

VOICING MALE ETHOS: AN ANTI-FEMINISTIC STUDY OF *MY FEUDAL LORD*  
BY TEHMINA DURRANI

Pinkish Zahra M. Phil (ENG Literature)

Government College Women University Faisalabad

pinkishzahra@hotmail.com

Amara Javed (Assistant professor)

Government College Women University Faisalabad

Sumaira Akhtar (M. Phil Applied Linguistics)

illusivelife10@gmail.com

University of Management and Technology Lahore

**Abstract**

Feminism has gained a prominent position in less time especially in the third world where women are largely considered under the control of patriarchy and male chauvinistic ideas. In such a situation when any woman writes against men or raises a voice against the settled norm of society it is not only highly appreciated but also results in extreme manipulation of men at the hands of women. This research argues that *My Feudal Lord* falls into the same category. Woman's stance of defaming their male counterpart raises many questions that need to be answered. Especially when a woman claims herself, to be a victim and a voice of third world Muslim country. This research is based on the theory of Anti-Feminism, which counters feminism, especially when it marginalizes men and defames them in the name of giving voice to females in patriarchal society. This study deals these research questions: Q. 1How does Durrani exploit the feminism to her benefit in *My Feudal Lord*? Q. 2How does Durrani misrepresent herself to be a Third World Muslim Women representative in the novel? The main objectives to conduct this research are: To find out the Anti-Feministic Elements in the undertaken Novel, *My Feudal Lord by Tehmina Durrani* to falsify the exaggerated use of Patriarchal imagery and to nullify the self behalfist claim of Durrani as a subjugated entity.

**Keywords:** anti-feminism, masculinism, equity Feminism

## INTRODUCTION

The present research is an anti-feministic analysis of Tehmina Durrani's memoir *My Feudal Lord* (1995). Anti-feminism remained a less understood process in twentieth century, but as the global dimensions are changing because of manipulation conducted by feminists, world dearly felt the need to raise its voice for the other part that are males who are blamed so much for so many things. Like feminism, anti-feminism has also several definitions and forms. Masculinism, an extended form of anti-feminism stresses that men are facing several challenges because of false behafist feminists, who claims to represent one gender while totally suppressing and neglecting the other. Anti-feministic discourse counters the feministic allegations that are imposed on men, males are suffering hugely because of these wrongly imposed feministic agendas in society.

*My Feudal Lord* (1995) is a controversial piece of writing which arises many types of questions in the mind of a reader regarding the representation of a woman. She challenged the behavioural patterns and considers that woman is oppressed because of three reasons that are feudal system, patriarchal society and cultural norms. Her basic aim of writing is to give a voice or break the silence and speaks on the behalf of woman but she is not representing the true picture. Durrani moulded the whole story in her favour by misrepresenting various issues. Even the very idea of feminism is misrepresented in her work *My Feudal Lord*.

*My Feudal Lord, Mendha Saayien*, catches the attention of large number of people not only in Pakistan but all over the world. It is considered as the Sensational European Bestseller. It is an autobiographical novel in which Durrani tries to represent the suppressed and subjugated women and the role of women in Muslim society but in doing so she misrepresents the whole ideology of feminism. The statement which is written on novel's title page is evident as it marks the view that it is a devastating indictment of a women's role in Muslim society; her work is warmly welcomed by the third world women but there are certain queries which arises in the mind of the reader which needs to be countered. Three words "devastating indictment", "women's role" and "Muslim society" are not only the words but the ideologies. All these key terms in the statement need to be understood in understatement as apparently it is making a very strong statement that captures the mind of

the reader Instead of representing these ideologies she misrepresents these ideas in *My Feudal Lord*.

Some forms of feminism are arrogant that need to be countered or challenged. Its discussion or debate claims that men are in crisis because of the feminization of society. The Masculinist phenomenon examines the alternative explanations; firstly, men have real problems. Secondly, Masculinism is openly opposed to feminism or consider as a counter movement due to extreme feminization in society; man is in crisis because of the exaggerated imagery created by women. Durrani did the same in her work *My Feudal Lord*. It is basically a confused narration in which she herself is not sure about various issues. She depicted her ambivalent state of mind through her words. At the very beginning she claims that her childhood was encumbered by a long list of don'ts, which is designated to maintain a distance between herself and the masculine world for example she is not supposed to wear make-up or nail polish. Do not look at boys and do not visit a girl who has an older brother, never pick up the telephone, never go out alone with driver even she is not supposed to stand alone in the kitchen with male servants.

Anti-feministic discourse counters the feministic allegations that are imposed on men, males are suffering hugely because of these wrongly imposed feministic agendas in society. Anti-feminism remained a less understood process, but as the global dimensions are changing because of manipulation conducted by feminists. World dearly felt the need to raise its voice for the other part that are males who are blamed so much for so many things. Like feminism, anti-feminism has also several definitions and forms. Masculinism, an extended form of anti-feminism stresses that men are facing several challenges because of false behalfist feminists, who claims to represent one gender while totally suppressing and neglecting the other.

#### *Anti-Feminism and the Countering Movement*

Anti-feminism or masculinism may sound alien or even harsh in Pakistani context but reality is, it does exist in the society and needs to be acknowledged. Masculinist or Masculinism and Anti- feminism, in English it usually refers towards those ideologies and thinking that focus on patriarchal ideology rather than being totally against feminism (Watson, 1996). Men are facing *Othering*. A social balance that was existing in societies since the ancient times, in which both genders were living together by celebrating their differences. This equilibrium is facing unsteadiness since 1960s when feminism starts deviating from its proposed ideology.

As *Dictionary of Literary Terms* defines Feminism as, “an attempt to describe and interpret women’s experience as depicted in various kinds of literature. It questions the long standing dominant male interpretations in literature” (Cudden, 1998, p. 7). Cudden further elaborates, “It attaches male notion of value in literature by offering critiques of male authors and representations of men in literature. It also challenges male ideas regarding the nature of women and how they feel and think” (p. 7). And according to Barkty (1900), Women’s oppression under male domination not only consists of solely in depriving women of political and legal rights but also extends in to the structure of our society and the contents of our culture and permeates our consciousness (Barkty, 1900, p. 63) Already much work has been done on *My Feudal Lord* from the feministic perspective. Feminism has many different uses and its meaning is often debated. For example, feminism is divided into two waves. First wave dating from 1830 to 1920 is best recalled for the suffragette movement, and a second wave, organized around women’s liberation, and dates from 1960s to the present day.

Most masculinists believe that human beings are divided into two naturally different and complementary sexes. And it is this complementariness that justifies the hierarchy of the values, attitudes, and behaviours associated with each of the sexes (Ge’linas, 2002, pp. 14–15). According to Masculinism, the male approach is all about natural hierarchy, with emphasis on kindness and mutual aid (Dallaire, 2005, pp. 125–126). Feminists thus surpasses and even denies the basic difference between men and women.

It is a commonly held belief that male is manipulated at the hands of feminists and feminism is continually used against men; females that blame males for violence easily gain public funding and media attention (Boucher and Gagnon, 2010). So, Masculinism and anti-feminism in simpler terms can be elaborated as a reactionary counter movement that is opposing the false feministic claims whose agenda is liberating women by totally discarding men. Under the disguising of advocating male and female equality, masculinists and Anti-feminism can be seen as advocacy working for the restoration of masculinity is supposed to be in crisis. Masculinism therefore includes a countermovement in the service of patriarchal domain and men in society. Its aim is to oppose and turn around the feminist movement.

Men and women are considered as two commonly independent flattering poles. “one of the difficulties in any discussion about gender and gender identity is that our terms of reference are already defined for us” by the prevalent ideology of gender differences and inequalities”

(Brittan, 1989, p. 35). Most of the time, it is considered that the gender roles are constructed politically. A feminist has made gender a problematic issue. The feminism is considered as a prevalent pattern and it claims the suppression of expressive voices and experiences and it is in search of the core relationship of the patriarchal system that is male dominant system and by doing so they consider themselves as suppressed. The *Death of Man* indicates the effort to discard essentialist ideas of humanity and nature. According to Flax it is the decentralization of man (Flax, 1990, p. 32).

*My Feudal Lord* was originally published in 1991 and translated along with Urdu under the title of *Mendha Saayien*, in to thirty-nine other languages. It is a popular autobiography in Pakistan as it is considered a challenge to the male dominant society by a woman who raised her voice against the injustices done by men against women. Many consider it a representative work of twentieth century. It is interesting to note that feminism was taking its shape in Europe and it influenced the third world as a source of breaking shackles of imposed othering regarding women. In such a scenario, any work from third world especially from Pakistan was warmly welcomed, especially when it was a defaming account of Pakistan's culture particularly Punjabi culture and adding more flavour to it by presenting men as antagonists. Although these things are not wrong yet they are presented in an exaggerated form by Durrani. This element of defaming becomes more grievous when people are presented only one version of reality and all the other things are left only on assumptions. Finding truth and justice becomes the responsibility of the reader when the person who was defamed at a larger level does not participate in any sense, neither in approval nor in denial.

*Introduction of the Novel: My Feudal Lord by Tehmina Durrani*

*My Feudal Lord* was written by Tehmina Durrani as an account of atrocities conducted by her second husband. She wrote this novel right after her divorce with Ghulam Mustafa Khar. The very dominant element in the novel is Durrani's claim of trying to be innocent and applying her narrative to the whole Pakistani culture. Durrani writes, "I refused to let go because of the kids" (Durrani, 1995, p. 115) where as she left her first daughter to marry her feudal lord (Khar). Durrani also writes about herself as "confused and sometimes ashamed" (Durrani, 1995, p. 25). It was Durrani's unpleasant childhood that left flaws in her personality that were later used as a source of proving herself as a sufferer. She left her first husband, Anees Khan as not being authoritative but afterwards blamed Khar for having these

qualities that made her fall in love with him and ending her first marriage. Mustafa Khar was “authoritative, conservative and overpowering” (Durrani, 1995, p. 111). *My Feudal Lord* is a confused narrative of a lady who herself is not clear in her ideas and defamed her ex-husband and lover. Durrani further writes, “Psychologically I had suffered from my father’s weak role in our family. Now here was someone who presented a quite different personality” (Durrani, 1995, p. 210). She was having a love and hate relationship with Mustafa Khar, she was playing the role of both admiring and being jealous of Mustafa Khar at the same time.

*My Feudal Lord* is divided into three parts, *Lion of Punjab*, *Law of Jungle* and *Lioness*. In first part, *Lion of Punjab* Mustafa Khar is presented as a dominating and authoritative man, who likes to subjugate his female counterparts and treat them as objects. Durrani writes, “There was not a day that Mustafa did not hit me... I just tried my best not to provoke him... (Durrani. 1995, p. 118).”

In second part, *Law of Jungle*, Durrani starts her journey of becoming a lioness, when Mustafa Khar is in exile during Zia’s regime by overthrowing Government of an elected democratic Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. Khar is provided with a residency in London from his in laws, Durrani writes, “This is my Father’s house and I do not think you should dare to lift a hand on me” (Durrani, 1995, p. 225). Durrani used this empowerment of her as a strong financial support from her parents. She further writes, “The next time you will raise a hand on me, I will pick a-up a knife and kill you” (Durrani, 1995, p. 215).

Ahmed says that Tehmina Durrani is the survivor of a country where women are not considered human beings. She revealed the violence and cruelty she experienced at the hands of her feudal-politician husband. She has good looks and brain. She writes books, paints and sells her canvases to the rich in Lahore. He further talks about religious misuse which is also depicted in Durrani’s novel by using terms ‘shariah’, ‘umraah’, ‘sunnah’ etc. (Ahmad, 1998, p. 8). This is an extreme othering of women at the hands of both men and women interpretations, Durrani presented women as such lean beings that everyone is denying their mere existence and blaming religion and Pakistani society simultaneously. Furthermore Roy writes that it is due to Tehmina Durrani that world opened its eyes towards the sufferings of Pakistani women. She argues that “being the citizen of a patriarchal society where the cultural norm for women and to remain silent against oppression, is terrible. She sensed the

stifling darkness of the corner she was pushed into, which led her to offer “spicy” details of her life for public consumption.” (Roy, 2012).

Durrani is continuously presenting contrasting images, at one point she says one thing and denies it in the very next place. There is a sudden shift in Durrani’s attitude regarding her mother. In the beginning, she portrays her mother as a strong matriarch, a divorced lady from her first husband and her mother from her second husband. On one hand, she claims that her father had no strong role to be played in the family, whereas, her narrative regarding her mother changes with the course of time, she defines her mother as, My mother was a widow of no influence. She had no means to fight my husband’s power. Ma could take me back through a court but she was not that spirited. She had all ways compromised in favour of family honour. A scandal would kill her. The doors that opened wide for a man slammed shut for a woman. If she fell out of grace, the society that hated her rise to prosperity would turn upon her. She could not save me on her own. The system was too rigid to allow for that (Durrani, 1995, p. 130).

When Durrani realizes her role of being a representative of third world Muslim women, her attitude changes A sudden shift of roles to prove men and society as evil. Whereas, her mother got divorced from the eldest son of Nawab of Tank for no apparent reason, she was the member of the same conservative male dominant society, but what made her weak afterwards is not understood at all.

Durrani presents Muslim society a reason for her suffrage while all her problems have nothing to do with Islam or Muslim society. For an instance if her claim is taken to be right then was she loyal towards her first husband? Answer is very much obvious. Durrani is representing herself to be a representative of women and a fighter against domestic abuse.

### *Problem Statement*

Voicing male ethos: an anti-feministic analysis is an effort to shun the exploitative settled norms of feminism that has adopted the arrogant form.

### *Objectives of Study*

This study has the following objectives:

- i) To find out the Anti- Feministic Elements in the undertaken Novel, *My Feudal Lord* by Tehmina Durrani.
- ii) To falsify the exaggerated use of Patriarchal imagery.

- iii) To nullify the self behalfist claim of Durrani as a subjugated entity.

### *Significance of Study*

This study is significant from Anti-feministic perspective as all the work done on *My Feudal Lord* is from feministic perspective. This research aims to find the hidden aspects that are exploited under the sham adaptation of feminism by falsely representing men as total wicked beings. The significance of present research work lies in its Anti-feministic approach that a suffering of women is given wrong perspective. The main objective of the present study is to lessen the breach between men and women by countering the existing manipulated status of women as presented by Tehmina Durrani in her work *My Feudal Lord*. This research highlights the biased notions towards men and society. This research contributes in ongoing research of Anti-feminism. It is also an effort to pave way for future researchers interested in the field of Anti-feministic literary criticism.

### *Research Questions*

This research aims to answer the following three questions:

Q. 1 How does Durrani exploit the definition of feminism in *My Feudal Lord*?

Q. 2 How does Durrani manipulate herself to be a Third World Muslim Women representative in the novel?

Q. 3 How has Durrani defamed Islamic values while claiming herself to be a Muslim women representative?

### *Materials and Methods*

We conduct this research under the theoretical frameworks of Anti-Feminism. Anti-feminism is believed to be motivated by the feministic theories of patriarchy and disadvantages suffered by women in society are incorrect or exaggerated. It seeks to oppress men under the false claims of empowering women. Canadian sociologists Melissa Blais and Francis Dupuis-Déri write that Anti-feminist thought has primarily taken the form of an extreme version of masculinism, in which, "men are in crisis because of the feminization of society". The term masculinism was coined by Charlotte Perkins Gilman in 1914 in one of her public lecture series titled "Studies in Masculinism". (Delap, 2007, p. 28) Antifeminism grew a branch known as masculinism. It created a division of antifeminism that feels the "masculine identity has been spurned". Masculinists talk about the violence against men being presented

as humorous in the media and society. Masculists also express concern about violence against men being ignored, minimized, or taken less seriously than violence against women.

My key theorists for this research are Warren Thomas Farrell and Christina Marie Hoff Sommers that provided the key concepts in developing framework and research methodology. Farrell in his book *Why Men Are The Way They Are (1980)* discussed the misrepresentation of man in the writings of women he further describes the prevalent discrimination of men having unreasonable social and economic power is counterfeit, and that men are systematically in disadvantage in several ways. He further elaborates the gender transition movement. Men are psychologically disturbed due to extreme feminization in society and they are continuously in struggling to maintain their position. Christina Marie Hoff Sommers challenges the feministic rhetoric and is of the view that some forms of feminism are exploitative and some feminists are deviating from their true cause and present themselves as the victims. She also describes that modern feminism is drastically fundamental and is detached from our daily lives. Sommers, the follower of equity feminism that has been categorized as anti-feminist by feminist critiques. She is also of the view that most of the feminist writers are misrepresenting the violence against men.

As Durrani claimed Ghulam Mustafa Khar to be a villain who can easily suppress women due to his social and financial status. Whereas, Durrani herself was from a strong financial background, being the daughter of Shakirullah Durrani, Governor of State Bank. This point appears to be manipulated at the hands of Durrani. Social status and class is seen throughout the novel, but the fame that Durrani got was only due to Ghulam Mustafa Khar and she later used to be called herself a victim and survivor of patriarchal system.

#### *Delimitation*

This study is delimited to Tehmina Durrani's autobiographical novel *My Feudal lord*, limiting the research to the anti-feministic elements.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

### *Multiplicity of Feminist Assertions*

Camille Anna Paglia (1998), is an American professor, academician and social critic is also known as a prominent critic of the modern culture and American feminism. Paglia is included in the world's top hundred public intellectuals and ranked on number twenty among

them. Paglia states that she advocates her own diversity of feminist assertions. She has also been blamed as “Anti-feminist feminist” by feminist critics. Paglia is famous for her book *Sexual Personae* (1990) in which she discussed Patriarchy and undue challenges faced to it by fundamental Feminists. She writes, that men have sacrificed and crippled themselves physically and emotionally to run the household, feed and safeguard women and children. Their pain, sacrifices and achievements are not at all recorded in any of the feminist rhetoric, which present men as oppressive and callous exploiters (Paglia, 1998).

#### *Opposing False Feminists*

She has been accused by Professor Alison Booth, A famous feminist, of being “anti-feminist cosmogony” (Booth, 1999, p. 27). While Robin Ann Sheets appreciates Paglia, for taking an intensely anti-feminist stand (Sheets, 1991, p. 205). While talking about her anti-feministic ideas, Paglia remarks that we can no longer in a world where everyone is a victim. Today whatever I am is because my father trusted me this way. I am this way because my husband made me this way (Paglia, 1998). She is against the false feminists who are insulting and stereotyping men as subjugators.

#### *Anti-Feminism: Architecting New Patterns for Feminism*

Elizabeth Ann Fox-Genovese, was a feminist American historian famously known for her contributions regarding women in society. Fox-Genovese was the prime founding member of conservative women’s movement. She expressed her ideas regarding feminism as “Sad as it may seem, my experience with radical, upscale feminism reinforced my growing mistrust of individual pride” (Fox-Genovese, 2000).

