treats him with equality and finally at the end kills him. Lennie can't even express his desire of

ketchup; he is shut down by George in an hostile manner and threatens him in an angry mood. He moves even farther by using abusive language to Lennie and blaming him for all the misfortune and bad happenings which the former had suffered from. We could see sometimes the rebellious behavior seems spreading out from Lennie when enough of he had heard from George comments:

I'd find things, George.

I don't need no nice food with ketchup.

I'd lay out in the sun and nobody'd hurt me.

An' if I found a mouse, I could keep it.

No body'd take it away from me. (13)

When something is too much to bear and is intolerable, then it is evident that the revolt is soon to be inevitable. Such is about Lennie; he tries to revolt against George and tell him to go separate way. He ask for freedom for both and solitary life, where no one could hurt him and if he finds a mice he could keep it without others interference, his words denotes George earlier arrogance to take away a mouse from Lennie's hand and hurling it towards the river. George uses his intellect to dominate Lennie, by showing him hypothetical dreams to the latter's attention and making him docile, "Someday-we're gonna get the jack together and we're gonna have a little house and a couple of acres and some pigs" (15).

Whenever Lennie tries to break away from George uses such statement to brainwash Lennie's mind. It is like the dreams which are normally shown by the male to their female counter-parts. In a way Lennie sometimes proves to have feminine traits submerged with him, as we could find him crying like a girl when his mouse is thrown in the river. As it is said that crying is related with female and boys don't cry. Further we could see George's masculine command to Lennie to hide in a place if he

commits some mistake in the future. George commands Lennie that, “Look Lennie- if you just happen to get in trouble, I want you to come right here and hide in the brush, till I come for you” (17).

George is imposing his male authority towards Lennie by telling him to hide in future in that place if something gets wrong with the latter. It seems that George was being clairvoyance to Lennie and he had almost seen the unseen, so he was trying to tell Lennie about it.

Sometime it looks like George is proving a good compatriot to Lennie but mostly Lennie is not given to utter a single sentence and every talking is done by George, on behalf of Lennie. Firstly it seems that George is proving too smart in comparison to Lennie and secondly we could interpret George’s domination over Lennie vis-à-vis like the male norms restrictions towards the female to not to speak without the male permission. And if mistakenly Lennie speaks any words he’s been scowled by George.

George motive is to present Lennie as only a good but passive worker eradicating his merits and expressing only the latter physical strength. In some sense we could see George as mere a sycophant. George seems intriguing in each and every move of Lennie. Lennie is not even having the permission to look and praise beauty, he is scolded by George, “Well, you keep away from her, because she’s a rat-trap if I ever seen one. You let Curley take the rap. He let himself in for it” (36).

George sounds tyrannical when he sees Lennie’s looking Curley’s wife. Lennie is not even let to have a good look over the lady and to appreciate her beauty. It is the law of nature that a beautiful thing always fills a sense of praise in human-beings mind. Same was in the case with Lennie, he was just enchanted with her beauty, but George responded angrily towards Lennie’s such acknowledgement.

George seems a bit opportunist when he talks with Slim regarding Lennie's humongous strength to perform more works in short span of time. It seems George always benefitted by Lennie's strength. George seems arrogant to declare to Slim that Lennie is always ready to follow only the former's orders.

It seems total domination of Lennie when George tells such things to Slim. It is evident in the later part of the story that George used to dominate Lennie from his childhood, making fun of him and playing nasty jokes with him was an integral part of George's life. We could view the cruelty of George when we see George commanding Lennie to jump in the river without any plausible reason. Poor Lennie don't have any choices then to jump in though he is unable to swim.

George interrupts in Lennie's day to day activities, Lennie cannot even have his share of fun, while George keep on playing cards with Candy and Slim, Lennie is not even have the freedom to tame a pup, "I told you, you couldn't bring that pup in here." "George reached down and picked the tiny puppy. Lennie set up quickly. "Give 'um to me George" (47).

