

I. Toni Morrison and *Love*: An Introduction

The novel *Love* (2003) by Toni Morrison, talks of love as shadowed by greed for property, jealousy, insanity and hatred. Bill Cosey, around whom the story is woven, has been dead for twenty-five years. But he is still a very real presence to the women who shared his life. During the 1940s he became a millionaire as the owner of Cosey's Hotel and Resort, the best known vacation spot for colored folk on the east coast. Everybody (guests) comes from as far away as Michigan and New York could not wait to get down here. The resort was a playground. In a time when segregation was still alive, blacks needed a place to socialize, have fun, and leave the rest of the world behind. Bill Cosey offered them just that. He ran a profitable business where all his guests felt beloved. He was a rich black businessman, respected in the community, and above all else, a ladies' man. Respect toward Cosey was a salute to his property rather than his sexy attitude.

The relationships of this ladies' man with women that surround him are the guiding elements of Morrison's novel, both thematically and formally. While during his life, these women, his wife, granddaughter, daughter-in-law, employees and others vied for his attention, following his death, their rivalries only grew stronger, as manifested by the arguments over his will. The novel's chapter titles, 'Husband', 'Lover', 'Father', 'Friend' and 'Benefactor' parallel the different ways these women characterize Bill Cosey. Even Junior, a young girl, hired as Cosey's widow's companion seems to worship his memory, although she never knew him in life. These women idealize Cosey as their own 'perfect man'. Most of the female characters wish to be close with Cosey without observing his sense of materiality and duality. That is, they are all blind except L.

Morrison brings these characters together to squabble over Bill Cosey and his estate giving *love* the of a soap-opera "Just another story made up to scare weak females and correct unruly children, a story that shows how a brazen woman can take a good man down"(10). And too often Morrison seems to willing to let *love* descent to the level of "pointless malice", which infects her prose and her themes with soap-opera formulae to capture the property.

Certain phrases stand out against the well-crafted mellifluousness of Morrison's otherwise remarkably restrained prose. Hack-eyed clichés pop up and standout, like when Christine opened the door she found Ernie

locked in the arms of the staff sergeant's wife. Elsewhere Morrison painfully overstates the novel's meaning such as when one character marks, that's like they started out being sold, got free of it, then sold themselves to the highest bidder. It does not help that another character responds, "Who you mean 'we'? Black-people? Women? You mean me and you?" (120). This is certainly true and well observed, but already apparent to even a casual reader. The women inhabit Cosey's world are Heed ,his wife, the girl he married when she was eleven and how she is reclusively determined to keep the family legacy; Christine, his granddaughter who was Heed's best friend until she married Cosey and became an enemy; May, Christine's mother, Cosey's daughter-in- law and widow of his only son Billy Boy; Vida, a former employee who, while grateful to Cosey, was never fooled by him, nor did she believe he died a natural death; Celestial, his pleasure women, the only one who was able to inspire his romantic love, Junior, recently released from correctional who talks herself into a job as "assistant" to the aging Head, who needs help with a nefarious plan; and the 'humming ' voice of L, the hotel's former cook. Her presence is quite ghostly but her words as she opens and then closes the story.

L is the voice of this narrative. She has seen all of these relationships developed, watched some fall a part and kept hidden the secrets she learned alone the way about the infamous Bill Cosey. This is her story of the events that took place over forty years. She weaves her judgments of the women: Heed, Christine, Vida, Junior, even Celestial through her series of recollections, all the while revealing her own infatuation with Bill Cosey. L's narration is the glue that holds the multiple story lines of love together.

The novel is told as series of flashback; Morrison follows the development of her characters through time, although she takes care to reveal their personalities slowly, keeping the reader eager for explanations of sometimes shocking actions. We have to wait for Morrison to explain Heed and Christine's rivalry, May's madness, Vida's scorn, and Junior's self-righteousness. By forcing readers to question, why? Morrison ensures the page-turner novel. However the incessant jumping from past to present may leave the reader quite confused.

As Morrison waits to reveal the relationship between certain characters and forces behind their emotions, one may find it difficult to keep track who's who and what's what. But in classic bring-it-home fashion, by the end of the novel Morrison ties up all the loose ends bringing the past and present together There

are many characters and vents to keep track of throughout this story, and paying careful attention to detail while reading will guarantee the novel's narrative force and full emotional impact when all the connections are finally made.

Morrison's *Love* is an ever-moving tribute to the past all the while making evident the realities of the present. Morrison's characters are full of life, emotions, and perfect vehicles through which the complexities of human behavior are uncovered. Morrison does a fabulous job of navigating through the tale of a group of women all enamored with one man. As the novel suggests love takes many shapes and can lead to an innumerable amount of relation when confronted with adversity.

Love has presented the heart of critics and received much critical appraisals since its publication. This shows richness and literary height of the text. The novel basically focuses on the tragic story of the protagonist and struggle for the identity of its characters. Especially, the novel shows post civil war situation of America, how the black people are in intra-conflict in the name of civilization. Critic Jonne McCarthy views that *love* is about the relation of historical facts. He further states:

The novel plays out against the back-drop of the civil right movement in the United States, from the 1995 murder of Emmett till in Mississippi through bus boycotts and church bombings to the unrest of the Vietnam. These events deeply affect May, who becomes critically paranoid, and Christine, whose lover heads up underground revolutionaries. (202)

In the name of love and better life the non-whites have turned materialistic, unsound love affair is acquiring and people are wasting the time worthlessly.

Nobel Prize winner, Princeton Professor, Morrison long ago reached pick of literary veneration at which her regal, high-priestess face alone is sufficient adornment for the covers of her books. Original Chole Anthony Wofford changed her name Chole to 'Toni' because some of her friends couldn't pronounce her name properly. Her mother, Ramah Willis, had moved to Ohio with her parents from Alabama in 1912, after the family lost their land to a group of white southerners in a shady business agreement. Morrison was born during the great

depression, a time when US economy almost collapsed. Many people lost their homes and countless number of people stood in line at soup kitchen to get food.