In her famous book, *"Feminism Is Not the Story of My Life": How Today's Feminist Elite Has Lost Touch with the Real Concerns of Women* (1996). She says that feminism has become an elite issue most of the times dealing with the issues and concerns of upper class women while totally ignoring and rejecting, middle class women that contributes a larger part in society as well as excluding single mothers, that are already dejected by society. This book is based on a series of interviews conducted on middle class women and issues, challenges and problems faced by them, that are most of the times ignored by traditional feminism. She writes: The demand (By Feminists) that the 'authorities' (should) protect women from men carries the depressing suggestion that independent, 'liberated' women are not capable of

taking care of themselves--or capable of showing the prudence to steer clear of the most dangerous situations (Genovese, 1996, p. 164).

Because of her recent book, Genovese has also been regarded as an important figure who can contribute significantly in architecting new patterns for feminism.

*Feminism as a Hate Movement: Hate against Men*

Erin Patria Margaret Pizzey also known as Nee Carney, is a Chinese born English novelist, journalist and family care activist. She gained global recognition for starting first domestic violence shelter. She wants to ban feminism as a hate movement, so that it cannot harm women. Pizzey use the term for exploitative feminism and those who are using it as militant feminists. She stated that the actual ideas of feminism are seized by militant feminists who are trying to deprecate all males at global level. She further adds that she has never seen men as enemy of women (Pizzey and Shapiro, 1982). Pizzey in an interview to *Daily Mail* in 2009 remarked that, (She) has never been a feminist, because, having experienced my mother's violence, I always knew that women can be as vicious and irresponsible as men" (Pizzey, 2009). In an interview Pizzey remarks, If feminism grew out of a justified sense of grievance, and created a platform where they did not attempt to heal their own damage, but to project onto all men... so yes, it is very cult like that way. But it's any cult group that works that way, they all have either a figure they adore or a hate object that keeps them together. And their hate is against men, even when they deny it (cited at [wehauntedthemammoth.com](http://wehauntedthemammoth.com)).

She believes men are more under privileged in current world as compared to the previous history to world

*Anti-Feministic Approaches: An opposing Idea for the Interests of Feminists*

Esther Vilar is an Argentine-German writer. By profession he is a doctor and a writer as well. She gained huge popularity and criticism in 1971 upon the publication of her book *Manipulated man*, in which she discussed her anti-feministic approaches that was opposing the interests of feminists and female rights activist. She commented in an interview that she received death threats on her book from feminists. She states:

...So, I hadn't imagined broadly enough the isolation I would find myself in after writing this book. Nor had I envisaged the consequences which it would have for subsequent writing and even for my private life - violent threats have not ceased to this date (Vilar, 1998).

In her book *The manipulated man*, Vilar writes, “As children, we became bored quickly and changed from one game to another. A man is like a child who is condemned to play the same game for the rest of his life” (Vilar, 1972, p. 08).

#### *Feminism, Continuing Traumatic Tariff*

Allan C. Carlson, a scholar and professor of history at Hillsdale College in Michigan and president of Howard center and the director of the Family in America Studies Center, she also served as an international Secretary of the World Congress of Families has criticized the role of feminism in society as devastating and a continual disturbed impact on the family.

#### *Manipulative Agenda of Feminists*

Anne Crittenden has written in her study, *The Price of Motherhood* which was later updated in 2010 by an addition in title *Why the Most Important Job in the World is Still the Least Valued* (2010) states: Even feminists are often reluctant to admit that women's lives revolve around their children. They measure success from the distance women have travelled from Kinder und Kuche, and worry that if child rearing is made a more tempting choice, many women... will drift back into domestic subservience. They fear that if women are seen to be mothers first, the very real gains that women have made in the workplace could be jeopardized (Crittenden, 2010, p. 7).

#### *Men, too, suffer from Problems*

Andrew Kimbrell, an American writer and Environmentalist, discussed about men and crisis faced by them in current society in his book, *Masculine Mystique: The Politics of Masculinity*, (1995). He discussed the problems faced by men in the recent years, his book is regarded as a ground-breaking addition for talking about the rights of men and taking a stand for them. According to *Publisher's Weekly Review*, “crisis of masculinity” is what this book highlights and brought into discussion. It is not only women that are victims in the society, but men too face violence and are equally victim and violence do not have any gender. Men die early as compared to the average age for human beings and more prone to serious diseases and have very minor chances of taking custody of children in case of divorce. He writes, that men are increasingly torn between the necessities of their job and their desire to have time for their families. ”Yes, men, too, suffer from a problem that has no name (Kimbrell, 1995). He further adds: What is the effect of virtual father absence on the family,

children, and the redefinition of men's role in society?" (Kimbrell, 1995). He says that men are mostly presented by our society as emotionless and practical therefore, most of the times their problems and sufferings get totally ignored.

*Absence and Marginalization of Father: Society Without the Father*

Alexander Mitscherlich, a German social psychologist, He has studied the absence and marginalization of father in his work *Society Without the Father: A Contribution to Social Psychology* (1993). He says that men are abandoned in our societies, their role as father and husband are over looked. These two essential figures are absent from our lives because they are physically absent from the lives of families due to long working hours. He says, "In our modern world, father is separated from the family for most of the waking hours of a child's day. The result is that, on the whole, children receive only father's temperament and not his teaching" (Mitscherlich. 1993).

*The Women's Movement Tragically Reduces Female Sexuality to the Terms of Male Sexuality*

George Franklin Gilder, an American writer advocate and economist is also considered number one anti-feminist in America. He was recognized as a critic of feminism in 1970s. He expressed his ideas regarding feminism as, her (females) sexuality determines her long-term goals. As a very physiological consciousness, she knows she can bear and nurture children. She has a central role in the very perpetuation of the species... The Women's Movement tragically reduces female sexuality to the terms of male sexuality (Gilder, 1994).

In his book, *Men and Marriage* (1992) he writes: They (Feminists) still insist that men and women can generally share and reverse roles... Although they declare themselves supporters of the family, they are scarcely willing to define it. He says, that feminists have disturbed the institution of marriage and family.

*The Abandonment of family system and Portrayal Males as an Outsider.*

Lionel Tiger is an American anthropologist famous for his book *The Decline of Males: The First Look at an Unexpected New World for Men and Women* (2000) in which he discussed a drastic and unexpected change in the institution of family and traditions in American culture so rapidly under the negative influence of feminism. He argued that feminism has wrongly empowered women by giving them the control of bearing children and deciding their gender which resulted in unparalleled abandonment of family system that made males an outsider.

Lionel writes: as we have seen, in Thirty Eight percent of American child support orders the fathers expected to supply the funds may have neither visitation nor custodial rights. (Tiger, 2000, p. 23). Lionel is also regarded as a pioneer of “Male Studies.”

*Feminists have caused more Problems*

Kate O'Beirne, an Irish-American writer who also served as president of Commission in Women in the Armed Forces during the regime of George H. W. Bush senior. O'Beirne is famous for her book, *Women Who Make the World Worse: and How Their Radical Feminist Assault Is Ruining Our Schools, Families, Military, and Sports* (2006). She discusses that many feminists have caused more problems and harmful effects for women instead of solving them.

*Feminists disturbing the Family Institution*

Kate O'Beirne held responsible Hillary Clinton, Gloria Steinem, Eleanor Smeal, Maureen Dowd, Kate Michelman, Ruth Bader Ginsburg, they adopted feminism as a sham disguise to serve women where as they did contrary to it. She further adds that their agenda is not pro male but anti-feminist. She adds that feminism converted male heads, such as fathers, brothers and husbands of family placeless and even questions their role which has made families, homes and all the institutions of society as battle fields.

*Feminism is Misguiding Women instead of Guiding them*

Phyllis McAlpin Stewart Schlafly, is an American constitutional lawyer, author, speaker and anti-feminist writer. She is popular for her anti-feministic ideas and presents a critique of modern feminism. She is against selective feminism that most of the NGOs working for the rights of women are serving it on selective basis rather than including all the women. She shunned feminists for discarding older middle class widows and divorcees and giving preference to young ones over them. In *Feminist Fantasies* (2003), Schlafly remarks that Feminism is influencing psychological viewpoints of women on life and primarily asserts it negatively, it instructs women “that the odds are stacked so severely against them that they probably cannot succeed in whatever they attempt” (Schlafly, 2003, p. 3). Instead of guiding, Feminism is misguiding women.

*More Freedom and Less Happiness*

Schlafly also criticized Roe v. Wade, a decision made by the Supreme court of United States of America giving women the right of abortion in 1973. She writes "the worst decision in the history of the United States Supreme Court" and said that "it is responsible for the killing of millions of unborn babies" (Schlafly, 2009). She is famous for her book written in 2011 *The Flipside of Feminism: What Conservative Women Know--and Men Can't Say*. In this book, she discusses that feminism has given women more freedom and less happiness. The war between genders is basically the need of feminists not feminism. She claims to be defending the actual rights of females. She further adds that feminist movements are making women to see themselves as victims of a male dominant society, which is a self-imposed role that they are making them to play.

*Gender Wars and Hostile Attitude towards Men*

Suzanne Venker, niece of Phyllis McAlpin Stewart Schlafly, together they have co-authored several books included *How to Choose a Husband. And Make Peace with Marriage* (2013) and *Seven Myths of Working Mothers, Intercollegiate Studies* (2004). Suzanne Venker in her book *The War on Men* (2013) she tries to discuss gender wars and said that women have developed a hostile attitude towards men as every feminist idea starts with the cliché of women are victims. She says no matter how attractive the agenda of feminism seems but for me it is a war on men.

*Gender Roles are Necessary and they Persist for a Reason*

Venker, in her Book, *The Flipside of Feminism: What Conservative Women Know--and Men Can't Say* (2011), writes that by discarding feminism it does not mean that women equality is discarded, No, because that is not what feminism is about. Rejecting feminism means showing acceptance towards the understanding that women do not need feminism for making them equal to men because they already are equal--just not the same (Venker, 2011). She further writes in the dedication of the above-mentioned book, that this book is an effort and we are hopeful that this book will contribute in developing an understanding that men and women are equally important and gender roles are necessary and they persist for a reason (Venker, 2011).

*World is becoming more for Women and Less for Men*

Lisa Belkin a blogger for *The New York Times* and author of *Show Me a Hero* (1999), she writes that we are living in an era where gender roles are changing dramatically; at this point retreatment of men is worth considering as the world is becoming more for women and less for men.

*Are Fathers Necessary?*

Pamela Paul, an Editor of *The New York Times* and author of four books, she is also a contributor to *Time Magazine*, *The Atlantic* and *The Economist*. in one of her article written in *The Atlantic* having the title, *Are Fathers necessary?* She says that fathers are not given their due space in today's household because of manipulated ideas of feminism "The bad news for Dad is that despite common perception, there's nothing objectively essential about his contribution" (*The Atlantic*, 2010).

*Manliness as a Symbolic Script*

Susan Charlotte Faludi is an American journalist and writer. She is also a winner of Pulitzer Prize in 1991. She is well known for her book, *Stiffed: The Betrayal of the American Man* (1999) in which discuss the issues of Masculinity in twentieth century United States of America. She writes, Manliness is a symbolic script, " a cultural construct, endlessly variable and not always necessary (Faludi, 1999, p. 15). *Time Magazine*, have written in the review of this book, A brilliant, important book.... These men talk to her as they have probably never talked in their lives before, and the rich and intricate tapestry she weaves from their stories is enough to make one rethink our entire Western value system. This book elaborated the identity crisis of men faced to them by the set pattern of society. This book gives voice to men and gives them an opportunity to be heard.

*Men do not have the Benefits of Equality*

Emma Watson, famous Hollywood actress, popularly known for her role of *Hermione* in *The Harry Potter Series* by J. K Rolling, was appointed as *United Nations Women Goodwill Ambassador* in July 2014. In her speech at United Nations Organization on September 20, 2014. she remarked about feminism: The more I have spoken about feminism, the more I have realized that fighting for women's rights has too often become synonymous with man-hating (Watson, United Nations, 2014). She says that previously she was the feminist too, but

she has noted that feminism is losing its meaning and has become an unpopular or outdated ideology. Watson says that men too face gender stereotyping; they are also shunned by society in several cases. She further adds: Men, I would like to take this opportunity to extend your formal invitation. Gender equality is your issue, too. Because to date, I have seen my father's role as a parent being valued less by society...I have seen young men suffering from mental illness, unable to ask for help for fear it would make them less of a man.. I have seen men made fragile and insecure by a distorted sense of what constitutes male success... Men do not have the benefits of equality, either (Watson, United Nations, 2014).

Watson continues that in United Kingdom more men are prone to suicide as compared to women. It is time to recognize gender roles as something different but to be appreciated rather than seeing gender as binary opposition. Men are evil, women are innocent etc. It is more about equality rather than inequality, it is appreciating differences rather than showing one's triumph over the other.

#### *Margaret Thatcher as an Anti-Feminist Icon*

Margaret Thatcher, The Iron Lady of United Kingdom, first and only female Prime Minister of England up till now, was mostly regarded as an anti-feminist icon by majority of feminists, Because of her claim that she owes nothing to the feminists. This is the reason that mostly Feminists claim Thatcher did nothing for women and did not take any steps for gender equality during her regime. Tacit Dean, An England based artist remarks about Thatcher in an interview with The Guardian in 2012, that, she was an active student feminist and regarded Thatcher (she) was our anti-feminist icon. She was a reactionary who was not concerned with equality of any sort. (Dean, 2012).

Linda Grant, An England based author, says about Thatcher that, she like many other feminists have seen her (Thatcher) as "a man dressed up in skirt suit" (Grant, 2012). Most of the Feminists hated her for showing no concern towards women.

#### *Difference in Being Anti-Man and Pro-woman*

Jane Galvin-Lewis, An Afro American social activist and founder of first center for Negro women in United States of America under the name National Council of Negro Women, Remarks about feminism that, you do not have to be anti-man to be pro-woman. (Cited at Forty Quotes by Lewis).

*Anti-Feminist Man and Feminine Woman*

Frank O'Connor, An Irish writer famous for his short stories and memoirs, writes about feminists as, no man is as anti-feminist as a feminine woman (Cited at Forty Quotes by Connor).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

*Anti-Feminism and Masculism*

Anti-Feminism and Masculism are synonymous terms that go side by side. The term Masculism was first used by Charlotte Perkins Gilman in 1914 in her two series of public lectures at Astor Hotel of New York (Allen, 2009, p. 152). It was further explored by Melissa Blais and Francis Dupuis-Déri, both Alumni of University du Québec à Montréal, in their article, Masculinism and the Antifeminist Countermovement: *Social Movement Studies* (2009). They have written that men are in crisis because of the feminization of society, (Blais and Deri, 2009, p. 20). Except this article most of their work is available in French.

*Research Methodology and Theoretical Framework*

Key theorists for the undertaken dissertation are Warren Thomas Farrell and Christina Marie Hoff Sommers. Both these Authors have important contributions in Anti-Feminism and Masculism. Their various works will be brought into discussion in this chapter to formulate the research methodology and theoretical framework.

*Close-Reading*

It sets the tone for the later research of my Anti-feministic paradigm in Tehmina Durrani's *My Feudal Lord*. We shall practice close reading to find the anti-feministic elements in the undertaken work. Close-Reading can be defined as the focusing on specific or details of a literary works to examine it from a certain point of view. According to Codon (1999), a "detailed, balanced and rigorous critical examination of a text to discover its meanings and to assess its effects" is called close reading (Codon, 1999, p. 142). This study has a deconstructive approach regarding Feministic elements.

*Warren Thomas Farrell*

Warren Thomas Farrell is an Irish-American educator, activist and writer of seven books on issues of men and women. He was born on June 26, 1943 in Queens, New York. Warren Farrell received a B. A. from Montclair State University in social sciences. In 1966, he

received an M. A. from UCLA in science and in 1974 a Ph. D. in the same discipline from New York University in 1965. (Cited at Wikipedia). *The Financial Times* has included him in the list of one of the world's top hundred thought leaders. He has appeared on over One Thousand Television shows worldwide and lives in Mill Valley, California.

#### *The Prevalent Discernment of Men*

In his book, *Why Men Are the Way They Are (1980)* Farrell attempts to answer various questions of male and females, he writes, that both the role-reversal practices that the women and men's groups allowed him to hear women's increasing anger toward men, and learn about men's feelings of being misrepresented (Farrell, 1986).

*Farrell's another book, The Myth of Male Power: Why Men are the Disposable Sex* written in 1993, was translated into many languages. It is considered "A Bible" in Men's rights movement. In which Farrell writes that the prevalent discernment of men having unreasonable social and economic power is counterfeit, and that men are systematically disadvantaged in several ways. He further writes, ...That for men and women to make an evolutionary shift from a focus on survival to a focus on a balance between survival and fulfilment, what was ultimately necessary was neither a women's movement nor a men's movement, but a "gender transition movement." He defined a gender transition movement as one that fosters a transition from the rigid roles of our past to more flexible roles for the future (Farrell, 1993, p. 19).

#### *Male Powerlessness*

Feminists have made male and female roles as power driven rather than role oriented, Farrell further elaborated this thing by defining power as, power as "control over one's life. He wrote that, "In the past, neither sex had power; both sexes had roles: women's role was to raise children; men's role was to raise money" (Farrell, 1993, chip. 2). Farrell remarked, Feminists call it sexism to refer to God as He; they don't call it sexism to refer to the Devil as He" (Cited at menstuff.org). Farrell writes, that men have a different experience of powerlessness. Men who have seen marriage become alimony payments, their home become their wife's home, and their children become child support payments (Farrell, 2008, p. 13).

*Psychological Impacts of Feminism and Anti-Feminism on Males*

While discussing the psychological impacts of Feminism and Anti-Feminism, Farrell writes in his book that, Men are psychologically there, where women were in 1950's. Which depicts the psychological dilemma of men at the hands of arrogant Feminists. Farrell states, "The last half century has not been a battle of the sexes, but a war in which only one side has shown up. Men have put their heads in the sand and hoped the bullets would miss" (Farrell, 2008, p. 9).

*Does Feminism Discriminate Against Men? A Debate (2008)* written by Farrell and co-authored by James Sterna, Farrell, writes that he felt the need of this book to address the role of gender studies in the departments of state held universities that majorly deals with female voicing and ignores/ silencing males. This book covers thirteen topics dealing with children rights, father's rights, and Boy crisis. He says that feminists are not advocating equal education basis rather exploiting male topic. Women studies courses are functioning as mushrooming industries to produce feminists, where as there are no male /men studied departments, if there are any, then they are also taught from feminist perspective, Farrell termed this as "Feminist Men's studies". In feminist studies, women's disadvantages are often seen as men's fault; and in feminist men's studies, men's disadvantages are men's fault. (Cited at menstuff.org). Although these departments are termed as Gender studies departments but underneath they are Feminist Men's studies. Farrell elaborated, Gender studies now studies only liberal women's view of women's powerlessness, and liberal women's perspective on male power. It (Feminism) doesn't look at liberal or conservative men's view of male powerlessness, or liberal or conservative men's view of female power (Farrell, 2008, p. 9).