Lennie tries to get back the pups, which belongs to him but, whenever he tries to revolt some words or another of George makes him silence. George in another stance seems merciless, as in one incidence Curley attacks Lennie, but George doesn't give permission to Lennie to defend himself against Curley's rage. So consequently Lennie gets hurt badly and blood pours down from his nose and one of his eyes bears cut and is closed. George cruelty seems to reach at the apex when in the final phase of the novel he reacts. "I guess we gotta get 'im an' lock 'im up" (103).

It seems that George had finally made plans to lock him up together as in the end Lennie revolt gets out of control so not finding any alternate George comes to this brutal decision. Thus we could say from the beginning of the story towards the end

Lennie is manipulated by George. Though Lennie tries to subvert George's domination time and after but his defiance is met more harshly by George and when at last Lennie's defiance crosses the limit George shoots him violently, thus meeting an unfortunate end. Thus we could conclude that George from the beginning is seen as a patriarchal force of domination, imposing domination and force upon Lennie and the latter is the submissive part.

IV. Conclusion

John Steinbeck in his novel *Of Mice and Men* presents the suppressed 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 Curley to his wife or George to Lennie. Both the suppressed characters try to break away from such domination. Curley's wife is presented as a valiant woman who instead of regular warning defies the male norms and throughout the story pops in and out in search of interaction with the male-workers.

Curley's wife represents the modern woman who is bold enough to tackle with the male society. She is bold and firm in her decision, though it seems she is in her husband's guidance, she regularly tries to subvert such rigid rules and tries to seek her own identity and counter attack the patriarchal norms, by disobeying the rule. She continues in her pursuit of freedom, from the time she is presented in the novel. She quarrels with one of the male worker in the ranch, which is proof enough of her courage to battle with the whole male norms. As all the male in the novel shuns her voluntary interest to talk with her leaving her lonely, on the contrary she is determined enough to have communication with them.

She feels extremely lonely, as there are no other female characters in the novel and as she is forbidden by her husband to interact with other male-worker, she defies him and seeks for interaction with other persons. Likewise, Lennie is seen subdued by George from the beginning, his every activities is under the sharp surveillance of George. He is just like a puppet in the hands of George. Though Lennie too seems to break away from George's strict behavior and do his own thing but due to his

immense dullness he falls prey of unwanted consequences. Lennie is portrayed as a pitiable man, who gets lots of sympathy from the reader for his immense foolishness.

To conclude, Curley's wife seems the main protagonist force, who tries her level best to fight against the antagonist patriarchal society for the freedom of her speech and the way to live her life in her own way, whereas Lennie plays the secondary force of defiance, though dominated by his male friend George, he is seen as carrying inherent force of a rebellion trying to break away from the orders imposed by George and lead his own life.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M. H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7th ed. Bangalore, Prism, 2003.
- Beauvoir De Simone. *The Second Sex, Woman as Other*. New Delhi: Penguin, 1949.
- Choderow, Nancy. *The Reproduction of Mothering*. California: University of California Press, 1978.
- Collard, Andree. *The Rape of the Wild*. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1988.
- Figs, Eva. *The Patriarchal Attitudes*. London: Faber and Faber, 1970
- Firestone, Shulamith. *The Dialectics of Sex*. Texas: Morrow, 1970.
- Greer, Germaine. *The Female Eunuch*. Portland, Oregon: Straus and Giroux, 1970.
- Leaf, Jonathan. *Of Mice and Melodrama*. New York: The New Criterion, 2007.
- Mackinnon Catherine. *In Harms Way: The Pornography Civil Rights Hearings*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Millet, Kate. *Sexual Politics*. Chicago: Uillinois, 1968.
- Morgan, Robin. *Sisterhood is Powerful*. New York: Knof Publishing Group, Vintage, 1970.
- O'Brien, Mary. *The Politics of Reproduction*. Boston, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981.
- Rich, Adrienne. *Of Women Born*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc, 1977.
- Roszak, Theodore and Betty. *Masculine/Feminine*. Gloucestershire: Harper and Row, 1969.
- Steinbeck, John. *Of Mice and Men*. New York: Bantam Books, 1988.
- Tanner, Leslie. *Voices from Women's Liberation*. New York: Signet, 1970.
- Valerie, Bryson. *Modern Feminist Thought*. New York: Feminist Press, 1995.