Morrison signals accomplishment as a writer is that she has managed, uncannily to invent her own mode of literary representation. Her themes are often those expected of naturalist fiction – burdens of history, the determining social effects of race, gender, or class- but they are also great themes of lyrical modernism: love, death, betrayal, and the burden of the individual's responsibility for her or his own fate. Never is 'history' faceless in her work, never are individuals absolved from responsibility for their own action.

Morrison earned MA in English from Corneth University, where she completed a thesis on 'William Faulkner and Virginia Woolf'. First she taught English in Texas Southern University from 1955 to 1957 and from 1957 to 1964 in Howard University. Before resuming her teaching profession in 1976 at Yale, she became senior Editor at Random House. Later, she became an Albert Schweitzer professor from 1984 to 1989 in the Humanities Department at the State University of New York. In 1989 she became the Robert F. Goheer professor of the Humanities in the Princeton University where she is a member of the program in Afro-American Studies and of the Creative Writing Department.

Her works include the novels *The Bluest Eye* (1970), *Sula* (1974), *Songs of Solomon* (1977), *Tar Baby* (1981), *Beloved* (1987), *Love* (2003), *Jazz* (1992), A volume of literary criticism, *Playing in the Dark, Whiteness and the Literary Imagination* (1992), which was based on the lecture series she delivered at Howard University and *Paradise* (1998). Hers has been, deservedly, a career of accolades and acclamation. In 1977 she was awarded both the National Book Critics Circle Award and the American Academy and Institute of Arts and Letters Award for *Song of Solomon*. In 1981 she appeared on the cover of *Newsweek*; the first black woman to be so featured on the cover of a national magazine since Zora Neale Husten in 1943. In 1988, she was awarded the Pulitzer Prize in fiction and the Robert F. Kennedy Award for *Beloved*. Indeed, many scholars believed that Morrison will be the first African-American to receive the Nobel Prize for literature.

There are many events in the United States associated with blacks and whites, which influenced Morrison, and inspired her to write more on those images. The Southern blacks had to live with legal racial

segregation laws. It prevented the blacks from eating in public restaurants with whites, using the same public bathrooms and even attending the same public schools. In addition, white gangs such as Ku Klux Klan terrorized blacks. Peter B. High in this context writes:

There was also a powerful organization called the Ku Klux Klan, which often used violence against blacks. Around the turn of the century, large numbers of blacks began moving from south to the cities of the north. (211)

While segregation laws were not prevalent in the North, still African-American faced discrimination in employment and the use of public facilities in North as well. For instance, Toni, her brothers and other blacks were not allowed to swim in Lake Erie in Lorain Ohio, while whites enjoyed the lake whenever they wanted. This was one experience, Morrison learned as harsh inequalities between blacks and whites. However, the relation between African-American and whites in Lorain were better than some parts of America whether it was North or South.

Toni Morrison and siblings attended schools with white students. Her parents were capable to install a sense of racial pride in their children. Racism and racial discrimination were unfortunately the realities for African-American in that time. Her parents knew their children needed a solid cultural background to succeed in life.

From early age Toni and her siblings felt that black people were better than all white people. Her parent and grandparent often told the stories from Africa about supernatural events, folk tales, and myths. There is tradition in black culture to handover their stories orally from one generation to the next. It enabled Toni Morrison to feel pride in her African culture. Morrison loved music and stories at her childhood. Their family influences helped her to advance her literary career toward equality and against materialization of human beings.

Morrison's works are always symbolic, of the shared human condition, both engaging with and transcending lives of gender, race and class. A rigorous, unsparing intellect displayed as much in her fiction as in the sophisticated from her considerable achievements as a narrative lyricist. The result in all events is to

vouchsafe her unique stature in American literature and world's. Reading Morrison's early novels as 'fantastic earthy realism', the various elements that helps Morrison dramatize the sometimes destructive effects of community on young black girls struggling toward womanhood. The uses and abuses of community, explores the dialectic of dominant culture and folk experience in Morrison's first four novels and the ways in which power and identity emerge from their interplay.

Roberta Rubenstein argues that 'Morrison's fictions dramatize issues of boundary, attachment, separation and division. In a psychoanalytic register she shows how individuals and communities construct meaning and identity via contradictory process of internalization and exclusion'.

Issue of women's biography is shown almost in Morrison's writing. Donald B. Gibson, maintains that Morrison's use of *Text and Counter Text* in '*The Bluest Eye*', (center mythology of the nominal culture) helps her own text dramatize the internalization of oppression. But it also enables Morrison to complicate customary notions of responsibility, Gibson suggests; "even in detailing the most hurtful abuse, her interest is not in simple condemnation, but in explanation"(27).

Michael Awkward approaches to *The Bluest Eye* power conception of Afro-American double-consciousness guides. Awkward, who discerns in Morrison's work a feminist version of such precursors as Ellison and Baldwin, concludes that the condition of double-consciousness and distorted sense of self and place may be an unresolvable consequence of African encounter with New World.

Likewise, in the novel *Sula*, the emergence of morally ambiguous female is subjectivity in one at last independent of the confiding dualities of patriarchal perception. A sense of place is central to Houston A. Baker, Jr.'s meditation on *Sula*. Baker remarks on the novel's conflation of intimacy and occupancy as he examines the politics of its passions.

Sula and *Beloved*, context of voices and perspectives, where daughterly tradition defines itself in relation to a maternal post. While white feminism normally occludes the mother's place, black feminism must work to restore the validity of the maternal perspective.