*Men as Oppressors Women as Victims*

According to Farrell, to understand the males, it is important to understand Three W's linked with men, Women, Work and War (Farrell, 2008, p. 20). Men are either seen in as binaries against women, men as oppressors, women as victims, men working for more hours and doing more dangerous jobs/works and war, fighting wars for the country where solely men must fight and war with women where they are continuously misrepresented as villains by Feminists.

*Christina Marie Hoff Sommers*

Christina Marie Hoff Sommers, is an American writer and an Ex- philosophy professor is a famous anti-feministic writer. She was born on 28 September, 1950 in California, She earned a BA at New York University in 1971, and a PhD in philosophy from Brandeis University in 1979. From 1978 to 1980, Sommers was an instructor at the University of Massachusetts at Boston. In 1980, she became an assistant professor of philosophy at Clark University (Cited at Wikipedia). She states that the modern feminism includes an illogical and unreasonable antagonism against men. She further adds that feminists lacks the ability to understands the serious possibility that both human beings, male and female, are alike but dissimilar, it means to acknowledge each other as different but equally important.

*Challenging Feministic Rhetoric*

*Who Stole Feminism, How Women Have Betrayed Women* (1994) she argues that modern feminism is drastically fundamental and detached from our daily lives. Sommers is the follower of equity feminism that has been categorized as anti-feminist by feminist critiques. She writes, Christina Hoff Sommers challenged feminist rhetoric and deconstructs the research on which many feminist claims are established and certainly women are told many lies to support hidden agendas of so called feminists. *Who Stole Feminism, How Women Have Betrayed Women* (1994) she argues that modern feminism is drastically fundamental and detached from our daily lives. Sommers is the follower of equity feminism that has been categorized as anti-feminist by feminist critiques. She writes, the gender feminists have proved very clever in gaining financial support from both government and private sources. This book acts as a criticism of feminism and all the available works that are blindly serving the manipulative agendas of Feminism. She writes, I have taught feminist theory. I have debated gender feminists around the country, and on television and radio. My experience with academic feminism and my immersion in the ever-growing gender feminist literature have served to deepen my conviction that most women's studies classes that teach a 'reconceptualised' subject matter are unscholarly, intolerant of dissent, and full of gimmicks. In other words, they are a waste of time (Sommers, 1995, p. 90).

*Women are from Venus, Men are from Hell*

Sommers also faced a harsh criticism from Feminists and was blamed for being funded by right wing to promote these kinds of ideas that will create confusion in society. According to

*The Nation*, Sommers further elaborates that feminism has created grave breaches between men and women, she describes this perspective as “Women are from Venus, men are from Hell” (Cited at Wikipedia/Sommers). At several points in the book, it is shown that how facts are deteriorated by gender feminists. Sommers states, The feminists who hold this divisive view of our social and political reality believe we are in a gender war, and they are eager to disseminate stories of atrocity that are designed to alert women to their plight. The "gender feminists" (as I shall call them) believe that all our institutions, from the state to the family to the grade schools, perpetuate male dominance. Believing that women are virtually under siege, gender feminists naturally seek recruits to their side of the gender war. They seek support. They seek vindication. They seek ammunition (Sommers, 1995, p. 16).

#### *The Myths of Feminisms*

In another book, Sommers published a book in 2002, *The War Against Boys: How Misguided Feminism is harming our young men*. In this book, she challenged the myths of feminisms and described boys as victims of it. She also stated that the programs started in 1980s largely based on the ideas of first-wave of feminism are prevailing the abandoning of indifference in patriarchal societies. She writes: we are turning against boys and forgetting a truth: that the energy, competitiveness, and corporal daring of normal, decent males is responsible for much of what is right in the world (Sommers, 2015, p. 03). Sommers stated: We have turned against boys and forgotten a truth: the energy, competitiveness, and corporal daring of normal males are responsible for much of what is right in the world. No one denies that boys’ aggressive tendencies must be mitigated and channelled toward constructive ends. Boys need (and crave) discipline, respect, and moral guidance. Boys need love and tolerant understanding (Sommers, 2015, p. 05). Violence against males are often ignored or presented as funny, something not meant to be taken seriously.

## ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

### *Durrani: An Introduction*

Tehmina Durrani was born on 18 February 1953, into one of the Pakistan’s most significant families. She is the daughter of former Governor of State bank of Pakistan, Shaker Ullah Durrani and a granddaughter of Nawab Sir Liana Hayat Khan who served as a Prime Minister of Patiala state for eleven years. At seventeen Durrani married to Anees Khan and

had a daughter Tanya. Durrani and Khan divorced in 1976. Durrani married Khar, who had been married five times and became his sixth wife. They had four children; Naseby, Nisha, Ali and Hamza. After thirteen years, they divorced.

Her first book *My Feudal Lord* is an autobiographical work released by Vanguard Books of Lahore in June 1991 caused controversy in Pakistani society in which she describes her life events to gain the sympathy of the readers. It is translated into thirty-nine other languages. She describes her life with a feudal lord Mustafa Khar.

Her second book is *A Mirror to the Blind* is the biography of Abdul Sitar Edh, who is a humanitarian, a social worker and a philanthropist. The book was published in 1996 by the National Bureau of Publications with the Edh Foundation. It is considered as an official document, of Edh's life.

Her third book *Blasphemy* was published in 1998, was popular but also controversial. In her work, she pronounces the secret lives of the Muslim clergy and spiritual leaders or *pairs*. Durrani is of the view that the story is factual or actual, with some names and proceedings are transformed to protect the identity of the women who are at the center of the story. She describes several cases resulting in the embarrassment and suffering of Muslim women. The book also made it into Pakistan's best-seller list.

Her fourth book *Happy Things in Sorrow Times* was published in 2013. It is a story expressed from the heart of a child. It is a story of true love and forced separation, enigmatic hardship, incurable loss and immeasurable fear. It is also a story of resilience, dignity, integrity, and heroic patriotism.

#### *Ghulam Mustafa Khar: An Introduction*

Malik Ghulam Mustafa Khar was born in Kit Add, Muzaffargarh, District of South Punjab. He was born on 2<sup>nd</sup> August 1937. He did his Matriculation from Saint Marry Convent, Multan and passed his senior Cambridge from Atchison College, Lahore. His father was a landowner of the Muzaffargarh. Mustafa's father, Muhammad Yar Khar was granted the title Khan Sahib in 1940 by the British crown. In the feudal system wealth equates with honour and power. Khar's family elders were not interested in politics but Khar was interested in politics and he got the title of Sher-e- Punjab (Lion of Punjab). In 1967 Khar joined Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto as one of the founding members of the Pakistan People's Party and fighting for the liberal cause, and very soon their party established a major voice of reform. He was

appointed as a Governor and Martial Law Administrator of Punjab, the most electorally powerful province in the country by the newly sworn in President Bhutto following the collapse of Yahya Khan's military government. When the 1973 constitution was adopted in August and Bhutto became Prime Minister of Pakistan, Khar was given the portfolio of Chief Minister of Punjab Province, Khar was replaced by the far more left-leaning and intellectual Hanif Ramay. Khar was temporarily reappointed Governor in March 1975 before being finally dismissed in July 1975. Bhutto's doubts over Khar's ambitions as well as the profound divisions within the PPP in the Punjab led to his denial, to allow Khar to run for Ramay's seat in Lahore. Khar's attempts to run for the seat as an independent ended in failure. Ironically by 1976 former rivals within the PPP. He was the first among the Khars to travel to the National Assembly at the age of twenty-four and he is always conscious of his status.

Mustafa Khar was Durrani's second husband. Durrani in her autobiography *My Feudal Lord* (1995) describes her distressing married life with an imperialist feudal lord, named Ghulam Mustafa Khar. Khar, an important politician was a former Chief Minister of Pakistan. Professionally he is a prominent champion of democracy. It is written in chronological order. This memoir is divided into three parts known as Lion of the Punjab, Law of the Jungle and Lioness. All the three parts map the development of Durrani from an ordinary aristocratic house wife to an emancipated woman, who is fighting for so called equality rights. Basically, what she wants to do is to overpower the masculine identity.

*My Feudal Lord: An Anti-feministic analysis*

*My Feudal Lord* (1995) is a controversial piece of writing which arises many types of questions in the mind of a reader regarding the representation of a woman. She challenged the behavioural patterns and considers that woman is oppressed because of three reasons that are feudal system, patriarchal society and cultural norms. Her basic aim of writing is to give a voice or break the silence and speaks on the behalf of woman but she is not representing the true picture. Durrani melded the whole story in her favour by misrepresenting various issues. Even the very idea of feminism is misrepresented in her work *My Feudal Lord*.

*My Feudal Lord, Mendha Saayien*, catches the attention of large number of people not only in Pakistan but all over the world. It is considered as the Sensational European Bestseller. It is an autobiographical novel in which Durrani tries to represent the suppressed and subjugated women and the role of women in Muslim society but in doing so she

misrepresents the whole ideology of feminism. The title of the novel is evident as it marked the view that it is a devastating indictment of a women's role in Muslim society; her work is warmly welcomed by the third world women but there are certain queries which arises in the mind of the reader which needs to be countered. Three words "devastating indictment", "women's role" and "Muslim society" are not only the words but the ideologies. All these key terms in the statement of the title page needs to be understood in understatement as apparently it is making a very strong statement that captures the mind of the reader Instead of representing these ideologies she misrepresents these ideas in *My Feudal Lord*.

Pakistan's short literary history is filled with much controversial political turmoil. The crucial point in most of the works included in Pakistani literature are neither representing Pakistan nor promoting any positive image either in Pakistan or outside of its borders. Feminism has always been a hot issue of Pakistani culture where women are largely suppressed either in the name of culture or religion. But religion is largely hijacked by personal interpretations.

I will discuss both Urdu and English versions of this work that are *My Feudal Lord* and *Mendha Saayien* respectively to strengthen my arguments in the undertaken discussion.

*Times*, claimed it as a bold narrative. Durrani in her claim wrote this autobiography is for the people of Pakistan, whereas a large population of Pakistan is unable to understand English, it is still an alien language for the majority, giving representation to these people can ironically be defined as an idea of reclaimed native. A self-claimed behalfist who is representing the community and its people. Durrani has also incorporated religion in her work so we will discuss that too.

*Dedication of the work: Durrani's Ambiguity*

*My Feudal Lord* has a dedication to anonymous people, Durrani's bold stance is questioned in the very dedication, while maintaining her bold stance of breaking the imposed shackles and talking about the forbidden issues she kept some people secret as a good will gesture. If those people, who are held accountable in this work can be named then those who played a helpful role should also be brought into light so that the audience and world can celebrate their sincerity towards an innocent woman. Durrani's this stance for a safer side creates ambiguity in her style which is obviously not a part of her personality.

*A Misrepresentation of Muslim Society by Durrani*

Durrani represents the Muslim society and the role of women; in doing so she is just using the concept of Islamization/religion to prove herself innocent but when by applying the technique of close reading, it has been observed that she manipulates the very concepts. Durrani divorced Anees Khan, her first husband, with whom, apparently, she was deeply in love and wished to marry but later she finds some flaws in his personality and fall in love with Mustafa Khar and marries her feudal lord. Durrani knows much about feudalism and feudal system and feudal laws. She writes, “According to feudal tradition, a wife was honour-bound to live her life according to her husband” (Durrani, 1995, p. 107). As well as she knows that a feudal lord is an absolute ruler who can justify all his actions. With all such qualities, which were qualities first that changed into flaws afterwards. She accepted Khar. She herself claims that “Mustafa was authoritarian, conservative and overpowering I knew from the start- but that was precisely what attracted me so much” (Durrani, 1995, p. 39). From the very beginning she knows about his authoritative nature which later became a cause of divorce. She is psychologically a sufferer and have had a confused state of mind it becomes clearer when she says “I still did not love Anees. If I had, perhaps I would have found Mustafa Khar less intriguing and less troubling” (Durrani, 1995, p. 39).

*Estrangement in Dealing with Blood Relations*

Durrani was having an estranged relationship with her mother. Her mother was graceful and authoritative and having full command over her family matters. All the family decisions were made by her and nobody could dare to challenge her authority. Due to her dark complexion amongst good looking paternal family due to these reasons and her own thinking her relationship to her mother was not ideal.

“When my mother spoke, it was a command, and we were to carry out orders in silence” (Durrani, 1995, p. 25). Durrani’s mother took divorce from her first husband for no apparent reason. She is a woman who was always concerned with her makeup, clothes and jewellery and polishing her personality rather than paying any attention towards her daughters and husband. With all this Durrani developed a personality that was against her nature. All the reservations she had experienced prior to her marriage proved correct. She lost her faith on the abilities of Anees and started questioning his decisions. This happened just because of the strong influence of her mother on her personality. She felt that mother treated both (Anees

and Durrani) of them with the same contempt. At this stage Durrani desperately needed a man who is going to strengthen her role in her own family especially what she wants to do is to change the views of her mother. At this stage, her mind was in turmoil and started observing Khar. Durrani begins to select her dresses to flatter him and want to gain his attention or attraction. She Writes, “I was flattered when Mustafa noticed, and upset when he did not” (Durrani, 1995, p. 65). She wants to impress Khar by her whimsical acts and claimed that “Mustafa seemed always to be trying to impress me.” While, He does not need to impress or inspire her because he was already at good position and have had a good personality. Durrani herself claimed that he was having a charismatic personality and she was much inspired by his personality.

*Gain of Popularity in the Name of her so called Islamic Values*

In A Muslim society, according to religious views, Durrani knows that marriage was a sacred and irrevocable institution. But she divorced Anees Khan and left her daughter, Tanya. And at one place she is of the view that “I let go just because of kids” (Durrani, 1995, p. 115) here the question arises what made her left Tanya? She left her daughter, just to marry her feudal lord to gain some position and fame in society. She considers herself as a feministic writer and she herself exploits the definition of feminism. She remains unfaithful towards her first husband with whom she marries with her own will and says: “he was the man I wished to marry” however, Durrani’s mother rejected the proposal because she felt that Anees was not good enough for her because his family was not well-to-do. With all this Durrani’s ray of hope for freedom faded. At last her mother accepted the proposal, at this stage she showed her ambivalent state of mind and rejects Anees Khan. She is not loyal towards her first husband and marries her feudal lord and by doing so she is going against the Islamic laws. Which is clearly forbidden in Islam, Quran clearly states this behaviour in Surah An Nisa, And tell the believing women to lower their gaze (from looking at forbidden things), and protect their private parts (from illegal sexual acts, etc.) and not to show off their adornment except only that which is apparent (like palms of hands or one eye or both eyes for necessity to see the way, or outer dress like veil, gloves, head-cover, apron, etc.), and to draw their veils all over Juyubihinna (i.e. their bodies, faces, necks and bosoms, etc.) and not to reveal their adornment except to their husbands, their fathers, their husbands fathers, their sons, their husbands sons, their brothers or their brothers sons, or their sisters sons, or their

(Muslim) women (i.e. their sisters in Islam), or the (female) slaves whom their right hands possess, or old male servants who lack vigour, or small children who have no sense of the shame of sex. And let them not stamp their feet to reveal what they hide of their adornment. And all of you beg Allah to forgive you all, O believers, that you may be successful (Quran 24: 31).

Throughout her work, she wants to gain the sympathy of the readers. She has adopted a sham claim to be an innocent woman but the reality is opposite. In the presence of Durrani's first husband she accepted Khar's proposal because what she just wants to do is to strengthen her position in front of her family and it happens just to accept Mustafa by rejecting Anees. She was extremely convinced by his personality and completely under his spell and thought that her future is completely bound with Khar. In the pursuit of her own future she completely forgets about Tanya's future that with this act her daughter suffers. Which straight way negates the feminism and the entire feministic claim.

#### *Khar's Popularity in the Province*

According to Durrani, Mustafa Khar, A rising politician and a feudal lord, brought some light and excitement in her life. Durrani always felt insecure about her beauty because she of having a dark complexion and somehow, she remained the neglected child by her mother but she gained the maternal love from her maternal grand- mother. The complex of being ugly was deeply set in her mind and she reacted accordingly. With the arrival of Khar in her life, it brought a certain degree of pleasure in her life and her insecurities about her beauty washed away. She suffered psychologically because of her father's weak role in the family so she attracted towards Khar because of his overpowering and authoritative nature. He was extremely popular and earned the title of "Lion of the Punjab" (Durrani, 1995, p. 20) Durrani was fascinated by this man and started taking interest in him while she is being already married, she was going opposite to Muslim teachings and goes against all the Islamic laws and ways of modesty. She began a full fledged affair with Khar, even when they both had spouses. Despite the clear warnings from Sheherzad Haq popularly known as Sherry, Mustafa's fifth wife, about his attitude and code of conduct Durrani chose Mustafa Khar, and married him while Sherry was already having an infant daughter and was pregnant with her second child. Again, Durrani's feministic claim of giving voice to women proves fake. Not a

single definition or form of feminism allows this behaviour of one woman against another one.

*Durrani's Intensive love at First Stage*

Marrying Khar, despite knowing that he had already been married five times fully aware of Khar's treatment towards his current wife Sherry. Durrani willingly became Khar's sixth wife in the presence of her fifth pregnant wife and an infant daughter and she claims to be so called feminist with having a claim of speaking on the behalf of Pakistani women by destroying another women's house by marrying her husband and wants to be innocent and gather the sympathies. Durrani's family shunned her by doing so, because she had committed the most audacious crime by dragging their names in mud.

*Durrani: A Misrepresentative of Feministic Values*

In an Interview, Durrani herself claims that she is a feministic writer and a bold writer. But in reality, she exploits the very concepts of feministic perspective. She is not loyal with anyone what she just wants to do is to secure her future. She cheats Anees. "Cheating on a man was an unnatural situation for me" (Durrani, 1995, p. 71). At this very occasion, she wants to begin her new life and she is much convinced by Khar's personality and she writes "Anees was becoming distanced from the way I saw my future" (Durrani, 1995, p. 71). For the sake of her own future she rejected Anees and Tanya and claims that she is a feministic writer.

*Durrani states in an interview.*

"Well I am a woman, so I naturally write from a feminine perspective. More than that, I am interested in reform. My work whether it is *My Feudal Lord* or *Blasphemy*, or Abdul Sattar Edhi's narrated autobiography *Mirror to the Blind* is about issues that concern our people, about breaking of a silence from a part of the society that cannot speak out. I am called bold because these are the issues one does not talk about, nor does one talk about one's life. I suppose my passion for reform is overwhelming. And, I think, when anything overwhelms you that much you have a natural boldness because you step out of the realm of fear" (Online Interview/Zaidi and Qureshi, 2012, p. 17).

Durrani once claimed that "whatever other faults Mustafa might have, he was a family loyalist" (Durrani, 1995, p. 125). But she was not loyal towards her second husband as well. She was going against him at various levels. Sherry already told her about Mustafa's

behaviour but Durrani selected him for herself by viewing all the circumstances and considered him as an elusive companion.

She was also of the view that she suffers just because of the patriarchal society where man is considered at dominating position or women is at subjugating or subaltern position, and where the women is considered as an object. The term 'patriarchy' has been used within post 1960s feminism to refer to the systematic organization of male hegemony and female subservience (Kamarae, 1992; Stacey, 1993 and Aina, 1998; etc.) The term has been defined as a system of male authority which subjugates women through its social, political and economic institutions. Feminists are also of the view that patriarchal society may take any historical form, whether it is feudal, imperialist or capitalist. A sex gender system and economic discrimination system, all these systems operate simultaneously. It is highly observed in the literature that the creation and practice of male dominance over women and children, is a historic process formed by men and women, with the patriarchal family serving as a basic unit of society. A patriarchy is considered the head of the household and within the family he controls productive resources, labour force.

#### *Selective Nature of Durrani*

In case of Durrani or from her own narrative we have come to know that she was not subservient but she was being selective. She was not in a subjugating position and nobody suppressed her in any case. She was authoritative by nature and took her decisions by herself. Anees was her own choice; similarly, on the other hand she married Khar just because of her own reasons. What she wanted to do was to maintain her status in front of her family or society. By marrying Khar, she knew that she gained a valuable position and became a prominent figure not only in her own family but in society as well, and at one place she is of the view "I had no choice, society would never accept me unless I became Mustafa's wife" (Durrani, 1995, p. 88). Khar was her own choice; nobody was imposing her will to marry him. What she just wanted to do was to improve her social status and she could only do it by having a legal relationship with Khar that is why she accepted Khar's proposal to be the part of elite milieu or being acceptable by the society. She knew well that her family would not accept her until or unless she improved her position. "my parents would not accept me unless I improved my status" (Durrani, 1995, p. 88). She knew well that Khar was the only man

who would knock her mother's respect and thinks that her marriage with Khar is the only salvation now.

However, she made the decision to leave her daughter Tanya with Anees to start her new life with Khar, and Anees was the first person who has come to know about her second marriage and he was obviously upset. By doing so she proved herself as a mean mother and unfaithful wife. She was neither a loyal to her husband nor a devoted to her daughter. In all the circumstances she wanted to maintain her position and prove herself as a best person. Marrying Khar was solely her own decision or will and she continuously pretended herself as an innocent being who knew nothing. She impressed Khar by giving him seductive gestures and attracted towards him and started attending all the meetings just to have had a glance of his feudal lord.

By marrying Khar, she secured her purpose. Although people around Mustafa wholeheartedly accepted her but her own parents announced that she was dead for them because she divorced her first husband without any solid reason. Her parents started considering her as a rebel after this rebellious act. When Khar, finally broke all the ties with Sherry (his ex-wife) by divorcing her. "Taluk, Taluk, Taluk' he said, and it was all over" (Durrani, 1995, p. 98). Durrani felt relieved. By destroying the house of a woman, she felt relieved and claims that she is a feminist writer. By destroying someone's home she felt pleased. She breaks all the boundaries and wants to act as an innocent soul. When Sherry finally left the house, she redecorated the house and said: "I began to redecorate the house that was mine now" (Durrani, 1995, p. 98). At this stage, she faced the consequences of her action before marrying Khar she was not thinking about her daughter Tanya, to whom she left just to settle herself and maintain her status. After marriage, she was plagued by gloomy revelations of Tanya's motherless survival and started crying for her, at this Mustafa says "if you loved your daughter so much, why did you marry me?" (Durrani, 1995, p. 99). Khar is absolutely right that it was her own wish and at this stage she is blaming Khar that he is not granting her permission. Before making this decision, she must have analysed the pros and cons of her action and there is no need to cry over spilt milk.

Before marrying Khar, Durrani used the word "mighty" (Durrani, 1995, p. 89) for him. But after marriage she was unable to carry out this relation in a proper way and in her writing she is blaming Khar for all the consequences and portraying a negative image throughout.

Although she knows the characteristics of feudal lord that their wives were bound to live within four walls but he gave her leverage and gives her importance in all the matters both political and domestic. He also took a great care of her health but she is depicting a negative portrayal of his positive attitude.

*Durrani's Bureaucratic life Style and Having Charge of Speaking for Inferior*

Durrani trained all the servants according to her own style and Khar gave importance even to her petty acts and said "I needed government bureaucrats to be our servants. 'These poor, illiterate boys are not good enough for you (Durrani, 1995, p. 98). He took great care of her health when he came to know about her pregnancy he advised her to take proper or nutritious healthy food "Mustafa insisted that I started my day by consuming buttered parathas and eggs" (Durrani, 1995, p. 99) and also drink fresh cow's milk and creamy beverages regularly and says "the regimen was nutritious for the unborn child" (Durrani, 1995, p. 99). She draws a negative portrayal of his positive pieces of advice and started believing that he is giving her advice to take rich food just in order to ensure that she became fat and assure that she become unattractive to other men. She writes, "By the time I was eight months' pregnant, Mustafa's rich, force-fed diet had caused me to balloon from my normal eight stone to almost eleven stone. I looked and felt like a bloated cow" (Durrani, 1995, p. 109). Instead of taking his advice in her favour she is plotting negativity out of positivity just to gain the sympathy from the readers.

Khar was not hiding anything from Durrani and told her about his relationship with other women and also gave her a vibrant depiction of everything. He told Durrani about the details of his personal life. His first marriage with his illiterate cousin Wazir, who was older than him and also told her about his first son Abdur Rehman and his escape from his village because he does not want to live or continue his relationship with Wazir and the elders "dissolved her marriage with Mustafa and gave her to her much younger brother-in-law" (Durrani, 1995, p. 42). In this course of time "Mustafa befriended a man who had an attractive and somewhat educated sweetheart" (Durrani, 1995, p. 42). when Firdous came to know about her pregnancy, the man escaped and at that time Khar provided her a comfy shoulder. Khar considered her as a prey of society and just for sympathy he married her and Firdous gave birth to a boy and within a year she gave birth to another boy. All these duties proved too much for Khar and he became confused with "Sympathy and love" (Durrani,

1995, p. 42) he decided to divorce her and sent her divorce papers. And after this he married Safia An, air hostess, who belonged to a lower middle class and was an adventurous woman but according to feudal tradition he banished her to his home village of Kot Addu. According to traditional values of his ancestors, women were remaining isolated from the outside colourful world Khar did the same with Safia. Safia remained in the women's chamber of the house where no outsider would enter and the walls of this chamber were too high. After that Khar being the prominent member of Pakistani politics would be the part of lavish parties "where women were the part of the menu" (Durrani, 1995, p. 49) At one of such party he met with a dancing girl Naubahar who used her body to please the young politicians. First Khar selected her as his mistress and then married to her regardless of knowing that his wife Safia is waiting for her in his village of Kot Addu "The Koran allows a man to have as many as four wives, but tempers this with the almost impossible requirement that he love them equally" (Durrani, 1995, p. 49.) He promised Naubahar to keep his marriage as secret. During this time, a battle for the separation of East Pakistan had begun "The West seemed to have misread the plight of the East Pakistani people" (Durrani, 1995, p. 49) Indian groups exploited the state of affairs and moved towards East Pakistan under the alleged reason of protecting expatriates. At the end of 1971 West Pakistan was simply a Pakistan and it would be a while before we recognized Bangladesh as a country. Meantime military men resolute that, it was a time for new leadership to overcome. With all this they installed Bhutto as president. Bhutto appointed Khar as Governor and administrator and at this time Khar's secret marriage to a dancing girl Naubahar was open. Hearing this, Bhutto warned Khar that an ordinary dancer could not be the wife of Governor of the Punjab. It exhibits his position and he was warned to correct the situation straightaway. He divorced Naubahar in order to maintain his position. Safia was liberated from the banishment of Kot Addu and installed in the Governor's house as a respectable wife. But Khar's brothers told him that as a governor his integrity is at stake and told him about Safia that "your wife has had an illicit relationship with your younger brother, Ghulam Murtaza. We cannot hide this fact from you any longer" (Durrani, 1995, p. 51) according to feudal law if wife betrays his husband it is considered as a biggest sin.

Hearing all this he went to Islamabad to attain some consolation from his mentor. Khar told Bhutto that he wanted to resign from this position because with all such circumstances he

was unable to maintain his status. Bhutto advised him not to do stupid act because they are the selected members and history would never pardon them if they exposed their weakness. According to Islamic ideology or Islamic law it is allowed to man to kill his traitorous or unfaithful wife in a fit of passion, but does not allow for intended revenge so he divorced Safia. It was the time when Durrani married to Anees Khan. Bhutto wanted Mustafa to marry again with a modern woman who belongs to his class and who can serve as a perfect hostess at the Governor's house. Khar met with Shahrazad who is the niece by marriage of the education minister during Bhutto's regime. Sherry was a beautiful lady but Bhutto was against this marriage and considers it as a non-compatible match due to different backgrounds; Sherry belongs to a middle class, Anglicized background and Khar belongs to a feudal background. But he does not take any notice of Bhutto's objection and indicated that he is not following any one blindly and do not want to take any instruction regarding his private life. Khar proposed Sherry and she became his fifth wife.

*Ambivalent situations in Durrani's Narrative*

On the other hand, Durrani hides everything from Khar “‘You're hiding things from me,’ he charged” (Durrani, 1995, p. 102) Khar wants to know about her relationship with Anees Khan; Durrani's first husband but she is reluctant to tell him about Khan and wants to change the topic and said we should change the topic because it is upsetting you but he wanted to know about all this. Again and again she lied to him. At this he become angry and beaten her but after doing this he realized his act of wildness and he felt sorry and suddenly transformed from a wild animal to a little frightened child and Durrani narrates this episode as “He fell at my feet and wept. ‘I'm sorry! I'm sorry! I'm sorry!’ he wailed. ‘What I have done to you?’ He begged forgiveness” (Durrani, 1995, p. 103). Actually, he does not want to hurt her feelings but the jealousy of another man in Durrani's life was haunting him continuously and he treats Durrani differently from the rest of his wives. He is not supposed to tolerate the idea of his wife with another man even if it was her ex-husband. Khar gave her a respectable status in the society just because of this reason he forbids her to tell anyone about all this. He does not want that people could humiliate her if she discusses all the personal matters with them, they could definitely disgrace her. He wants people to respect her. “if they thought that I didn't, why should they”. (Durrani, 1995, p. 104) She analyses the situation and because of her weaker part she hides everything from the outsiders and thought that Khar was correct.

As her track record is not up to the mark and she betrayed her first husband he sentenced her repeatedly. She did not tell anything to anyone just to rescue her own position because exposure of Khar's violence would reduce her to Sherry's position and it also reduces her credibility and mother would not think of her significance.

Durrani once claimed that "My love for the man had now turned into fear. I knew that anything that I might say or do could make him angry" (Durrani, 1995, p. 106) Khar become angry just because of her behaviour and lies. She often lied to him but he dislikes this attitude and just because of these reasons he becomes angry and even wild. She started accepting his traditions and values for her own sake because her previous record did not allow her to argue with a man of principles because she already betrayed an innocent young gentleman Anees and she knows well that she is in lime light just because of Khar and become an important figure not only in front of her family but also in front of society. By portraying Khar's character she wants to become innocent and also wants to gather the sympathies of the people that she suffered in silence. She only remained silent when she is not having strong arguments and where she knows that her position was not even strong because after her marriage with Khar, her own family disowned her because of her rebellious act. Anees was an innocent man she is playing the whole game in front of him and he speaks nothing. Her first husband trusted her blindly but she betrayed him. Her confused narration also shows her confused state of mind. She changes her values instantly what she accepts at one place; the very next place she rejects her own ideology. She did the same in case of Anees and after that in case of her feudal lord as well.

#### *Khar's Conception of Feudalism*

Khar was not completely the follower of feudal tradition, law and culture. He was not backward in his approach and he was the person who was wide-open to modern world and his pattern or philosophies were broader and of wider range. In this view Durrani writes "He kept me suppressed and cloistered, but then again he treated me as a companion. He discussed politics with me and expected me to take an active interest in his work" (Durrani, 1995, p. 107). He discussed all the matters with Durrani and not treated her like his other wives. He discussed politics with her and wanted her response as well. She knows well about her ambivalent state of mind because she was always intermingling her past and present and in such situations her words did not relate with her actions. She never showed consistency in

her behaviour but all the time she demanded a consistent behaviour from Khar's side, Durrani writes, "When he was in a sunny frame of mind he was loving and considerate. He fed me with his own hands. He dreamt with me. He promised to be a good husband" (Durrani, 1995, p. 108) and by his various acts he proves himself as a good husband. He took great care of her health and ordered his servants to provide her food and milk well in time. He gave her importance in various political issues. Durrani in her writing also showed that he was caring and prevented her from any situation where there is any risk or harm, she further writes, "He would not allow me to sit with my back to a fire, lest the hair suffer damage. In his most tender moments he returned to this passion, oiling and combing my tresses" (Durrani, 1995, p. 108).

She claimed that her marriage with Khar was controversial and also claimed that she was striving to keep this relationship integral at various levels. Indeed, she was not the only Pakistani woman who was striving for keeping the relationship intact. She wanted to depict her role as a subjugated entity who suffered a lot in silence but in true sense she was not a sufferer. She was silent and sometimes does not react just because of her own weaker part because she knows well; what she already did just to become famous or to gain some position but she manipulated her role to gather the empathies and to represent herself as a true feministic writer. Durrani writes, I must not fail at any cost. A lasting and happy marriage was my only value. Under its respectable shroud, alongside my powerful husband, my mother would not be able to shun me and the fear of that happening become equal to – or even greater than – my fear of him. The two fears kept me shaken and traumatized (Durrani, 1995, p. 108-9). Durrani claimed that Khar never felt any sense of responsibility for his children, in this view of matter if we see Durrani's character that she felt no responsibility of her daughter Tanya before marrying her feudal lord. In this view of matter Khar was even more responsible and showed responsibility than Durrani. In this episode, it becomes clear that when Khar received a news, that Sherry, his ex-wife had delivered a son. He immediately visited them and brought the child at home for his mother to see and she performed the rituals.

She lifted her lips to his tiny ear and call the azaan three times: 'Allah ho Akbar' ('God is Great'). Then she said the Kalima: 'La Illahall Allah Mohammad urRasool Allah' ('There is

no God but God and Mohammad is His Prophet’), Thus was the boy established the Islamic faith” (Durrani, 1995, p. 97).

*Khar’s love for His Children*

He took back his child to the hospital but his infant died that night because of pneumonia. Rumours circulated that Khar was not happy at the birth of his child, which was again a blame on his personality. Durrani writes “I had seen how shaken he was by the boy’s death” (Durrani, 1995, p. 97). when she witnessed the whole situation with herself, then how she claimed that he was not having any sense of responsibility towards his children. Khar was more responsible than Durrani. She just pretended to be faithful but the reality was quite opposite. She saved herself by claiming herself as victimized or subaltern. By doing so she was showing her childish behaviour and immaturity.

Sree (2008) quotes Durrani, “I am a woman, so I naturally write from a feminine perspective. My works are about breaking a silence for a part of society which cannot speak out...I am called bold because these are issues one does not talk about. My passion for reform was overwhelming. And I think, when anything overwhelms you, you have a natural boldness because you step out of realm of fear (p. 29).

In an interview with Aaj TV titled *Meri Jadojehd*, Khar said that he borrowed ten pounds from Jam Sadiq Ali in England to buy milk for her daughter.

*Durrani Attributed Lioness Title to Herself by Herself*

Through the depiction of her own character we see that she was not a repressive soul. She is not even breaking the silence by doing so but in reality she is portraying a very negative image of even herself. She is not a victim but her first husband is victimized by her deeds. Her own daughter Tanya is being ignored by her selfish acts. Nobody forced her to divorce him, it was solely her own decision but she wanted to blame others in order to attain the sympathies and prove herself to be a victim of patriarchal society. She felt that she had lost her identity or status by marrying Anees Khan. But when Khar realized her that she will gain the status after marrying him then she ignored the fact “When you ring up people you have to introduce yourself as my ex-wife. You have no identity of your own. Nobody knows you. People meet you because you have something interesting to say about me” (Durrani, 1995, p. 374) and he is absolutely right in his claim that she will gain honour and respect just because of Ghulam Mustafa Khar. But by hearing all this she says, she would say that she is Tehmina

Durrani not Tehmina Khar and claims that she is having an individual identity. Which is again an emotional statement to strengthen the sham claim of being feminist, while it is an understood thing that a wife after divorce cannot use her ex-husband's name as a surname, ultimately nullifying all her claims and blames. If she was already honour bound then why she chose Khar for her? She became famous just because of him because people wanted and still want to know about their political leaders and famous personalities and he is one of them and she knows well about this fact but after gaining a respectable position she betrayed him and become a self-proclaimed lioness, while totally discarding the fact that without Mustafa Khar who was entitled as lion of Punjab she can never ever become a lioness and Khar was given the title of Lion in acknowledgement of his political services whereas, Durrani attributed lioness title to herself by herself, this claim under the Structuralism and Post Structuralism in Post-modern era can be defined under the terms of Signifier and signified and Langue and Parole, that clearly defines that for Durrani's claim to be a lioness she clearly needed Khar, the Lion who was already a lion before her and remained lion after her while she was a nobody before him and lioness with him and again a no body after him.

She claims that she suffered just because of the patriarchal society. According to Sinha's work (2008) "Women have had no real power in the outside world, no place in decision making. Intellectual life, the work of the mind, has traditionally not been accessible to women – due to society's mentality" (p. 1) in patriarchal society it is considered that women is being oppressed by male hegemony and consider women as passive members of the society but in case of Durrani it is evident that she is not a subjugated or passive entity rather she was active who took all her decisions by herself and at various levels she was going against even her own parents. She was not marginalized in her life and empowered herself by using various tactics. She was diplomatic and playing with others. Durrani through her work also wants to illustrate the point that in third world countries like Pakistan, women are considered as personal properties of men and men control every sphere of lives of women even including their behaviour and movements. Men have the right to make all the decisions and women must follow their decisions in society but Durrani's decisions of her life are not imposed by other members of the society but she made all the decisions by herself. She is manipulating the third world women by using their situation for her own benefit without providing any solution for them. and If someone shows one's negation she goes against that

person. She even went against her mother's decision just to marry Anees and is of the view that her mother was not giving her importance or attention because of her dark skin tone, which again negates her feministic ideas on one side is a self-acclaimed feminist and claimed herself a victim of colour politics and it was her mother who made her feel inferior due to her complexion not any other person, specially not a man. And another noteworthy point is Durrani's colour changed into a fair tone, with the passage of time, which she accredited to her strong will power, which simply means all the dusky and dark toned women are of that colour because they lack Durrani's will power, and they are not equal to her. This point again rejects her feministic claims, specially of giving voice to the third world women, while this is not way to give voice to them, by adopting body shaming and beauty myth or colour politics towards them.