Her first three novels center on the relation between communities not only signifies empowerments for its members, but the exertion of power over its members. Focusing on *Tar Baby*, Marilyn Sanders Mobley in *Jadine as Cultural Orphan in 'Tar Baby'* describes a cultural orphan's quest for wholeness and identity and the vexing dilemma of liminality(18).

The themes of the maternal sexuality and generational continuity among black women are pursued in *Tar Baby* that Jadine's troubled rejections of norms of black motherhood are set against the abject failure of while the motherhood of the white family as a whole.

In Susan Willis's view, in *Specifying: Black Women Writing the American Experience*, Morrison abiding concern is the preservation of Afro-American folk cultures after the depression of rural. Southern prewar black communities were the reclamation of the neighborhood as a model of community (29).

The next novel *Song of Solomon*, Milkman the son of a successful bourgeois businessman's flight initially represents an entirely selfish desire for Pilate's gold. Morrison's struggle in American society and Jadine's searching for ancient properties for her real identity corresponds in her another novel *Tar Baby*

The novel prize winner *Beloved* (1998) has been acclaimed as Morrison's most dramatic novel. The story pulls the reader into the meaning of slavery for American women, through the extraordinary figure of *Beloved*, the murdered baby girl of Sethe. The way the novel is written is complex, weaving across different time frames and different voices, to reveal the hideous shape of slavery in the minds of all who survived it. In the process of slavery, women are more dominated by American patriarchal society. The female characters are sexually exploited and physically tortured to get entertainment and to accomplish their own household as well as outward work.

The imposed consciousness about the concept of beauty on black females has been imparted in the mind of black female in her novel *Jazz* (1992). The white American character Golden Gray having white skin and beautiful eyes defines beauty as his appearance is. This is imported to the mind of black females who do not have such beauty and make them contrast and struggle for being beauty between Violet and Joe.

Morrison's fictions explore events that are dominations, injustices and slavery of African-American and its consequences. She writes for those who are marginalized in the name of gender, race and class. Morrison reveals the myriad ways in which human beings entangle themselves in each other's circumstances.

Morrison's writings always engage major contemporary social issues: the interrelatedness of racism, class exploitation and sexism, domination and imperialism, the spirituality and power of oral folk traditions and values, the mythic scope of the imagination, and the negotiation of slippery boundaries, especially for members of oppressed groups between personal desire and political urgencies. Her works also articulates perennial human concerns and paradoxes: how are our concepts of the good, the beautiful and the powerful related; what is goodness and evil; how does our sense of identity derive from community while maintaining individual uniqueness? Morrison has said in "Star Power."

If anything I do, in the way of writing novels (or whatever I write) isn't about the village or the community or about you, then it is not about anything. I am not interested in indulging myself in some private, closed exercise of my imagination that personal dreams - which is to say yes, the work must be political.... It seems to me that the best art is political and you ought to make it unquestionably political and irrevocably beautiful at the same time. (40-46)

The quotation shows Morrison insists on the social injustice like oppression i.e. class oppression same as domination on female by the dominant social groups. She raises political issues which correspond with her writings.

The crux of the *Love* is where matter is counted rather than spirit and social custom. Human beings can be distinguished from animals by consciousness, religion or anything else we like. Human beings begin to distinguish themselves from animals as soon as they begin to produce their means of subsistence, a step which is conditioned by their physical organization. By producing their means of subsistence human beings are indirectly producing their actual material life. The way in which human beings, their means of subsistence, depends first of all on the nature of actual means of subsistence they find in the existence and reproduce.

The production of ideas, of conceptions, of consciousness, is at first directly interwoven with the material activity and the material intercourse of men, the language of real life. Conceiving, thinking, the material intercourse of human beings, appears at this stage as the direct efflux of their material behavior. The same applies to the mental production as expressed in the language of politics, law, morality, religion, metaphysics, etc. of people. Human beings are the producers of their conceptions, ideas they are conditioned by a definite development of their productive forces and of the intercourse. Corresponding to these, up to its furthest forms. Consciousness can never be anything else than conscious existence, and the existence of human beings is their actual life process. If in all ideology human beings and their circumstances appear upside down as in a camera obscura, this phenomenon arises just as much from their life-process.

For survival, a woman sleeps with a man but there the woman is wronged because she is helpless, she does not have money but the male has money. Money protects him whereas lack of money is curse for the female of same participation. Women are compelled to adopt profession of prostitution. They are paid less than man although “when a man took a woman, he came to live in her household activities” (Tong 47). The economic situation of unemployed or underemployed black people explains why they, like labor, sell themselves to others. Therefore, prostitute, like labor, is a class phenomenon. Apart from L all female characters are used as commodity in the capitalistic society. He further says:

There is a bourgeoisie demand for prostitutes and as long as most women are paid no wages or inadequate wages, economically dependent women will sell their bodies to men in order to support themselves and in some instances, their children. Thus, to fight capitalism is also to fight prostitution- whatever form it takes, including marriage because most women will not have access to meaningful work at a decent wage until the capitalist system what depends upon their exploitation is smashed. (Tong 65)

The discursive narration by L in novel *Love* deals how the woman characters are taken as matter to utilize as good of satisfying :

Manila's girls had been congenial most of the time; other times not. But they so enjoyed their hearts of gold-gold they had slipped from wallets, or inveigled with mild forms of blackmail- they were staunchly optimistic. They told Christine not to worry, some women was bound to de-dick him one day, and besides, she was still a fox, there were lots of players and every goodbye ain't gone. (85)

Although, Christine shows herself changing from raunchy and foxy behavior but she does not implement in real life. It shows the pre-dominant condition of people, how materiality affects them. People believe they could change their habit reversely, it is not happening.