Khar's treatment with Durrani was quite different from his other wives. He gave her importance and not even left her alone in the village of Kot Addu. At the time when Army was against Bhutto and Martial law was declared. Khar took hold over the situation and in a little time he starts working on his plan to move at safe places which he made instantly. He said to Durrani to pack up the luggage. "He ordered me to pack his suitcase and added 'Don't forget my vitamins – and my cigars'

'Is it going to be dangerous?' I asked.

I don't know. It might be a bloody coup. They've come to get me. You'd better go to Ghulam Arbi and Saima's house today. Arbi was his brother. 'Don't worry' Mustafa said. I packed his things. He kissed me on the forehead and left (Durrani, 1995, p. 110).

#### *Khar a Saviour for Durrani*

Khar wanted to save her from difficulties and wanted to give her a respectable place but she was not loyal. Her actions proved that she only wants to save her position in all the circumstances. For fifteen days, she knew nothing about Mustafa, when he found favourable circumstances he sent a note to her that he was well and in Abbottabad. Three weeks before her baby was due all the prisoners were moved in a state guest houses in Murree. She was allowed to visit him there and moved there temporarily in order to spend time with her Husband. She had spent the day with Khar and nights at his friend's home. When she sensed that the time of her delivery was at hand she visited a doctor in Civil and Military hospital Murree, they told that due to inadequate facilities they were unable to deliver her child

unfortunately she went back to Ghulam Arabi's home in Islamabad and started waiting for the labour pains to begin. After three days Khar arrived there to see his wife. "Three days later a huge black limousine with military licence plates arrived. We were all shocked to see Mustafa emerge, smiling. Zia had allowed him special permission to visit his pregnant wife" (Durrani, 1995, p. 112) Khar spent the night with her wife and left early in the dictator's car. It arouses the suspicion in the mind of Khar's fellows and Bhutto that Khar may struck a deal behind their backs. The generals fanned the suspicion by holding Mustafa in Rawalpindi for the next few days. Mustafa had requested a meeting with me in all innocence, but he was now suspect and became somewhat isolated from his allies (Durrani, 1995, p. 112).

After two days Zia released all the political leaders. Bhutto went back to Islamabad and Khar returned to his wife. And after few days Durrani gave birth to a daughter, Naseeba. After the birth of her daughter she felt that she can at least moderated her mother's mood. Durrani's mother flew from London to stay with them. Durrani in front of her mother tried to prove her marriage with Khar a perfect one because her mother can only approve her life if she saw her happiness and she wanted to portray that her decision to marry with Khar is perfectly alright. If she is of the view that Khar is the true embodiment of patriarchal society then why she left Anees, he was not a patriarch and he was not imposing his decisions on her. He had given her a space or a margin to live her life with her own set patterns but she betrayed him.

#### *Durrani's Propaganda regarding Khar's Nature*

Durrani knew about his husband's nature and Sherry had already warned her not to go against Khar, otherwise she herself would be responsible for the consequences. Durrani knows well about all this before her marriage with him but she was going against him and attended the parties late at night without his permission just to show off in front of her mother and to show her big head that she had done a very justified act to marry with her feudal lord. "Mother was invited to ladies' dinner and she wanted me and two-week-old Naseeba to accompany her. Mustafa reluctantly granted his permission" (Durrani, 1995, p. 113). When she already knew that he was reluctant in giving her permission to attend the dinner then she must have to avoid this sort of things and straight forwardly would told her mother that she would not accompany her. But her insecurities came in front of all this and by doing such acts she was creating a non-favourable condition for herself. Durrani is of the

view point “I suffered alone, just I had suffered for Tanya” (Durrani, 1995, p. 116). Her sufferings were self-created. Her sufferings for Tanya were the outcome of her own decisions and here the question arises why she left her all alone. Her status consciousness pushed her to do so but she is blaming Khar for all the consequences in order to prove him wrong in all spheres of life. The reality is going against her that is why she started writing this work to prove her guiltless to provide a comfort to her guilty conscience and she understood in third world countries this work will be projected because most of the women are feministic and they have just seen the one-sided picture which goes in their favour that is why people show their sympathies to her that she suffered alone.

Political incidents are of equal importance in the undertaken research as Ghulam Mustafa Khar was himself a politician and the time in which this book was written was an important and turmoiled era of Pakistani political history. Durrani mentioned about Bhutto in his book and writes that when Bhutto decided that he will have to take his case to the people and he went to Lahore and there he was welcomed by a vibrant crowd. Everyone wanted to have a glimpse of the man and want to hear his vibrant words and he delivered a provoking speech General Zia has committed treason. He has tempered with the constitution. The people of Pakistan will not spare the traitor. The army does not have the right to usurp power by ousting the people’s representative and deposing an elected Prime Minister” (Durrani, 1995, p. 115).

The listeners responded with enthusiasm without any realization that they were whistling Bhutto’s warrant. The scene shifts to Islamabad, Khar warned Bhutto to change his stance otherwise general would eliminate him but Bhutto believed that the power of people is at his side and they will stand up to protect their leader. Khar informed Bhutto that the generals wanted to meet him. Bhutto approved Khar’s meeting with generals because he wanted to know about the military’s plan and wanted to assess them. During Khar’s discussions with generals they proclaimed him and said that they desired people like him but they showed the hostile behaviour towards Bhutto and stated that he could only persist if he tamed his overconfidence. Generals were also of the view that they were not conflicting to the idea of Bhutto going into exile. If he would agree that he was leaving politics forever. But Khar is of the view point that this proposal was like making a human being to live without oxygen. When Khar reported all this to Bhutto he wanted to convince him to flee the country and

asked the permission for himself to do so and “live to fight another day” (Durrani, 1995, p. 116) Bhutto granted permission for the latter request and paved the way. He invited the United Arab Emirates’ Ambassador and introduced with Khar. Bhutto completely understood the situation but he was not having other way outs instead of, stay and fight. After some time of this meeting Bhutto was rearrested and Khar was called into secret meetings with some general and one night Khar said to Durrani that immediately they had to leave for England without their daughter Naseeba and he was of the view that due to critical situation it is dangerous to bring her along. Khar took her England, it also shows his love, devotion and loyalty towards Durrani. She herself claims that his previous wives were used to live in Kot Addu, Muzzafargarh. When he was moving at different places. But he always gave her importance and showed his loyalty. She was little bit uncomfortable at Khar’s decision but he used to satisfy her by saying so “in politics, compromises are necessary” (Durrani, 1995, p. 117).

#### *Durrani’s Protocol Because of Khar*

When Khar and Durrani flew for London Khar was received by a Pakistani settler who would call himself as Harry. Harry knows about their political cause and was their friend so, there would be no issue while passing through the immigration and Khar’s affiliation with Bhutto caused no issue and they were granted political asylum. Khar accepted Harry’s hospitality and went with him where he lived; it was a small flat in Earls Court. Khar remained comfortable there because he knew that he was in exile and the meaning of exile for him was sacrifice and somehow, he managed very well with uncomfortable conditions. Instead of adopting the situation and standing at the side of her husband at the hour of need she was thinking against her husband that his decision was not right. In the particular situation Durrani was uncomfortable and started thinking that if she was facing the same condition then she would stay and fight “But I lay awake most of the first night, embarrassed that we had run away, leaving Bhutto in what was certainly his death cell I did not know how Mustafa had arranged passage out of the country, but something told me that something had bartered his honour for his life” (Durrani, 1995, p. 121).

During this time, Durrani was not aware about the critical situation and why Khar arranged the passage then why she was thinking or going against him. She always wanted to live in favourable circumstances.

Khar was a family loyalist and Durrani knew about this fact and he was not a person who breaks the family ties. Her family was already in London and she was in contact with her mother on telephone; but her father was not accepting Khar into his family. At that time, her parents are facing a problem that one of their daughters; Minoo, turned eighteen and wanted to study photography in a boarding school on the Isle of weight but issue is of coeducational institute and her parents did not allow their daughter to go their because they were conservative. During this tussle, Minoo contacted Durrani and Khar and asked for help and urgent meeting. “We arranged a rendezvous at a restaurant” (Durrani, 1995, p. 123) and she discussed the whole issue and disclosed her plan of running away they tried hard to discourage her but she would not accept. The very next day Durrani’s mother called her and in extremely upset tone told that Minoo has ran away. Khar took the phone and promised “No matter what happens, I’ll get Minoo back” (Durrani, 1995, p. 123) by saying so he has taken a special place in mother’s heart because she felt comfortable after this assurance. Before this action of Minoo, mother had planned a visit to Marbella, Spain. Khar said to her to continue with this plan by giving assurance to bring Minoo to her there. Minoo again called us and Khar convinced her that she could get what she wants without breaking the family ties and also convinced her to “Come to Spain with us” (Durrani, 1995, 124) and guaranteed her that this matter will be resolved. She accompanied Khar and Durrani to Marbella and there Minoo contacted her mother to start the reconciliation but she bawled her frustrations but Khar pulled the phone from her hand and said in my presence you are not supposed to be rude with your mother and said to mother in a lower and respectable tone that he will talk to her after some time after discussion with Minoo. After that he lectured Minoo that if she screamed her frustrations, then her parents would not allow her to go, so she must show her calm behaviour, then he called mother and told about Minoo’s problem that she was spoiled but she told about her difficulties that how she brought up her young girls in liberal environment of England.

#### *Khar as a Family Loyalist*

Mother was extremely under the spell of Khar after brief dealings with him and found him a respectable and honourable man. Then mother convinced father that it was a time to accept Durrani and Khar in a family fold and break the boycott. Durrani was happy at this that she is no more isolated being and it all happened just because of Khar’s loyalty towards her family

otherwise reconciliation was impossible at any cost. Durrani's Mother invited them on a reconciliation dinner. When they reached, Durrani's Father, Shakir Ullah Durrani, met them affectionately and he was friendly towards Khar as well because he won his heart by having a strong hand with Minoos and accepted him as family loyalist. At dinner, they met with younger sisters as well. Minoos showed her best behaviour. Zarmina, a dress designer and Adila who seemed much curious about them and Durrani sensed that she admired her rebellious act of marrying with Khar and standing up against the dictatorial mother. After the dinner Father outlined his manifesto: 'I'm making up with you today despite the fact that I'm hurt and upset by your decision. This is your second marriage and I don't want you, for any reason at all, to leave him. You can only leave his home in a coffin. This is the point on which I take you back into the family (Durrani, 1995, p. 126).

*Durrani's father's Reaction on her Second Marriage*

His father gave her a clear picture that Khar is her second husband so she must not leave his house in any circumstances. She must have to compromise with her husband to maintain the relationship but she betrayed him at various levels and unable to show her loyalty towards him and going against him because of her rebellious nature. To settle Durrani her father made some arrangements of her happiness by sending Naseeba. Dai Ayesha travelled with the baby and she felt nearly complete. Naseeba's three aunts were so excited to see her. In London Durrani's parents maintained a home and an apartment both. They offered their apartment to live in instead of living in Earls Court with Harry. Both Khar and Durrani assumed a new life as fashionable expatriates and invited some of their old friends from Pakistan for dinner. Zarmina and Adila stayed with them for the sake of help. Durrani arranged the apartment, Khar cooked food for the guests, Zarmina was handling Naseeba and in the meantime "Adila attacked the liquor" (Durrani, 1995, p. 127) when Durrani and Zarmina noticed their sister Adila that she was drunk and out of control they became worried because of two reasons. Firstly, guests were about to come, secondly if their parents came to know that Adila was drunk then they will be disturbed or worried about their daughter and at this time Durrani wanted to hide all this from parents because she felt that the journey of her happiness begins right now so she does not want to make a fuss over her happiness. In this situation of Adila, Khar handled her "He grasped her by the shoulders and she struggled. But she struggled closer rather than away. For a brief instant they stopped, almost sharing an embrace. Then

Adila relaxed and suddenly go to home” (Durrani, 1995, p. 127). Durrani’s drunk sister Adila was handled by her brother in law, the feudal lord. Ironically, being a drunk female is not an issue for feminist Durrani but Khar’s habit of drinking was troublesome for her.

*A Confused Narrative towards Durrani’s Mother and Khar*

After that Khar and Durrani moved to Durrani’s parents’ home which was situated at beach hill and highly luxurious and decorated richly. Each facility was available. Father’s hospitality was at its peak and Mother was much influenced by Khar’s personality and took a great interest in politics and listened his views with great attention and analysed Pakistan’s politics with great insight. Again, Durrani felt isolated.

At first, I found irony in the situation: I had escaped from the domination of my mother by climbing into the lap of a tyrant, and it was somewhat amusing to see the two dictators magnifying one another’s egos (Durrani, 1995, p. 128).

In the above lines, it is clearly depicted that Durrani was neither a feminist nor representing *third world’s women*. She was not only against her mother but also against his husband, by referring both as Dictators. Whereas it was Durrani’s ego that was not bearing them together and was taking the reconciliation in a negative way.

Khar used to discuss all the issues regarding Durrani’s relationship with her mother. When Durrani came to know about this she continuously refused the idea. If she was discussing the true portrayal of her mother with Khar then, why she is worried regarding such discussion? The only reason is that she is moulding the things in her favour or to attain sympathy.

*Desire Surpass Khar’s Power and Status under the Sham claim of being a Feminist*

Durrani is not the only one who felt isolated. She knew that Khar also felt isolated and she gave the reasons of his isolation as “He missed having a bevy of disciples. He missed being a chief. He disliked being in a foreign country. He missed the panoply of power” (Durrani, 1995, p. 131) She knew that he once used to be at powerful position instead of dealing him with sympathy or loyalty at the hour of need she called him abnormal. In the matter of fact, she was showing her abnormal behaviour because of her own so called fears of not telling anyone about his relationship with Khar because she already deceived her parents and family. She remained silent just because of her own reasons “I forced myself into a tortured silence” (Durrani, 1992, p. 132) Khar always gave her importance and acknowledged her at every point and always felt sorry for his misgivings and she claims that she suffered just because of

patriarchy here the question arises how many men from patriarchal set up felt sorry after their misgivings? He knows that he was short tempered but never let her down in any case he even brought her England with him. He acknowledged her by saying, Do you know how much you mean to me? I am incomplete without you. This has been a very frustrating period of my life. It will pass. You'll see – I'll change and make up to you. I've been so close to a nervous breakdown (Durrani, 1995, p. 132).

He was disturbed that she knew this fact but she was not trying to save the relationship at any cost he often used apologize to her "I'm really sorry. Can you ever forgive me? He cried at my feet" (Durrani, 1995, 132) he just wanted to save the relationship that is why he did so. But she used to threaten him by saying that he was living in her father's house so he was not supposed to do any daring act because she wanted to become more powerful than him. Instead of considering his position or his loyalty towards her family she gave him a cold shoulder. She knew the fact that even her own family accepted her because of Khar's behaviour. It is again evident that this so called *devastating Indictment* of a false behalfist under the mask of feminism, whereas, it was the power competition, it was not for equality instead Durrani wanted to surpass Khar's power and status.

#### *Ironic Claim of using Children as an Excuse for Tolerating Khar*

Durrani started making up plans to free herself from Khar and once again it was the start of betrayal towards his second and husband. But this time her daughter Naseeba became a reason that she was not divorcing and she described this episode in the following words, Divorce was not just possible. British and Pakistani law might be on my side, but in the feudal world, a man retains control of his daughter, and I knew that Mustafa would use her as a hostage to assure my loyalty, I was willing to forsake everything except Naseeba (Durrani, 1995, p. 143).

While for the sake of marrying Khar she left Tanya but in case of divorcing Khar she was of the view that she was not leaving Naseeba and made her an excuse or a reason that she was bound with this relationship. These boundaries were self-created. Here the question arises if she left Tanya then why not Naseeba. Instead of being loyal or save the relationship she is plotting something different not just different but oddly different "I began to hope secretly that Mustafa would die" (Durrani, 1995, p. 143).

*Durrani's Double Standards Regarding Islam and Feminism*

Durrani suddenly became feminist having the claim of speaking on the behalf of Pakistani women when history repeated itself this time it was Durrani's sister Adila who played the same game with her which once she played with Sherry. Adila was much inspired by the charismatic personality of Khar and did the same with Durrani what she had done with Sherry. In the presence of Khar's pregnant wife Sherry, Durrani took interest in him and started wearing the dresses of Khar's choice to gain his attention or become the center of attraction by her whimsical deeds. While in an interview, Khar himself said that he used to take interest only in those women who were already interested in him at the first place. (Reema Khan show), and now she claimed that she is representing or narrating the story on the behalf of Muslim women and stands by the side of other women. A woman who had already destroyed another women's house, how can she be the claimant of a feminist or even Muslim. Adila used the same tactics to gain Khar's attention but this time Durrani was of the view that they are not on the right path because this time she was a sufferer just because of her own sister. It is nothing more than an irony, "Adila changed her manner of dressing. Suddenly, all western outfits were discarded and replaced with traditional eastern clothes" (Durrani, 1995, p. 135). Adila started trying to let her down in every possible way and started copying her style and decided to have had a long hair because she knew well that Khar attracted towards long hair.

47

*Durrani's tale of Sacrifice and Suffering: A Constructed Version of One Sided Reality*

Durrani makes arguments about life and death and concluded that life is worse than death. She decided to commit suicide and bring heavy dose of medicine from her parent's house and took the entire dose at once. When Khar came there unexpectedly and found her lying down across the floor he called his friends immediately and took her to the hospital in Hampstead. Khar asked the doctor about Durrani,

"Will she live?"

'Is she a fighter?' the doctor asked

'Yes'

'That's our only hope then (Durrani, 1995, pp. 137-138).

Khar called Durrani's elder sister Rubina and told her that she tried to commit suicide and said it would be better if she did not discuss it with her parents because they will be panicked

after hearing such news. Slowly Durrani recovered and after two days she was discharged from the hospital with the news that her pregnancy remained unaffected. In this course of time when she decided to commit suicide Khar did not say even a single word to her. It was her confused state of mind that continuously made such plans. When she came home from the hospital he said “you embarrassed me” (Durrani, 1995, p. 138) he is quite right in his view that she embarrassed him because everyone will blame him for her stupid act and he was also ashamed that she was examined by male doctors because he was conservative for being a feudal in Durrani’s words. There is again a flaw in this story, Durrani tried to commit suicide, while being pregnant when she seemed her position getting compromised to gain attention of everyone and this time she was even willing to risk her to be born baby’s life. This is a drop scene of her love for children and making sacrifice for them.