In direct contrast to German philosophy which descends from heaven to earth, here materialist ascends from earth to heaven. Material out from what human beings say, imagine, and conceive, in other to arrive in human beings in the flesh.

Materialists set out from real, active human beings and on the basis of their real life-process, they demonstrate the development of the ideological reflexes and echoes of this life process. The phantoms formed in the human brain are also necessarily, sailboats of their material premises. Morally, religion, metaphysics, all the rest of ideology and their corresponding forms of consciousness, thus no longer retain the semblance of independence. They have no history, no development, but men, developing their material production and their material intercourse, change, along with this their real existence, their thinking and the products of their thinking. Life is not determined by consciousness but consciousness by life. In the first method of the approach the starting point is consciousness taken as the living individual; in the second method, which conforms to real life of living individuals themselves and consciousness is considered solely as their consciousness.

In world of materiality, poor people are alienated because they are treated as if they are commodity. As the wage labors are estranged from their work, themselves, human being and nature prostitutes (wives-prostitutes) are also alienated from all the aspects that laborers are alienated. Tong gives reason why prostitutes are alienated:

Selling one, whether as a wife or a prostitute, alienates one from one's work because that work is being done for another, not for oneself. This concept is particularly applying in the case of the prostitute, for what she is closet to her, her body her sexuality. So under capitalism workers sexuality becomes a commodity. (104)

Not only wife but daughter and other family members are commodity as matter. Christine is treated as commodity by her step mother. Junior is carried as goods by her employer.

In the text of *love* female characters are dominated by materialistic approach by major characters; Bill Cosey and Heed. Bill Cosey, the protagonist of the novel, revolves female characters for his prosperity in Hotel business according to his will. He continuously uses female even after his death, they have to depend upon him and engage to save his property for the name of Cosey. They are used sexually too that he marries an eleven-year old child and has secret relation with Celestial. They are compelled to be molded and commodified according to the will of male. All the female characters live and work for the sake of his property. On the one hand, Bill Cosey uses female characters for the sake of his property fame, on the other hand, female characters like Heed struggles and enemies with other for her husband and she herself is sexually exploited for pleasure for male female has to do only for their male like a worker in capitalist society. Their desires do not count, what actually counts is the desire of male.

This researcher will try to unveil domination of human in the name of matter in an economic context in the text *love* by Toni Morrison. How the black people, within the same society, are being dominated in the name of conservation. They are using the norms and values constructed by themselves on the basis of power relations of materiality which have the economic basis.

By presenting the Marxist and neo-Marxist views, I will try to connect the existence of human beings in search of property with the help of artificial love of materiality in my theoretical modality and textual analysis with reference of Karl Marx, Engels, Adorno and Horkheimer, Gramsci, Althusser and Hegel.

II. Marxism and neo-Marxism: The Question of Materiality

Materialistic people believe that having money and possession is the most important thing in life. It directly relates to physical objects rather than emotions or the spiritual world. Human beings are distinguished from animals by their consciousness and by their civilization, religion and culture they establish through it. They distinguish themselves from animals as soon as they begin to produce their means of subsistence, a step which is conditioned by their physical organization. By producing their means of subsistence human beings are indirectly producing their actual material life. Human beings, means of subsistence, depend on the nature of actual means of subsistence they find in the existence and have the reproduction.

The mode of production must not be considered simply as being the physical existence of the individuals. Rather it is defined from the activity of individuals, a definite form of expression in their life, a definite mode of life in their part. As individuals express their life, so they are. What they are, therefore, they coincide their production, both with what they produce and with how they produce. The nature of individuals thus depends on the material condition determining their production. Indeed their production only makes it appearance with the increase of production. In its turn this presuppose the intercourse of individuals one another. The form of the intercourse is again determined by production.

The definite individuals who are productively active in a definite way, and enter into a definite social and political relationship. Empirical observation must separate each instance being and without any mystification and speculation and the connection of the social and, political structure with production. The

social structure and the state are continually evolving out of the life process of definite individuals, not as they may appear in their own or other people's imagination, but as they really are; i.e. as they operate, produce materially, hence as they work under definite materials limits, presuppositions and conditions independent of their will.

In the production of the ideas, of conceptions, of consciousness, is at first directly interwoven with the material activity and the material intercourse of the human, the language of real life of conceiving, of thinking the material behavior. The same applies to the mental production as expressed in the language of politics, law, mortality, religion, metaphysics, etc. of people. Human beings are the producers of their conceptions, ideas, etc. and as they are conditioned by a definite development of their productive forces and of the intercourse. Consciousness can never be anything else than conscious existence, and the existence of human beings is their actual life process. If in all ideology human beings and their circumstances appear upside down as in a camera obscure, these phenomena arise just as much from their life process. Indirect to German philosophy which descends from heaven to earth, here materialistic ascends from earth to heaven.

For society to be fair there will need to be an intellectual group that educates the working classes to enable them to challenge the dominant cultural hegemony of the capitalist ruling class. Neo-Marxists look further than classical Marxists and not only focus on the importance of the economy. They also recognize other inequalities that exist in the society. For example, new criminologists account for crime amongst the working class and blacks in terms of economic inequality, individual meanings, policing strategy and the effects of labeling.

Karl Marx, German philosopher, produced the sociological, political and economic theories often in collaboration with Friedrich Engels, developed critique of society and his claim was both scientific and revolutionary. Marx proposed a model of history in which economic and political condition determine social conditions. They were responding to social hardships stemming from the rise of capitalism. Appropriately, these theories are formulated specifically to analyze how society functions in a step of upheaval and constant change. This critique achieved its most systematic expression in his most famous work, *Das Kapital* (1867). Marx is

known for his theories of socialism in *The Communist Manifesto* (1848). He is most famous for analysis of history in terms of class struggles, as assumed up in the opening line of the introduction to *The Communist Manifesto*: "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle" (Marx, 21).

Within dialectical account of history is the idea that a given individual's social being is determined by larger political and economic forces. Simply stated, the social class into which a person is born determines their outlook and viewpoints. For Marx, economic, political and social dimensions are the determinants of human consciousness. In *German Ideology*, he says, "life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life" (625). The economic condition of the people determines how they develop language, law, politics, morality, religion and art, too:

Men are the producers of their conceptions idea etc-real, active men as they are conditioned by the development of their productive forces and of the intercourse to these, up to the furthest forms. Consciousness can never be anything else than consciousness existence, and existence of men is their actual life process. (625)

Here Marx means that production of ideas, conceptions, consciousness, etc. are directly related to the material reality.

Marxism disproves the bourgeois economic, political and social mechanism. Marxism initiates a movement of proletarians. Marx address a wide range of issues, including alienation, and exploitation of the worker, the capitalist mode of production, and historical mechanism.

From Marxist point of view, literature is treated as the reflection of the socio-economic life. When we talk of the socio-economic life of the society, we can find distinct classes in struggle for the economic, political as well social advantages. So, literature for Marxism should reflect this dialectical totality of a society and the value of literature is judged on the basis of how far it has done this function. Marxism is different from the movement "Art for Art Sake." It stresses the need that literature should be useful to life. It denounces the modern trend of writings, which concentrates on minute a subjective picture of the world. Disproving the early

concept of art and literature, Marxist theories of art and literature believe that literature has a social as well as political implication and it must be committed to people. It should aim for the betterment of the society.

Although Marx and Engels have not left any systematic works entirely centered on art and literature, they have raised some basic questions about their discussion on 'base' and 'superstructure'.

The interpretation of the relevance of Marxist theory to literature is a matter of dispute not merely between Marxists and non-Marxists (sociologist literature critics, philosophers) but have been and still the subject of bitter controversy between those claiming to be Marxists (Forgacs 21).

We find contrary views about art and literature among the Marxist critics and theorists themselves. Lucas treats literature as the reflection of outside reality. The distinction between Marxist and non-Marxist sociological realistic criticism is not so sharp. Till nineteenth century all criticisms were sociological. Therefore criticism is often organized from quite earlier. Of course, it is closely associated to biographical, sociological and historical criticism. Fundamental difference between them is that Marxist criticism examines how far a literary work embodies ability in changing human existence and leads it to the path of progress, prosperity and emancipation whereas other gives emphasis on interpretive function and examine whether the work is successful in interpreting life and world appropriately. And, its criticism is the primary of art and literature

But Marxism, a living body of thought, aims at revolutionizing the whole economic life establishing new political system led by proletarian orthodox Marxist theory literature strongly insists that a work of literature should reflect the class relation and be committed to the case of working class people. A writer's success or failure should be judged on the basis of his works which exhibit his insight of the socio-economic situation of the epoch; it demands the author to produce real objectively with special attention to class division, the exploitation of the lower class by the upper. So literature instead of rendering outward superficial appearance of reality should explore the inner class. In order to capture the reality successfully, an author needs to have deep intellectual power and penetrating vision of the historical of the period. Outward superficial

depiction of the things like that of naturalism and modernism which bracket off all the inner causes can never lead to reality. Literature for Marxist critics should be auxiliary in spreading ideology of working class.

For Adorno and Horkheimer, as Neo-Marxists, business is made into an ideology in order to justify the rubbish they deliberately produce. They call themselves industrialists; and when their directors' incomes are published, any doubt about the social utility of the finished products is removed:

Furthermore it is claimed that standards were based in the first place on consumers' need, and for that reason were accepted with so little resistance. The result is the circle of manipulation and retroactive need in which unity of the system grows ever stronger. No mention is made of the fact that the basis on which technology acquires power over society is the power of those whose economic hold over society is greatest. (Adams 202)

In the name of information and entertainment capitalist and apartheid group make people to learn newness. Outwardly, the aim of their languages and media aware people but their deeper intention is to mistreat:

Media turns all participants into listeners and authoritatively subjects them to broadcasts programs which are all exactly the same. No machinery rejoinder has been devised, and private broadcasters are denied any freedom. They are confined to the apocryphal field of the "amateur," and also have to accept organization from above.

(Adams 203) In addition there is agreement- or at least the determination among all executive authorities not to produce or sanction anything that in a way differs from their own rules, their own ideas on consumers, or above all themselves. Films, or stories in magazines in different prize range, depend not so much on subject matter as on classifying, organizing and labeling consumers. Something is provided for all so that none may escape; the distinctions are emphasized and extended. The private culture monopoly it is fact that tyranny leaves the body free and directs its attack at the soul.

The ruler no longer says, "you must think as I do or die, you are free not to think as I do; your life, your property, every thing shall remains yours, but from this day on you are a stranger among us" Adams (209-210). Not to conform means to be rendered powerless, economically and therefore spiritually to be "self-employed."