*Durrani’s Trust Deficit Relationship towards her Family and Khar*

One day when Durrani was quite sleepy at night and was in her bedroom at once she finds that Khar was not lying with her on the bed side she become worried. The very next morning she asked him where was he the last night or who was coming into their room. Khar explained that it was Adila she wanted to discuss something with him so he went with her in a breakfast room because he did not want to disturb Durrani’s peace but Durrani was not satisfied with his explanation and wanted further detail that what they had discussed. Khar explained her that Adila was involved in an Iranian boy and she needed some advice but Durrani said that you must have to discuss it in the bedroom instead of going to the breakfast room but Khar stuck on his point that “Adila needed to confide in him – like an elder brother. He declared that his advice would keep her from getting hurt. He was now playing the role of saviour of the family honour” (Durrani, 1995, p. 139), in another episode Durrani visited her parents’ home. Her father was in Japan for some business deal. Zarmina, Minoo, Adila and mother was at home. Mother asked Adila to make tea but she said that Zarmina will make it and she complained that she was not well. Khar started discussing the current situation of politics and everyone was taking interest in his discussion suddenly Minoo in her authoritative tone said to Adila “get up and leave the room” (Durrani, 1995, p. 148) it was quite shocking for Adila but she compiled herself.

The next morning Durrani received a phone call from her mother who told her that Adila ran away from home and she was worried in case of developing any scandal and complained that

it was just because of Minoo and she was hurt when she ordered her to leave the room. On the day Khar was supposed to go to Liverpool for a political meeting but he cancelled his trip to find Adila. Minoo called her friends but found no report about her eloped younger sister. Khar was also not succeeded till afternoon but Mother begged him not to give up the search because she considered him as a saviour of family honour and he obeyed and reassured her that he will find her. He made a plan that she will definitely contact someone then it is easy to trace her. He also assured that he had spoken to appropriate authorities for help. At 10 pm Adila called Durrani and in a very numb tone said that she was very hurt and will never go back to home because everyone hated her and accused that she is having designs on Khar and assured her that Khar is like her brother. Adila ended the call by saying she will call later. Immediately Durrani called her mother and reported the whole conversation. After an hour Adila called Durrani again and now Durrani asked her to meet with her and she told that she was in Hilton hotel if she wants to meet she may come. Durrani suggested Khar to handle Adila, here the question arises if Durrani was not having trust on Khar then why she suggested such thing. If she considers her as a powerful being then why in case of Adila she becomes weak. In the matter of fact Khar is the family saviour he strengthened the ties and Durrani's own family believed Khar.

Adila blindly trusted Khar and always wanted his assistance even in her private matters and once when she wanted to discuss something with him; everyone in the family puts his fingers on Khar's character instead of Adila and started blaming him. It was the lack of trust that made Adila to trust her brother-in-law as compared to her own sisters and mother. Adila took interest in him and told him about the Iranian boy. When Durrani wanted to know about the whole story Khar told her, I did pick Adila from school that day. I didn't want to tell anyone what I was doing with her, so I denied the story. Adila was pregnant. It was that Iranian boy. I had taken her to a clinic for abortion. I was protecting your family's honour. For this I am being painted as a dishonourable man. It is a strange world when you are condemned by your kindness (Durrani, 1995, p. 154).

*Durrani's Adoption of Manipulative and Selective Feminist approach in her Narration*

Once again Durrani felt the sense of guilt at the time of the birth of her daughter Nisha that she had taken tranquilizers without thinking about another soul and she realized this on the delivery of her daughter that it might have had a bad effect on her infant. After the birth of

her daughter once again she blamed Khar that he was the cause of boycott from her family instead of giving respect to her husband she says “You have cut me off from my family, I accused. ‘I have four sisters. I have a brother. Parents. Where are they? Why are not they with me today? Think about it. Who is responsible? Think’” (Durrani, 1995, p. 156) She got cut off from her family once again because of her own sister Adila instead of blaming Adila for the whole cause she put her finger on her husband. Her own sister took interest and was impressed or inspired by Khar’s personality but at this point she ignored her interests and simply made her husband an accuse. He became a sufferer or in crisis just because of her own wife to whom he gave importance in all spheres of life and always tried hard to save the relationship. He presented expensive gifts to her often or He even felt sorry for his mischiefs and wanted to resolve all the serious matters.

Durrani’s own sister Adila says that “Mustafa hates you, Tehmina. Everyone hates you. Mother hates you, too. There must be something wrong with you” (Durrani, 1995, p. 167) Khar never claimed at any level that he hates Durrani it was Adila who played the same game which once Durrani played with Sherry but this time she wanted to portray her character innocent to prove herself as the saviour of women rights and suddenly become feministic who stands by the side of females and spoke for their rights by breaking the silence. Durrani wants to become a lioness in the second phase of her life where she wants to become a ruler and rule everyone according to her own principles. She is having a confused state of mind and having an imbalanced personality.

#### *Durrani’s Self-Imposed Claim of Innocence*

Durrani claims that she was treated as a subjugated entity by Khar but her own narration acts as a proof that she was overpowering and not treated as a subjugated entity by her feudal lord but at various levels she threatened her husband and treated him as subjugated being. It became clearer from the episode when they were living in her father’s house she said to him not to do any daring act at her father’s place; Instead of thinking that her parents accepted her just because of Khar’s character.

Durrani often betrayed her second husband as well in another episode when he gave her permission to go out with her siblings for recreation she bought some magazines and lied to her husband when he asked what has she bought; she used to hide things from him. She always blamed others for her mischief in an occasion when she realized that why she married

Khar instantly her mother came into her mind “I thought she would treat me better because I was married to an important man with a strong personality, someone who could hold his own.” (Durrani, 1995, p. 181) At one stage Durrani left Khar and went to her father’s house at that time her father was hospitalized and she realized that it was not her own home and she narrated this event as “I looked around sadly and realized: this is not my home; this is the home of another woman. I stood alone in the large house, broken and desolate” (Durrani, 1995, p. 183), After this he called Khar and asked him to pick and he agreed. Durrani used to act differently in different situations, used to adopt a different role for herself under different needs, thus becoming powerful and powerless simultaneously. After this event, she must have to compromise on various issues but she become lioness and showed her power. He always considers her as a responsibility and gave importance to her. At the birth of her son Ali she did not bother to tell her husband. “When the doctor finally arrived, she asked if I wanted her to inform my husband, but I did not feel it necessary” (Durrani, 1995, p. 186) and not giving importance to him, thus making Khar as a father an absent figure in their newly born son’s life.

#### *Durrani’s Conspiracy of creating Gender Discrimination*

She also claimed that “He was thrilled that I had, finally, produced a son and heir” (Durrani, 1995, p. 186), after hearing the news of his son. It was Durrani’s own fabricated story, he was already having sons from other wives as heir, he had his first son from his first wife Wazir Begum at the age of seventeen, so he was not already having her and son much before and even without Durrani. Khar never made any wish to her that it is only a son that he needs. Durrani is portraying a negative character by writing her self-made assumptions from his name.

#### *Durrani as an Escapist*

Durrani is an escapist. She wants to escape from the harsh realities and want to live in imagination. She considers that being escapist is the only way out but from her attitude towards her husband the picture become vivid that she wants to see her feudal lord at lower rank.

*Durrani's Presentation of herself as Innocent*

Durrani also claims that she could not react and often ignore his husband's transgressions and in her own narrative she explained this as "I could not react swiftly enough to his mercurial changes" (Durrani, 1995, p. 187) but she often reacted violently and even threatened his husband, with whom once she was blindly in love. This situation becomes clearer from the event when she was warming food for the children and Khar asked her to go outside for some recreation but she resisted continuously and after that she reacted swiftly and she narrates her own reaction as, I grabbed the pot from the stove and threw it at him. He screamed in pain from the burning brew. For a moment, he was paralyzed. Then, as he raised his hand to strike back, I pushed him in the chest and yelled, 'The next time you raise your hand to me I will pick up a knife and kill you!' There is a power and conviction in my voice, although my heart was beating madly. I had declared war (Durrani, 1995, p. 188). Durrani lacks a stable personality and in psychological terms can also be called as having a split personality disorder, which is very much evident in her narrative, *My Feudal Lord*. She is the one who is unable to carry out a relationship properly and she begins to fight and declared a war against the so-called patriarchy and male chauvinism, that she is continuously trying to be held responsible for all her acts, she wants to be a tragedy queen and war heroine simultaneously. She is not at all subaltern or marginalized but she calls herself victimized because of patriarchal system and claims that she is speaking on the behalf of subjugated entities but she is not speaking for the rights of other women but by doing so she misrepresent the whole idea of feminism and most importantly third world women.

*Patriarchy and Male Chauvinism: Durrani's idea of justification for all her acts*

She claims that she is a sufferer who suffered because of patriarchal society but her first and Second husband both are victimized because of her over powering nature she wants to become famous and powerful and she is gaining fame just because of Khar but before breaking the relationship she has forgotten all this. Durrani considers marriage as a contract in which she is not bound to save the relationship at any cost and she narrates it as "I'm your wife. I'm not bound to you by ties of blood. We have a contract to live together. I can tear that up whenever I feel like it" (Durrani, 1995, p. 188). Once again presenting the arrogant form of feminism, in which no family institution is more important than gaining power for a woman. She is not the saviour of her relationship with Anees at one stage and Khar on

second stage and crossed the boundaries or Islamic provisions to attain what so ever she wants. She selected Anees Khan and Mustafa Khar by her own choice, no one was pressurizing her in both the cases. Nobody imposed his decision on her but she was unable to carry out her relationship with them. The reason is very much obvious from her own writing, is that she wanted to become a lioness who wants to rule others. She makes it evident on various levels, at another place Durrani says to Khar, Get that into your head. Learn to respect me and appreciate my living with you. I find no necessity at all to live in this concentration camp. You correct your ways and make our lives worth living – or I’m leaving (Durrani, 1995, pp. 188-189).

After this threat Khar gave his reaction according to situation and he is justified in this view of matter “If you ever mention leaving again, I will not spare you. This is not an atmosphere that I can afford at my home. I have growing daughters. Do you understand?” (Durrani, 1995, p. 189). it is strange that a patriarchal feudal lord is more concerned about his daughters than a feminist mother. It once again nullifies Durrani’s claims that Khar was more inclined towards his sons as compared to his daughters.

Durrani knows that Khar was powerful and he was having a strong background and this was the only reason she selected him and married him because she knew and considers it the only way out to strengthen her role in front of her family and society but she wanted to become more powerful and strong and after few years of her marriage with Khar she changed her attitude towards him “Now my composure upset him; my silence weakened him” (Durrani, 1995, p. 190) With this attitude of Durrani and her representation of her own character through her narrative it becomes clear that she wants to gain sympathy but she is not a weak character and shows her power at various spheres of her life. She used both religion and patriarchy, whenever and wherever it favoured her.

#### *Durrani’s confused definition of freedom*

If Khar misbehaved with Durrani he felt sorry but in case of Durrani one can see that she never felt sorry after misbehaving with her husband and wanted to control his every action according to her own desire. Khar often said her and considers her a responsibility and always gave her protection ““I want you to know that I will never leave you. You are the only woman I can think of as a wife. I want you to feel complete secure”” (Durrani, 1995, p. 202) He always gave her special place and value but she rejected him and at times she gave him a

cold shoulder especially in the hour of need. He gave her freedom and in her own words “He gave me an increasing measure of freedom, Often, on his way to a meeting, he dropped me off at Harrods, and allowed me to roam the department store until his return” (Durrani, 1995, p. 215) If Khar does not believed or trusted her then obviously, he would have never permitted her to do so.

She claims that she broke the silence by writing this work and spoke on the behalf of women who suffered in silence but she is nor a sufferer and neither remained silent. She writes, “At dinner I coolly removed my dark glasses, exposing my husband’s fury. Someone asked what happened and I replied socially, ‘Mustafa hit me.’” (Durrani, 1995, p. 216) Durrani’s aim is to glorify her and in her writing, she achieved this goal by misrepresenting various issues and Khar is right in his view that she is exhibitionist. She never protects her husband and once she is of the view “I’m not going to protect you any more” (Durrani, 1995, p. 216). Durrani’s claim of misrepresenting religion is again evident, she is depicting “devastating indictment of a Muslim women” While, Quran clearly states in Surah Al-Baqarah, Verse number 187, "They (your wives) are your garment and you are a garment for them" (Quran 2: 187).

#### *Durrani’s usage of Kids for her own Benefit*

At another place Durrani declared that “I had to keep my marriage together for the sake of my children and myself” (Durrani, 1995, p. 217) here the question arises that why she did not give it a thought before her second marriage and why she is not showing her compromising attitude with Anees Khan. The only reason is that she was status conscious and she knows that her first husband was not at famous position that is why she selected Khar to maintain her status because she saw her future with the Lion of Punjab and she knows that she was acceptable only with such a glorious figure. Here she is also of the view that she is keeping her marriage for the sake of her children then what about Tanya her first daughter why she was not thinking about her before marrying with Khar. It is understood that marriage or saving her home was not at all her priority and its reason is quite simple that she wanted to gain popularity and fame and for attaining this she left her daughter and her first husband.

Anna Paglia an Anti-feminist feminist is of the view that, Men have sacrificed and crippled themselves physically and emotionally to run the household, feed and safeguard women and children. Their pain, sacrifices and achievements are not at all recorded in any of the feminist rhetoric, which present men as oppressive and callous exploiters (Paglia, 1998).

*Durrani's Denial of considering Males as Victim*

Unfortunately, Durrani's case with *My Feudal Lord*, Khar is also not different, he sacrificed at various levels and he even assured her about his love for her wife and he even acknowledge her in front of others "Grasping my hand, Mustafa declared in the tone of extreme sincerity, 'I could not think of living without her. You cannot imagine what she means to me or how good she has been for me'" (Durrani, 1995, p. 218). At another point, when Durrani decided to leave Khar and decided to divorce him she called her brother Asim and told him about her intention after that when she called the divorce lawyer. "During this task, he found it necessary to phone Mustafa to discuss the case. He reported back to me that Mustafa had stonewalled, arguing that we could work out our differences without him" (Durrani, 1995, p. 221). Khar is willing for reconciliation and wants to resolve this matter. But Durrani's mother gave her courage when Khar came to pick her and says "I want him to realize that you are leaving from your parent's house. He must never forget this. You have a home to come back to" (Durrani, 1995, p. 223). Instead of giving her lesson to sacrifice and live her life peacefully with her second husband she gave her courage that if she wants to leave Khar she may leave and come back to her parents' place, while previously, according to Durrani's own claim she was placeless and her mother was a weak woman, who was also previously strong and supported Khar more than supporting Durrani. At another place Khar showed his positivity and was of the view that, "Let us give our marriage another chance,' he implored. 'I will try and understand you. You must try and understand me. Let us forget what happened.'" (Durrani, 1995, p. 293) At various times Khar compromised to save the relationship but Durrani is not willing; she want to become overpowering and disrespected him and claimed «I no longer respected him (Durrani, 1995, p. 224).

*Durrani's Lust for Power*

Durrani wanted to become a lioness and she herself claims that "Mustafa treated me like a queen. He did not speak to me in a normal tone; he bleated like a lamb. We spent the night at Haslemere and then embarked upon a second honeymoon in Palm Beach, Florida" (Durrani, 1995, p. 223) if Khar treated her like a queen then why she did not treat him like a king. She wanted to see Khar as an obedient person who blindly obeys all her orders. She is secured just because of Khar and she herself claims this view "No, I was not in love, Yes I felt secure and even content" (Durrani, 1995, p. 224) Khar always gave her space and loved her but her

own state of mind was always ambivalent she was unable to maintain the balance in her relationship and blames her feudal lord at every level and do not want herself to be made accountable for her own mistakes. She wants to prove herself as a flawless being by doing so she highlighted the negative portrayal of her husband. She wants to apply her narrative to overall Pakistani culture but she is not at all giving voice to all. Once she also claimed that “I no longer respected him” (Durrani, 1995, p. 224) It is ambiguous that when she is not giving him respect then why she thought and even demanded respect in return.

*Misinterpretation of Religious teachings by Durrani*

At another episode when Durrani for the very first time travelling alone Khar instructed her not to pack up make-up because he did not want that people to see her as a symbol of attraction but she was against her husband and she narrated this whole event as “I was travelling alone for the first time, and he did not want me to attract any male attention. His paranoia irritated me. This is silly, I thought. I could buy make-up in India” (Durrani, 1995, p. 232). To become a center of male’s attention is also against the teachings of Islam but she is using the web of Islamic rules and Islamic traditions only to save herself and portray others as evil characters. She is misrepresenting the whole ideology. She is often against her husband’s view point and trying to prove herself innocent. Once she decided to go to the hairdresser to cut her hair, Durrani writes, I awoke one morning with a compulsion to cut my hair, to get rid of this talisman of Mustafa’s desire. My hairdresser tried to dissuade me, wailing that my incredibly long hair was the key to beauty, but I was firm. I had not cut my hair since the age of fourteen and now, as the scissors snipped away, I felt as if Mustafa’s evil spirit was exorcised from my life (Durrani, 1995, p. 235).

*Durrani’s Contradictory Behaviour towards Mustafa Khar /*

She was always going against Mustafa’s will and his desires. Before marrying Khar she was having long hair which is used as a symbol of attraction by Durrani. Whereas, it was Durrani herself who was attracted towards Khar and was inspired by his charismatic personality and it was solely her own desire to marry with the man of honour. Her own reasons are behind making this relationship but at the end when she does not want to be bound with this relationship she started blaming Khar. If Khar’s personality is having some flaws then why she left her first husband Anees Khan to whom she is married with her own choice. In the matter of fact, she replaces the irreplaceable relationships easily and it was she, who needed

to change her personality, while Khar remained uninfluenced, He remained the same before and after Durrani and it depicts Durrani's insignificance in his life.

Tanya came to see her mother when Durrani was at her parents place on 29 July 1986 at this juncture she is able to take Tanya back in her life but she decided to let her go back to her father Anees Khan because she don't want to take a huge responsibility on her shoulders she writes, "it was better for her to stay with Anees, with a civilized father who loved her, at least until I resolved another crisis" (Durrani, 1995, p. 248) Anees Khan provides her daughter Tanya a proper security and loves her daughter but she will never get the love of her mother neither her own nor her step one "Tanya clung to me and wailed, just as she had nine years earlier. She cried, 'I hate my stepmother!'" (Durrani, 1995, p. 248). Nine years earlier she left her without thinking about her future and took a selfish decision of gaining a status in society and she again sent her back to her father.

#### *Durrani's Cold Attitude towards her Feudal Lord*

At times when Khar needed his wife Durrani the most, she gave him a cold shoulder and shows her icy attitude towards him and by giving these gestures she wants to show him that she is no longer in love with him. She is not even loyal with him. He often promised to her to be a good husband, "He promised to be the ideal husband. He would make amends for his past behaviour" (Durrani, 1995, p. 250) Khar is not even sure about his wife's intentions because she is disloyal with him and he is in trouble to make any decision regarding kids that either they live in Pakistan or England in this scenario she writes, "He was unsure of my intentions. If he brought the children back to England, I could easily leave him again and reinstitute criminal charges" (Durrani, 1995, p. 251) Again she relates to Khar in the name of politics "Together, we would turn our shared dreams into reality. In truth, this theme now held far more interest for me than prospects of our personal relationship. He fed my idealism" (Durrani, 1995, p. 251).

Khar at various times supposed to assure Durrani about his love for her but she never shows her love instead she wants to consider him only with his political position and shows her connection with him "He maintained that he was a changed man. In tears, he vowed to live up to my expectations. I did not cry. I did not feel." (Durrani, 1995, p. 250) she is not standing at his side in fact she is standing with him only because of his status and she herself claims that I wanted to do something worthwhile with my life and, if politics was the answer,

I was inextricably linked to him. Mustafa the husband no longer mattered to me. But the Lion of the Punjab could still command my respect and loyalty (Durrani, 1995, p. 251).

*Khar's Loyalty towards Durrani*

He is loyal with Tehmina but she is not loyal with him and gives him importance for his political cause and not gave respect to the relation. Khar left everything to Durrani and gave her margin during his political turmoil and said to her that it was solely her own decision whether she wants to stand by his side or leave him. Khar's words penetrate in her mind and agreed to stand at his side for his political cause because she is in love with this noble idea. Because of her previous behaviour Khar was still worried and insisted her to write an oath on the Quran promising to stay for him even if he was imprisoned for fourteen years. She became famous because of Mustafa Khar, people wants to know about her because of Khar and considered as a representative of Khar.

Khar always gave her proper place and gave her respect and by his various acts shows that he is loyal a husband. In the incident of her return from Lahore to Kot Addu he offered Durrani a front seat and asked his brother to sit on the back seat. She writes "He told his brother Ghazi to sit in the back and asked me to sit in front. It was a progressive gesture, a break from tradition" (Durrani, 1995, p. 270). He is giving her an equal status and by doing so he even breaks the feudal tradition and goes against such constructive conservative norms but she is not considering him at any cost and never tries to save this relationship in fact she wants to become more powerful than Khar and this is the reason she gave herself a title of lioness. Khar by this gesture told the world that Durrani's place is beside him although the women of Khar family have always known for their lesser place but he breaks the tradition.

During his exile, he never lost his position. His supporters are still at his side and acknowledge him. She writes, Pandemonium prevailed. People ran amok, sobbing and screaming for a chance to get close to Mustafa, even to touch him. Many were trampled. Mustafa stood quietly, resolutely acknowledging the outpouring of love... He knew now with certainty that his support had not crumbled during his absence. The people could still see him as a charismatic figure who could make their dreams come true (Durrani, 1995, p. 271).

Khar's followers accepted Durrani just because of him. Mustafa Khar completely relies on Durrani and on another crucial moment she gave him threat by saying 'it's impossible to be

your wife.’ ‘Don’t leave me here, ’Mustafa pleaded. ‘For God’s sake. What will happen to me? You’ll go away and I’ll be locked up here. I’ll have so many worries. You are the only person I love, who loves me. You are the only hope I have. If you leave me I’ll have nothing else (Durrani, 1995, p. 277).

*A Manipulative and Exploitative Role of Durrani as Wife*

Durrani knows that he needs her in this crucial time of political turmoil she exploited him and become much more stubborn. And shows her headstone nature and rebellious attitude once again and try to prove her superiority through such acts. She started growling at him and realizing him that she is standing for his political cause although she herself took interest in politics than her husband. At this juncture when she is at her grandmother’s place in Lahore and composing a registered letter for Khar asking for a divorce meantime, Tanya came back and they started discussing their future; Durrani discussed her future as usual unsettled and Tanya told her mother that she hates her stepmother and wants to live with her. After some days, the superintendent censoring Khar’s mail and come up with Durrani’s registered letter and their troubles become public and the news of pending divorce hit the front pages of papers and this news is quite shocking for everyone. “Many condemned me as callous and inconsistent. My poor husband was suffering behind bars, and I was walking out on him” (Durrani, 1995, p. 280).

Everyone loves Durrani because of Khar and after her news of registered letter in which she is asking for divorce hits the front pages of newspaper and people change their view points about her and they started giving their viewpoints which later on considered to be right. She writes, “The more vicious rumour-mongers said that I wanted my freedom so that I could be with other men. A few days before I had been the crusading wife. Now I was the woman everybody loved to hate” (Durrani, 1995, p. 280). If we see these rumours at this present stage then we have come to know that it proves to be correct now she selected another man for her. Her daughter Tanya shows her deep love and affection with her mother and shows her willingness to live under Durrani’s custody but she always creates unfavourable conditions and preferred for her to live with her father. It may be a kind of torture for her daughter Tanya as well to live with her step mother. Again, Durrani broke the news like a bomb on Tanya that she must have to back to her father as he provides her proper security

“Tanya, you’re in a good school in New Jersey. Your father loves you and can give you security. I can give you nothing... you must return to your father” (Durrani, 1995, p. 280).

*Khar’s family owned Durrani*

Khar’s family also gave Durrani a proper place and protocol. During the turmoil, she heard the news of the death of Khar’s brother Rehmani who is died of heart attack at the age of thirty. Rehmani always treats Durrani with affection and live with them for a time and he shows his courteous and respectful behaviour. When his body arrived from London. She went to Islamabad to attend the funeral ceremony. Khar’s brother Ghazi and his son Abdur Rehman received her graciously. Khar was also allowed to attend the funeral of his brother in Kot Addu. Durrani heard that Khar is weeping like a child and she is not even feeling sorry for him and claims that “It was the first time since I had married him that I was not at his side during a time of special ordeal” (Durrani, 1995, p. 280).

When Durrani is suing for divorce she felt suddenly that she is no longer bound to Khar’s dictatorship. Nusrat Jamil who is a journalist for the English language *The Nation* called her and asked her for an interview and told her that she wanted to write about the story of human’s interest regarding politician’s estranged wife. She agreed for an Interview because she finds Nusrat as intelligent and articulate. Durrani also claimed that Nusrat knows about her life that is full of restrictions and she narrated this event as, “Nuscie knew that mine was conditioned life, that I had lived with a much older man rooted in a feudal mentality. My values were conventional, and yet she saw in me potential that instigated rebellion” (Durrani, 1995, p. 281). She selected Khar by herself and she knows very clearly before marriage that he is the product of feudal system and is having feudal mentality. Her claim of spending conditioned life is altogether wrong. She lives her life fully. Basically, she is not satisfied and it is difficult for her to attain satisfaction. She is not even satisfied with Anees Khan basically she is rebellious by nature who is always going against the norms and traditions. She blames others for her mischiefs. Before marrying with Khar she knows that he is much older than her but she decided to marry.

According to her claim her old friends left her, the reason is that most of the people are attached to her because of Khar, people consider him as a ray of hope and when Durrani is standing for his political cause they welcomed her whole heartedly but when she is taking a stand against him and demanded divorce all of them were shocked. As she always blames

others for her own deeds and by giving her views about life and death she writes, “My views on life and marriage were outdated and restrictive. I realized that Mustafa and my family had drawn me into their world and shut all the windows” (Durrani, 1995, p. 285). She wants to become modern by breaking the traditions and by saying that Mustafa and her own family are completely stuck to old norms and traditions and do not go for change but she will break the traditions.

Durrani’s family and Mustafa helped her, all her needs are fulfilled, without any demand she will get everything at her doorstep but she is not thankful to her family and even Mustafa and she charged that she enjoyed her role as a detached spectator. She started making new relations and felt more comfortable by considering herself out of Mustafa’s spell. “It was a major achievement for me to create new relationships not imposed upon me by Mustafa. These people saw me as myself, not as the extension of a politician” (Durrani, 1995p. 287). But after making new friends she remains confuse of her position, of her status and even of her identity and says: “But who was the person I wanted to be?” (Durrani, 1995, p. 287). So, she is dealing with the issues of identity crisis with having an ambivalent state of mind and developed an imbalance personality who always wants to prove herself better than others either parents or husband or family members are standing on the other side. At another place, she is representing her ambivalent state of mind when she asked her grandmother for a prayer by saying, “Sometimes I asked her to pray for Mustafa’s release from prison; sometimes I asked her to pray from my release from him” (Durrani, 1995, p. 287). She is even confused that she loves her feudal lord or hates him and her grandmother realized her that she must have to make her mind and define clearly that she loves Khar or hate him.

Durrani narrated her confused state of mind as, “I was horribly confused. Anew life beckoned to me, but the old ways still had me in their grip. What was I to do? What did I want to do? I did not know” (Durrani, 1995, p. 287). At last she decided to go back to London and settle herself with her kids but she faces difficulties at this time because nobody is standing at her back all of them are giving her importance and proper place because of Mustafa Khar and she did not want to get their help that’s why she decided to send her three children to London and said to her sister Minoos to receive them from the airport but her own mother was against this decision and is of the view that she will not go and receive them at any cost they must have to go back to Pakistan. Durrani is not going with her kids because

her paperwork is still incomplete and she wants to complete it and considering it to be her first priority.

Minoo told her about mother that she is coming to her then she decided that Minoo arranged a driver for her children and she complied and after that her children were so worried to see this situation at airport that their aunt is not there to see them and they were facing great trouble during this time. After this again her sense of realization arouses and she thought “Had I bartered the happiness of the masses for my own peace of mind? I was secure in my British cocoon – but – the pain” (Durrani, 1995, p. 291) to find escape from the pain she began to paint and according to Durrani her paintings showed her the way and each brush stroke brought her closer to the decision: to return. Her oath and her words which she writes on Quran continuously haunt her. On the Quran she writes, “I will stand by Mustafa through his incarceration be it for life” (Durrani, 1995, p. 292). After only a month in London she began to pack and landed to Islamabad, Khar was under the custody of police when she sent the children to see him. It was a tearful reunion. Children were attached with their father but the lioness makes the decisions. Press photographers were gathered to capture the tearful reunion of the Lion and his cubs. The following day she visited him and saw that he had lost much weight. They were tentative with one another finally Khar broke the ice by saying, “Let’s give our marriage another chance, I’ll try and understand you. You must try and understand me. Let’s forget what happened” (Durrani, 1995, p. 293). Once again, he wants to save the relationship with all the suffering and hardships he faced because of Durrani. He gave her a chance. Durrani depicts his miserable situation that the powerful man has bent and broken with grief but she is not standing with him in such miserable conditions. She became exploitative at such situations. She considered that the lion was in prison this time and lioness was free. He promised to change but she is not considering him at any cost.

As she claims that she is a representative of Muslim society we have seen that once when she went to the prison cell to see Khar she is not covering herself properly and without dupatta she enters in to the prison yard. At this moment Khar shook his head and he moaned “My wife walking into a prison, with all these men around, uncovered by a dupatta, I forget it, I said with a shrug.

Is it something you forget? He asked sharply, but with a view towards education and not malice. ‘You’ve forgotten a very basic thing. It represents your *sharam* (shame) and your *haya* (feminine modesty)’ (Durrani, 1995, p. 301).

Her claim is altogether wrong she is neither a representative nor she represents Muslim culture and traditions. She writes that she entrapped Khar by her appearance and after that she caught in her own trap. “I had tried to keep him with the help of clothes and Adila, had tried to snatch him away with hers” (Durrani, 1995, p. 301).

He never betrays her feelings and wants to negotiate with all the issues. During his imprisonment, he advised her to be polite and be firm. He is possessive and insecure because of his wife’s attitude and often shows his love and possessive nature for her by saying, ‘Without you I cannot achieve anything,’ he declared. ‘I feel that I can achieve anything when you are at my side. I can take the greatest of risks. I would gladly die today, If I knew that you would remain committed to me’ (Durrani, 1995, p. 302).

Khar is having the convincing power and have had the leadership qualities. They are having four children to raise and Durrani must have to understand the situation of her children that they need a father to identify with, and to love but she is completely transformed and just have had an eye on her own future and thinking about for her own benefits.

Khar declared that Tehmina Durrani is his representative and whatsoever she says or does is representing him but she is an exploitative wife who betrays him for her own sake and presents his picture as a product of male dominating society where women are suppressed. Although she is not suppressed but she writes that her act of writing this book is to liberate herself from all the boundaries and she is also of the view that she is a mouthpiece of all the women who are subjugated and subaltern. In the matter of fact, a woman who is neither subjugated nor subaltern how claims that she is the representative of such community.

Another episode is of great importance that Durrani’s father is in love with another woman that was Sabiha Hasan. Her claim is that Khar is a womanizer but her father is not a womanizer then why he is in love with another woman it is because her mother is not giving importance to her husband and always giving importance to her fashion accessories. Her mother is authoritative by nature and his father was a simple man and he proclaimed, “his new wife, Sabiha Hasan, accepted him for who he was. ‘I don’t have to be the Great Man that your mother made me,’ he said. ‘I wasn’t a great man’” (Durrani, 1995, p. 332) Durrani

shows her sympathetic behaviour to her mother but considering her as a “wronged woman” and this latest development seemed like a manifestation of divine justice. Her father declared that he is no more wanted to live his life in lie and said that at last his life is becoming important for him.

Khar was worried for her wife’s mistrusting attitude and he complained, “I can’t live like this I want a peaceful life with my wife.” (Durrani, 1995, p. 344) but she left his house fourth and final time. She is not consistent in her behaviour once again her life was reduced to newspaper’s headlines and everyone branded her as inconsistent. Financially Mustafa Khar supported her in every possible way that during her married life she will never in trouble. Once again, he wanted to see her in his life but she become lioness and wanted to maintain her own position in society because she knows that it was the time that people know her and she is beneficiary so she rejected her feudal lord. He wanted to resume his marriage with Durrani but she wants the divorce. He signed the divorce papers and by calling children in to the room he said, ““I want you, my children, to bear witness that I don’t want your mother to leave. I want her to be my wife. I love her. But she wants to leave me”” (Durrani, 1995, p. 364). Children cried and pleaded with their mother and requested not to break the home but Durrani wants freedom she was happy with this decision and is of the view that a great burden is lifted from her shoulders and she is no more a Tehmina Khar.

She writes that the press printed the lurid account of Khar’s relationship with Adila. They attributed the story to Durrani but according to her claim she denied being the source of this story and lied for the sake of Adila because she is not having any intention of running her marriage but by writing this memoir she forgets her love for her poor baby sister and writes about Adila’s intimate relationship with Khar in detail to strengthen her position. This time Durrani forgets that her memoir is read by many people and they raise many questions.

After her divorce with Mustafa Khar she writes about Khar and her own position as, Mustafa was free and powerful. He had sixteen servants. He had regained his wealth and his political position was stronger than ever. I had lost everything – even the children... how completely he had stripped me. This was the difference between man and woman. (Durrani, 1995, p. 373).

She blames others for her own mischiefs. It was solely her own decision to take divorce from Khar but presented a negative picture of Khar in front of society to gain sympathies and popularity and she achieved her goal by writing this book.

## CONCLUSION

The research concludes that the arrogant form of feminism needs to be countered or challenged because when there will be extreme feminization in society; it ultimately results in manipulation of men through the misrepresentation in various discourses by feministic writers. Anti-feministic discourses basically counter the feministic allegations that are falsely imposed on men. Masculinism which is considered as an extended form of Anti-feminism stresses that men are facing various challenges because of self behalfist claims of feminism. Exaggerated imagery of marginalized women of third world is portrayed in various texts to prove that the women are suffering because of patriarchal setup. Though the term patriarchy meant to describe the rule of father in a male-dominated domestic system, but it has now gone beyond its literal meanings, and is often defined out of context and reaching to the extent that it has become a social and legal system which considers men as a root cause of all the problems faced by women and associated an automatic inferiority complex with the women which makes them secondary, marginalized, subaltern, subordinate and even slaves to men. In Durrani's *My Feudal Lord*, she tries to gather the sympathies by narrating her one-sided story in which she portrays that she suffered because of patriarchal male dominated society but it is very much clear from this research that she is not the sufferer and just presenting one sided picture to prove herself as a so called feministic writer.

Masculinism and anti-feminism in simpler terms can be elaborated as a reactionary counter movement that is opposing the false feministic claims whose agenda is liberating women by totally discarding men. Durrani in her writing did the same she wants to liberate herself by discarding her feudal lord and shows that she is a real sufferer. Masculinists and Anti-feminism can be seen as advocacy working for the restoration of a masculinity that is supposed to be in crisis. Durrani's first husband Anees Khan is the real sufferer who is having a complete trust on her wife but she betrayed him in every possible way just to gain some position in society and another victim is her father who suffered due to the dominating nature of her mother and Khar, a feudal in Durrani's perspective.

History written by hunters will never glorify the Lion, a famous African proverb defines this narrative in a nutshell. Durrani is a huntress who is unable to glorify the lion. Khar who is considered as a “Lion of Punjab” (Sher e Punjab) is not glorified by the huntress. She misrepresents various issues to gain the acknowledgement from the country like Pakistan.

Her claim of suffering alone in silence is incorrect. She claims that women are always bound to cope with social restrictions but her own character is the proof that she always went beyond these restrictions and is very much selective by nature. She crossed the Islamic boundaries even in her narration by depicting the character of Adila and sharing her intimate details of her own marital lives.

Durrani is using Islam as a shield that protects her in every possible way she wants to show that her act of writing this book breaks the silence and wants to prove that her narrative is applied to whole Pakistani culture in which women is not having any choice to raise her sigh and considered as a subjugated entity but in Durrani’s case, she is not a subjugated entity rather she is over powering who wants to become lioness in every possible way. She wants to rule others and painted her life in her own way on the canvas. She exploits the definition of feminism completely. According to Islamic values it is the moral duty of a wife to obey her husband but she betrayed her first husband in every possible way to marry her feudal lord which is against the Islamic values. Mustafa Khar is giving a very different treatment to her as compared to his other wives but throughout her writing it seems that she wants to prove him as an evil character. Tehmina Durrani is acceptable in the society or in the family just because of Mustafa Khar and she knows this fact that is why she selected him for herself.