When the outsider is excluded from the concern, he can only too easily be accused of incompetence:

Whereas today in material production the mechanism of supply and demand is disintegrating, in the superstructure it still operates as a check in the rulers' favor. The consumers are the workers and employees, the farmers and the lower middle class. Capitalist production so confines them, body and soul, that they fall helpless victims to what is offered them. As naturally as they ruled always took the morality imposed upon them more seriously than they did the rulers themselves, the deceived masses are today captivated by the myth of success even more than the successful are. (Adams 210)

Advertising is its elixir of life. But as its product never fails to reduce to a mere promise the enjoyment which it promises as a commodity, it eventually coincides with publicity, which it needs because it can not be enjoyed. In a competitive society, advertising performed the social service of informing the buyer about the market: it made choice easier and helped the unknown but more efficient supplier to dispose of his goods. Far from costing time, it saved it. Advertising today is negative principle, a blocking device: every thing that does not bear its stamp is economically suspect. Universal publicity is in no way necessary for people to get to know the kinds of goods-whose supply is restricted anyway. It helps sales only directly. For a particular firm, to phase out a current advertising practice constitutes a loss of prestige, and a breach of the discipline imposed by the influential clique on its members. In wartimes, goods which are unobtainable are still advertised, merely to keep to keep industrial power in view and, how people are treated in the name of culture and civilization:

The culture industry perpetually cheats its consumers of what it perpetually promises. The promissory note which, with its plots and staging, it draws on pleasure is endlessly prolonged; the promise, which is actually all the spectacle consists of, is illusory: all it actually conforms is that the real point will never be reached, that the diner must be satisfied with the menu. (Adams 213)

Adorno says how the mainstream culture is extracted from certain phenomenon and change the

perception of the people in *Literary Theory and Criticism*: Culture should promote diversity and innovation; instead, it becomes a commodity which has to be justified in markets term. The result is increasing standardization, rather than real innovation. Mass culture is therefore seen as just another part of the apparatus which makes people submit to the imperative of the economic system. (195) Hegel says Dialectical materialism is essentially characterized by the thesis that history is the product of class struggles and follows the general Hegelian principle of philosophy of history, that is the development of the thesis into its antithesis which is sublated by the "Aufhebung" (synthesis, a term not employed by Hegel in describing his dialectics- Walter, 1966). This conserves the thesis and the antithesis. Hegel's dialectics aims at explaining the growth and development of human history. He considered that truth was the product of history and passed through various moments, including the moment of error, as error, or also negativity, is part of the development of truth. Marx's dialectical materialism considers, against Hegel's idealism, that history is not the product of the spirit but the effect of material class struggle in society. Theory thus has its roots in the materiality of social existence.

Marx and Engels started with the observation that everything in existence is a unity of opposites. For example, electricity is characterized by a positive and negative charge and atoms consist of protons and electrons which are unified but are ultimately contradictory forces. Even humans through introspection find that they are a unity of opposite qualities; masculinity and femininity, selfishness and altruism, humbleness and pride, and so forth. The Marxist conclusion being that everything "contains two mutually incompatible and exclusive but nevertheless equally essential and indispensable parts or aspects" Walter (1966). The basic concept being that this unity of opposites in nature is the thing that makes each entity auto-dynamic and provides this constant motivation for movement and change. This idea was borrowed from Hegel who said: "Contradiction in nature is the root of all motion and of all life" (Walter 1966).

This dichotomy is often found in nature. A star is held together by gravity trying to push all the molecules to the center, and heat trying to send them as far from the center as possible. If either force is completely successful the star ceases to be, if heat is victorious it explodes into a

supernova, if gravity is victorious it implodes into a neutron star or a blackhole. Furthermore, living things strive to balance internal and external forces to maintain homeostasis, which is nothing more than a balance of opposing forces such as acidity and alkalinity. Homeostasis

Louis Althusser talks in his book *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus* (1970), reproduction of the means of production everyone (including the bourgeois economists whose work is national accounting, or the modern 'macro-economic' 'theoreticians') now recognizes, that no production is possible which does not allow for the reproduction of the material conditions of production: the reproduction of the means of production.

The average economist, who is not different in this than the average capitalist, knows that each year it is essential to foresee what is needed to replace what has been used up or worn out in production: raw material, fixed installations (buildings), instruments of production (machines), etc. The average capitalist, for they both express the point of view of the firm, regarding it as sufficient simply to give a commentary on the terms of the firm's financial accounting practice.

From the observation of what takes place in the firm, in particular from the examination of the financial accounting practice which predicts amortization and investment, we have been able to obtain an approximate idea of the existence of the material process of reproduction, but we are now entering a domain in which the observation of what happens in the firm is, if not totally blind, at least almost entirely so, and for good reason: the reproduction of labor power takes place essentially outside the firm. How is the reproduction of labor power ensured? It is ensured by giving labor power the material means with which to reproduce itself: by wages. Wages feature in the accounting of each enterprise, but as 'wage capital', not at all as a condition of the material reproduction of labor power.

However, it is not enough to ensure for labor power the material conditions of its reproduction if it is to be reproduced as labor power. The available labor power must be 'competent', i.e. suitable to be set to work in the complex system of the process of production. The development of the productive forces and the type of unity historically constitutive of the productive forces at a given moment produces. The result is that the labor power has to be (diversely) skilled and therefore reproduced as such. Diversely, according to the requirements of the socio-technical division of

labor, its different 'jobs' and 'posts'.

What do children learn at school? They go varying distances in their studies, but at any rate they learn to read, to write and to add i.e. a number of techniques, and a number of other things as well, including elements (which may be rudimentary or on the contrary thoroughgoing) of 'scientific' or 'literary culture', which are directly useful in the different jobs in production (one instruction for manual workers, another for technicians, a third for engineers, a final one for higher management, etc.). Thus they learn know-how.

But besides these techniques and knowledges, and in learning them, children at school also learn the 'rules' of good behavior, i.e. the attitude that should be observed by every agent in the division of labor, according to the job he is 'destined' for: rules of morality, civic and professional conscience, which actually means rules of respect for the socio-technical division of labor and ultimately the rules of the order established by class domination. They also learn to 'speak proper language', to 'handle' the workers correctly, i.e. actually (for the future capitalists and their servants) to 'order them about' properly, i.e. (ideally) to 'speak to them' in the right way, etc.

The state is thus first of all what the Marxist classics have called 'the state apparatus'. This term means: not only the specialized apparatus (in the narrow sense) whose existence and necessity to recognize in relation to the requirements of legal practice, i.e. the police, the courts, the prisons; but also the army, which (the proletariat has paid for this experience with its blood) intervenes directly as a supplementary repressive force in the last instance, when the police and its specialized auxiliary corps are 'outrun by events'; and above this ensemble, the head of State, the government and the administration.

The important point is, the state (and its existence in its apparatus) has no meaning except as a function of State power. The whole of the political class struggle revolves around the State. By which the possession is the seizure and conservation of State power by a certain class or by an alliance between classes or class fractions. This first clarification obliges to distinguish between State power (conservation of State power or seizure of State power), the objective of the political class struggle on the one hand, and the State Apparatus on the other.

To summarize the

‘Marxist theory of the state’ on this point, it can be said that the Marxist classics have always claimed that (1) the state is the repressive state apparatus, (2) state power and state apparatus must be distinguished, (3) the objective of the class struggle concerns state power, and in consequence the use of the state apparatus by the classes (or alliance of classes or of fractions of classes) holding state power as a function of their class objectives, and (4) the proletariat must seize state power in order to destroy the existing bourgeois state apparatus and, in a first phase, replace it with a quite different, proletarian, state apparatus, then in later phases set in motion a radical process, that of the destruction of the state (the end of state power, the end of every state apparatus).

Antonio Gramsci, Neo-Marxist, wrote in his *Prison Notebooks* under the surveillance of a fascist jailer and often felt compelled to disguise his real meaning. So Marxism is called ‘the philosophy of practice’, Lenin is referred to as ‘Ilyich’ and the revolutionary party as ‘the modern prince’ (after the ‘prince’ who Niccolò Machiavelli hoped would bring about a revolutionary unification of renaissance Italy). Yet again and again there are references in the notebooks whose revolutionary meaning is obvious to those with eyes to see.

The real progressive Marxist Gramsci says, "the revolutionary movement failed because it organized around immediate economic interests (which he called ‘corporatism’) without drawing in other oppressed and exploited groups in a fight for a new society" (Shafir, 1980). He refers to Lenin’s example.

The ideal of the social democrat should be a people’s tribune who can respond to each and every manifestation of abuse of power and oppression, wherever it occurs, whatever stratum or class it concerns, who can generalize all these manifestations into one big picture of police violence and capitalist exploitation, who is able to use each small affair to set before everybody his socialist convictions and his democratic demands and to explain to each and all the world-historical significance of the liberation struggle of the proletariat.

Gramsci’s concern is precisely how to carry through this task in a period which he does not see as immediately revolutionary. He also sees it as more difficult in the ‘west’ than it was in Russia, since, in his view, the ideological ties binding people to existing states are stronger than they were in Russia because of the

existence of dense networks of formal and informal organizations ('civil society'). These influence the lower classes but their leaderships are tied in one way or another into the structures of existing society and serve as a channel which feeds the ideologies into 'subaltern' [i.e. lower] classes.

The 'hegemonic' struggle is a double battle to free the working class from ideas that bind it to the existing exploitative order and to bind other 'subaltern' classes into a 'bloc' with the working class.

Gramsci takes the case of 'the man of the people' with certain ideas but who has not had the chance to develop his own 'intellectual formation' and finds himself out-argued by people who seems to know more than him. Should he change his views 'every time he meets an ideological adversary who is his intellectual superior' (Gramsci, 1975)? He will not do so, providing he knows there are people in the group whose views he shares who can win the argument. He remembers them putting forward the group's view in a way that proves it is superior to opposing views even 'even if the arguments in its favor cannot be readily produced' (Gramsci, 1975).

Clearly, the problem with any narrow view of the validation of ideas by practical activity is that it would seem to justify all sorts of views Gramsci would have regarded as false. Religion, for instance, could be held to be useful for people to whom it provided some sort of mental comfort, and therefore true. Or Mussolini could be held to be correct because he was successful and Gramsci himself wrong because he ended in prison. Gramsci rejects posing the validation of theory and practice in such a narrow limited sense. For him, what is in question is the historical development of humanity as a whole. Language and practical activity are inseparable from each other. Insofar as human beings take part in practical activity with one another they have to communicate with each other, to find verbal expressions that correspond to aspects of that activity. And every time new forms of practical activity arise (whether it is a question of new ways of making a livelihood, new struggles between social groups, or anything else), there emerge new linguistic expressions (reinterpretations of old ones) and, with them, new ways of conceptualizing reality.

A fundamental theoretical question is raised: can modern theory –Marxism, be in opposition to the 'spontaneous' feelings of the masses? ('Spontaneous' in the sense that they have been formed through everyday experience illuminated by 'common sense') It cannot be

in opposition to them. Between the two there is a 'quantitative' difference of degree, not one of quality. A reciprocal 'reduction' so to speak, a passage from one to the other and vice versa, must be possible.

Antonio Gramsci is considered to be an important figure in the field of cultural studies. He takes the ideology of Marx and applies its practice to his native Italy. Gramsci uses Marxian concepts of base/superstructure, these are really in the background of Gramsci's concerns, although certainly relevant. Yet Gramsci is often positioned in terms of Marx. However, Gramsci had his own way of defining culture, its attributes and disjunctions. More specifically, he employed a definition of culture that is independent, though not disassociated from, concepts of hegemony, class, and "sociology of knowledge." Gramsci is limited to English-language texts. So while scholars writing in other languages may have discussed Gramsci's definition of culture, "socio-political" nature, of culture rather than on culture itself.

General understanding of culture is the expression of people's attitudes and beliefs that come together to form a society of mutual reciprocity. The ideological state apparatus, as Althusser explains, depends on what the people want. One example is the case of the dividing line between rich and poor in the U.S. On one side is the argument that the people with the top percent of the wealth should promote better labor practices that do not exploit the poor. On the other side of the argument is the belief that mass production, which depends on the exploitation of labor, benefits the greater good (the majority), and therefore is justified.