She is in the lime light just because of “Lion of Punjab” the position or fame she attained is because of him. People always want to know about political figure that is why she is considered as a source of information and her book is acclaimed internationally. Secondly, she manipulates herself to be the third world women who always suffered and remained silent but in Durrani’s case we have seen that she will never remain silent and act according to her dispositions and if she remains silent then there is a strong reason behind her silence; that is her past which haunted her at every level in all the spheres of life.

Voicing male ethos: An anti-feministic study is an effort to shun the exploitative settled norms of feminism that has adopted the arrogant form. We have seen that in the name of feminism Durrani wants to gain the attention of the readers because these issues are

considerable and are important to discuss. She is having an extra marital affair in the presence of her husband which is also against the teaching of Islam. When all the way she is not observing Islamic values and traditions then her claim of writing or depicting Muslim society in her work *My Feudal Lord* is went wrong all the way.

Durrani made Muslim society a reason for her suffrage while all her “problems” have nothing to do with Islam or Muslim society. She is using an exaggerated imagery of patriarchal society to prove herself as a subjugated entity but through her own narration it is obvious that she is using these tactics just to prove herself as an innocent being and her aim is to gain the sympathy from every possible way. The result of this present research work lies on an Anti-feministic approach that a suffering of women is given wrong perspective. Through Tehmina Durrani’s work, *My Feudal Lord* we have seen that she highlighted the biased notions towards men and society. Her biased notions are the proof that she is presenting a negative portrayal of men. She presented that women always sacrifice to keep her home and to make it a peaceful place and let go various issues for the sake of kids but Tehmina Durrani left her first Daughter Tanya without thinking of her future and continuously blame Mustafa Khar that he is not giving attention towards his children.

She defamed the Islamic values and claims that she is representing Muslim society. She is using Islam just to cover her own position. She is not loyal with her first husband, which is totally against the Islamic values. Secondly, she demanded divorce from him without any apparent reason which is also against the Islamic teachings this acts as a proof that is misrepresenting Islam and her claim of writing and representing Muslim society is altogether wrong. Andrew Kimbrell, an American writer and Environmentalist, discussed about men and crisis faced by them in current society in his book, *Masculine Mystique: The Politics of Masculinity*, (1995). He discussed the problems faced by men in the recent years, his book is regarded as a ground-breaking addition for talking about the rights of men and taking a stand for them. According to *Publisher’s Weekly Review*, “crisis of masculinity” is what this book highlights and brought into discussion. It is not only women that are victims in the society, but men too face violence and are equally victim and violence does not have any gender. Tehmina Durrani is neither victimized nor mistreated instead Anees Khan, Shakir Ullah Durrani and Ghulam Mustafa Khar are the victims who were ill-treated by the whimsical acts of the females.

Mostly men are presented in our society as emotionless and practical therefore, most of the times their problems and sufferings get totally ignored. Tehmina Durrani also presented men as totally emotionless and practical and do not understand the problems and sufferings. She ignored their feeling and emotions completely and presented herself as sentimental, soft hearted and sensitive creature whose aim is to present herself as a feministic writer by totally ignoring the positive side of males. Her criterion of spending life is continuously in flux. What she accepted at one place rejected on the other place and remains unable to create the balance. Her relationship with others is not consistent and her acts are the outcome of her ambivalent state of mind.

As we have seen in Durrani's memoir *My Feudal Lord* (1995) that it is divided into three parts, that is Loin of the Punjab, Law of the Jungle and Lioness we see the development of Tehmina Durrani from an ordinary woman to a lioness. She became a lioness who is fighting for so-called equality rights. She is neither marginalized nor suppressed at any level she took her decision by her own will. This research highlights that her narration is as confused and full of binaries. She wants to prove herself innocent but her own narration is the proof that she is moulding it in her favour by misrepresenting various issues. She made patriarchal society a reason for her dissatisfied and unsettled life which is altogether wrong, in patriarchal society male is considered at the dominating position where as female is considered at subjugating position and according to her own narration it becomes crystal clear that she is not dependent on anyone for taking her life decisions regarding marriage. Anees Khan and Mustafa Khar were her own choices and she was even going against the decisions of her family. She was fully aware of Khar's nature before marriage. She knows that he belongs to feudal background then her expectations to see him as a transformed person are obviously her own construct. By marrying Khar she gained a status not only in society but also in her family. People know about Tehmina Durrani because of Mustafa Khar but when Khar make her realize by saying "When you ring up people, you have to introduce yourself as my ex-wife. You have no identity of your own. Nobody knows you. People meet you because you have something interesting to say about me" (Durrani, 1995, p. 374). In reaction to this she decided to write this book *My Feudal Lord* and is of the view that her act of writing this book breaks the traditional silence. In this research work we have seen that she

is not a traditional wife who remains silent instead she always reacted abruptly and never felt sorry for her misdeeds.

She is playing the game with Mustafa's wife Sherry and cheated her but when her own sister was playing the same game with her then she considered it against the Islamic values. She created the so-called values which are totally beneficial for herself and which presented her imagery as a victimized soul. She is not the product of patriarchal system which she claimed throughout the text. Yet she is the woman who misrepresented social norms, values and traditions. She is not at all the speaker of women rights.

Durrani justifies all her acts by claiming that she is the victim of male chauvinism and patriarchal system. She is a confused personality whose own concepts are intermingled with one another. At one place if she accepts something it gets rejected at another place. She is having double standards throughout her life. She left her first husband and daughter to marry her Feudal lord and justifies her act by giving various justifications which are continuously in her favour but misrepresents the marriages of Mustafa Khar in her narration to get sympathy from many people and by giving a bleak picture of his treatment with children portrays that she is presenting a negative picture. When there is extreme feminization in society then the picture presented by female is accepted whole heartedly and is acclaimed at international forum but this time men are in crisis. Their representation itself becomes the misrepresentation.

It was Durrani's thirst for power for which she is continuously in flux. She wants to gain some position or status by using fair and foul means. She is continuously threatening her feudal lord for his mischiefs but wants that the world could see her as an innocent angel. Her past continuously haunts her and because of this reason she is unable to maintain a balance in her personality. Tehmina Durrani is applying the approach of "Selective Feminism" and "Manipulative Feminism" in her narration to justify all her acts and shows her hostile attitude towards men and shows her aggressiveness towards men and by doing so she considers herself as a strong entity. In her narration, she portrays the arrogant forms of feminism that depicts the man as a contrastive symbol and it even manipulates the whole idea of feminism. Durrani attributed a title of lioness herself by herself she is presenting just the one version of story which goes in her favour. Through the depiction of her own character we have seen that she is not a repressive soul in fact she is overpowering who wants to gain some position and

she is giving herself a title to show the world about her so called equality which she attained after so many years of struggle. Her claim for writing or presenting Muslim society in her narration is altogether wrong. It is against the Muslim teachings that Tehmina Durrani is wearing the dresses of Mustafa Khar's choice before marriage just to become the center of attraction and inspire him by her whimsical deeds. Ironically, she is using children or making them reason for tolerating Khar. Durrani wanted to surpass Khar's power and status under the sham claim of being a feminist. She wanted to present her better self and it is only possible by giving a negative portrayal of Mustafa Khar because he is in power and she wants to beat him at any cost.

Feminists have made male and female roles as power driven rather than role oriented, Farrell further elaborated this thing by defining power as, power as "control over one's life. ". Tehmina Durrani is also the same feministic writer who wants to control the life of others and become much more powerful. She wants to control Mustafa Khar's life completely and wanted to drive him according to her self-made rules. The basic aim or objective of Equity feminism is to attain the social and legal equality. Equity feminists believe that men and women must have the equal/same rights, have had the same opportunities and must be paid equally for the same work, so supports equality at all levels.

Tehmina Durrani in her narration of *My Feudal Lord* also wants to attain equality at all the levels and shows that women are much more powerful than man.

Suffering of males at the hands of females needs to be understood completely and it is the hour of need to change the prejudiced thinking among cultures and people. This research seeks the gender relations in which women's weakness is considered as man's fault and man's weakness is also considered as man's fault and they are in crisis both ways. This research is very much significant from Anti-feministic perspective in which the sufferings of women is given a wrong perspective and this present study is an effort to lessen the breach between men and women by countering the existing manipulated status of women as presented by Durrani in her work *My Feudal Lord*. Moreover, this research also highlights the biased notions towards men and society.

This research concludes that Durrani is given one sided picture through her narration in *My Feudal Lord* and her claim of presenting Muslim Society is altogether wrong by her own act of writing this book in which she is presenting the bold narration of all the events which are

the proof that it goes against her in all the way as well as her claim of breaking the silence is also wrong she never remain silent and took her bold decisions by her own but blamed others at the end to prove herself as an innocent being and by doing so she gathered sympathies of people around her. Her claim of writing from the feministic perspective is also wrong she moulds or manipulates the whole idea of feminism in her writing. Herein lies the gist and conclusion of this research. By demonstrating Durrani's life, this research shows that she is neither a feministic writer nor it is a devastating indictment of a third world woman and we must have to give a voice to male Voicing male ethos: An anti-feministic study is an effort to shun the exploitative settled norms of feminism that has adopted the arrogant form.

#### *Notes*

*Selective Feminism:* It can be defined as giving privilege to younger women over older ones. It is a doctrine that advocates younger group of females and give them their rights. It can be defined as the hostile attitude of women towards men. Women show aggressiveness towards men and consider her as a strong entity. *Equity Feminism:* The basic aim or objective of Equity feminism is to attain the social and legal equality. Equity feminists believe that men and women must have the equal/same rights, have had the same opportunities and must be paid equally for the same work, so supports equality at all levels. *Manipulated Feminism:* It can be defined as the arrogant forms of feminism that depicts the man as a contrastive symbol and it even manipulates the whole idea of feminism. *Masculism:* It promotes manliness and male characteristics, it is an arrogant form of men's rights just like arrogant forms of feminism that totally ignore males, and similarly it excludes females. *Masculism:* It aims to reduce sexism and adopt an understanding way between both males and females by countering the wrong allegations imposed on men by women. *Gender Transition Movement:* It can be defined by Farrell in his book *The Myth of Male Power: Why Men are the Disposable Sex* written in 1993 as one that fosters a transition from the rigid roles of our past. Feminist more flexible roles for the future (Farrell, 1993, p. 19). (Men's Studies): It can be defined as, women's weaknesses are often seen as man's fault but in Feminist men's studies, men's weakness can also be the cause of men's fault and this become the reason that men are in crisis both ways.

## REFERENCES

Al-Quran, Surah An Nisa, Chapter 24, Verse 31

Al-Quran, Surah Al-Baqarah, Verse 187

A, K. (1998, October 19). Taking on Feudal Lords, Tehmina Durrani's New Book Raises A Storm in Pakistan. *Out Look*.

Allan, Judith A. (2009). *The Feminism of Charlotte Perkins Gilman: Sexualities, Histories, Progressivism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. pp. 152, 353

A, Soumita, (2014) *Autobiography as Testimony: Truth and Fiction in Tehmina Durrani's My Feudal Lord*, Deen Dayal Upadhyay Gorakhpur University, Gorakhpur

Blais, M and Dupuis-Déri, F (2011), *Masculinism and the Antifeminist Countermovement*

Blake, M. (2015) "Mad Men: Inside the Men's Rights Movement—and the Army of Misogynists and Trolls It Spawned". *Mother Jones (January–February 2015)*. Retrieved April 20, 2015.

Briitan, A. (1989). *Masculinity and Power*. UK: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Booth, A. (1999) "The Mother of All Cultures: Camille Paglia and Feminist Mythologies. *The Kenyon Review*. 21. 1: 27–45.

Boucher, J. -C. & Gagnon, J. -P. (2010) *Le scandale des fausses statistiques du ministere de la Sante' et des Services sociaux du Quebec sur la violence conjugale*, in: 300 000 femmes battues: Y avez-vous cru?, pp. 91–210 (Sainte-Adele: Cafe' creme).

Blais, M and Dupuis-Déri, F. (2012) "Masculinism and the Antifeminist Countermovement. " *Social Movement Studies: Journal of Social, Cultural and Political Protest* 11: 1 (2012): 21–39.

Baser, A and Habib, B., A, S. D. (2013). *Women in Tehmina Durrani's My Feudal Lord*.

Crittenden, A. (2001). *The Price of Motherhood*. New York: Owl Books.

Cuddon, J. A (1999). *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*.

Christensen, F. (1995). *Ted Honderich, ed. The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*. Oxford University Press.

D, Tehmina, (1995). *My Feudal Lord*. London. Transworld publishers.

Dallaire, Y. (2005) *L'homme 'agit' ses emotions*, in: M. Proulx (Ed.) *La planete des hommes*, pp. 109–145 (Montreal: Bayard Canada/Societe Radio-Canada).

Delap, L. (2007) *The Feminist Avant-Garde: Transatlantic Encounters of the Early Twentieth century*, Cambridge University Press.

Dupuis-Déri, F. (2009). "Le masculinisme": une histoire politique du mot (en anglais et en français)". *Recherchesféministes* 22 (2): 97

Esther V. (1998) *The Manipulated Man*, revised edition.

Flax, J. (1990). *Thinking Fragments: Psychoanalysis, Feminism, and Postmodernism in the Contemporary West*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gelinas, A. (2002) *Le quite salariale et autres derives et dommages collateraux du feminisme au Quebec* (Montreal: Varia).

Georgia, D, L. (2008). "Gender Ideology: masculinism and femininalism". In Goertz, Gary; Mazur, Amy G. *Politics, gender, and concepts: theory and methodology*. Cambridge University Press. pp. 159–192

Heilburn, Carolyn G. (1989). *Writing a Women's Life*. Ballantine Books

J. Meri (2010) Mustafa Khar episode, vidpk. com/... /Ghulam-Mustafa-Khar-in-Meri-Jid-o-Jehad-31 December. 2010

J. Lorber (1994). *The Social Construction of Gender*

Kramarae, C. (1992) "The condition of Patriarchy" in KramaraeCheris and Spender Dale (eds.) *The Knowledge Explosion: Generation of Feminist Scholarship*. Athen Series, Teachers College Press, London.

Kimbrell, A. (1995), *Masculine Mystique: The Politics of Masculinity*.

Marshal, Barbara L. (1994) "35: Feminism and Constructionism (in Part VI: Continuing Challenges) ". In Holstein, James A.; Gubrium, Jaber F. *Handbook of Construtionist Research*. p. 693.

Christina Hoff Sommers (1994) coined the term gender feminism in opposition to equity feminism.

Pizzey, E. (24 September 2009). "Why I loathe feminism... and believe it will ultimately destroy the family". *Daily Mail* (London).

Pizzey, E& Shapiro, J. (1982), "Introduction", in Pizzey, Erin; Shapiro, Jeff, *Prone to violence*, Hamlyen, p. 13

Khan. R. (2011), Reema Khan Show <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SOz9PuCeiH0> October, 09 Samaa TV

Gilder, G. (March–April 1994), "Freedom from Welfare Dependency", *Religion& Liberty*.

Genovese, Elizabeth, F. (1996), "Feminism is Not the Story of My Life": How Today's Feminist Elite Has Lost Touch with the Real Concerns of Women.

O. Shabina Nishat, (2008), Women of Pakistan – Tehmina Durrani - My Feudal Lord

Sheets, Robin A. (1991) "Sexual Personae. " *Journal of the History of Sexuality*. 2. 2: 205–298.

Smithand. S W. Julia (1998). Women Autobiography, Theory: A Reader. The United States of America. University of Wisconsin Press.

Sree, S. P. (2002) Alien Among Us: Reflections of Women Writer on Women. New Dehli: Sarup and Sons

Sinha, S. (2008) Post-Colonial Women Writers: New Perspectives, New Dehli: Atlantic Publishers

Schlafly, P. (2009) Feminists Psychoanalyze Themselves Again. November 23, 2010. November 2009. The Phyllis Schlafly Report. Eagle Forum.

Schlafly, P. (2003), Feminist Fantasies. Spence Publishing Group

Watson, P. (1996) The rise of masculinism in Eastern Europe, in: M. Threlfall (Ed.) Mapping the Women's Movement, pp. 216–231 (London: Verso).

Farrell, W. (1986), Why Men Are The Way They Are, (N. Y.: McGraw-Hill, Personal Introduction.)

Farrell, W. (1993), *Myth of Male Power*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster. 1993. p. 19.

Faludi, S. (1999), The Betrayal of the American Man

Farrell, W and James S. (2008) Does Feminism Discriminate Against Men, (N. Y.: Oxford University Press)

Venker, S &Schlafly, P. (2011) The Flipside of Feminism: What Conservative Women Know and Men Can't Say.

Zaidi, N, A and Qureshi, M. B, (2012) Autobiography And Woman Empowerment With Reference To Tehmina Durrani's My Feudal Lord, p. 17, The Women - Annual Research Journal Vol. 4

<https://vultureofcritique.files.wordpress.com/2016/05/esther-vilar-the-manipulated-man-1972.pdf>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OLE31Yd0iz0>

MP3:<http://www.fdrpodcasts.com/#/3285/the-war-on-men-suzanne-venker-and-stefan-molyneux>Soundcloud:<https://soundcloud.com/stefan-molyneux/fdr-3285-the-war-...youtube.com>  
<http://suzannevenker.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/The-War-on-Men-sample.pdf>  
<http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2010/07/are-fathers-necessary/308136/>  
<http://www.menstuff.org/columns/farrell/archive.html>  
<https://thejaggedword.com/2014/09/17/a-society-without-father/>  
<http://arc.psu.edu/events/speaker-information/national-black-feminist-organization>  
<http://ecosalon.com/40-quotes-on-feminism/>  
<http://www.theguardian.com/politics/the-womens-blog-with-janemartinson/2012/jan/05/margaret-thatcher-feminist-icon>  
<http://sociology.about.com/od/Current-Events-in-Sociological-Context/fl/Full-Transcript-of-Emma-Watsons-Speech-on-Gender-Equality-at-the-UN.html>  
<http://www.wehuntedthemoth.com/2013/04/14/antifeminist-crusader-erin-pizzey-bravely-tells-redditors-that-never-in-the-history-of-the-world-have-men-been-so-unprivileged-if-you-think-about-it/comment-page-4/>  
<http://susanfaludi.com/stiffed-reviews.html>  
<https://www.buffalolib.org/vufind/Record/850568/Reviews>  
[www.goodreads.com/ My Feudal Lord](http://www.goodreads.com/My-Feudal-Lord)  
<http://minhavidasemti.com/garden-of-eden/anti-feminist-essays.html>  
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tehmina\\_Durrani](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tehmina_Durrani)  
<http://www.womensweb.in/articles/feudal-lord-tehmina-durrani/Roy, S, 2012>  
<http://www.outlookindia.com/article/feudal-lords/206670>  
<http://www.ryanmacpherson.com/presentations/13-invited-speaking/132-the-war-on-women-myth-or-reality.html>

May 5, 2017