However, Althusser would argue that it is because the U.S. promotes the rhetoric of mass consumption in its various forms that the question of whether it is fair or not to exploit the laborer is irrelevant. The will of the majority (the mass consumers) defines the rules of labor; labor becomes exploitative only when the ideology of mass consumption is replaced with something else. From a Marxist, and even Gramscian perspective, although the line between rich and poor is egregious, it is because the poor choose not to directly challenge the system because they buy into the ideology of mass consumption -- that a more equitable economic superstructure is not to be found.

So, the way capitalistic society silently makes people material and culture becomes as goods of pleasure can be clearly seen in the novel *Love* by Toni Morrison. The upcoming chapter will be an attempt study and analyze the novel with ideas and insights formed through the above discussion.

III. Materiality of love: A Textual Analysis of *Love*

In the world of commerce and capitalism, human beings are identified through their power of affording money and different essentialities. Human and other moral values are discarded, and are insignificantly overlooked. Morrison expresses the topic by literalizing love not merely as an emotion, not what one

purportedly feels towards another; rather, she portrays love as an act, leading to the question: how does one "do" love? (2) Morrison's repeated use of hands as a leitmotif in *Love* foregrounds the action of love, the materiality of love.

Heed, Bill Cosey, black rich man, daughter of preacher enters in the world of funny and holiday resorts where in only possessive has property. Bill Cosey, the former owner of Cosey's Hotel and Resort, was a wealthy and powerful man whose acts of love and violence, generosity and cruelty, structure the novel. As a free man, his love is never safe, and indeed he and his legacy ruin the lives of the women in his inner circle. Years after Cosey's death, the women are still obsessed with him, suggesting that death does not stop love but the purpose is to grab his property. It illustrates the effect of the changing economic structure and materialistic world of the then African-American culture; Heed is the one of the thousands of poor lady seeks the property during the post-war era.

One of the biggest changes in the American culture was overwhelming emphasis on 'making property' or the one seeking of money in such a way that one's love being a lover and beloved becomes immediate evident. The new approach of material world is castling love and pleasure, in social assistance and relation all other ideas form, including those of business and, of economy, morality etc. Materialism is a philosophy of the subject who forgets to take account of himself/herself. Everything is matter and object for materialistic people. In most of religion: Hinduism, Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, all mater is believed, to be an illusion called 'Maya' and 'love', binding us from knowing the truth. But it changes the mind of people according to time and necessity.

Morrison amplifies this argument in *Love* in which hands--their materiality, their work, and their transformation--bespeak characters. The twelve diamond rings--"two on three fingers of each hand" (20)--function as a synecdoche of Christine. Her hands, "bedizened" by the jewels, are mentioned throughout the novel:

Christine spread her fingers for the familiar jolt the diamonds gave her.

Then she assembled the rice, shrimp, the sauce, layering each meticulously, artfully in the casserole. It would remain warm while she tossed alight salad. Then she would arrange it all on a silver tray, take it up three of stairs, where she hoped it would choke the meanest thing in the coast. (24)

The rings "snatched light from the ceiling fixture and seemed to elevate her task from drudgery to sorcery" (20). Diamonds have long been thought to hold special properties, these icons of sentiment have, in addition to their role in courtship and marriage, epitomized the ideals of royalty and nobility and were even thought to prevent poisoning. Christine claimed the diamond rings won by her grandfather in a poker game, ostensibly to place on Cosey's hands in the coffin. On the surface, decorating Cosey's hands for the afterworld is a loving gesture, but pairing death with diamond engagement rings, imprinted with "other women's hopes" (74) suggests the subterfuge of sentimental love. The rings, themselves a commodification of women's dreams, romanticize heterosexual relationships, which, as Cosey's poker game unmasks, are easily bargained--bought, won, and lost--by men. Christine's bold assumption of the rings is a commentary on Bill Cosey, whose sins of the past were obscured by the dazzling opulence of his resort and his wealth. In this way, the diamonds, representative of Cosey's assets, are a small part of his inheritance, for which both Christine and Heed vie. Christine's bold assumption of the diamonds makes visible her claim to Cosey's property.

Christine examines the damaging impact of Heed upon so-called her prestigious identity. Even as the dirty business of class prejudice in telling the stories of the Heed and Christine, she also is bent on affecting a cultural cure.

Heed and Christine, against a board history of the black experience in twentieth century America in her account of Cosey's Hotel, which thrives as an elegant and fashionable East Coast playground for wealthy blacks in the segregationist 1940s; is in decline by the integrationist 1960s; and, by the 1990s, is an abandoned ruin haunted by the Cosey's former cook, L. Examining the exclusionary politics of class in the African-American community, Morrison depicts Heed, Bill Cosey's widow, and Christine, his granddaughter, as a mortal class enemies.

Even as Morrison, in telling the story, the story of Bill Cosey, exposes of power and the money of the black patriarchy, she also works to subvert it, in part, though her ghostly narrator, L, who functions as a witnesses of someone with judgment. L's hum, which is, mostly below range, comes the story of wild women who "never could hide their innocence-a kind of pitty-kitty hopefulness that their prince was on his way" (4) and the story that reveals "how brazen women can take a good man down"(10). This shows the property seeking attitude of brazen women in

the name of love. Christine is all about money seeker, the dialogue between her and Junior pointed as:

"Can I have one?"

"Buy your own. You get paid. I don't.

"Suppose I

can't afford it, Christine.

"You can afford that metal in

your nose, you can afford cigarettes."

"Well, I don't smoke anyway. Stinks." (130)

This discussion shows how greedy she is. Christine denies the relation between her and Junior. In the mind of Christine, there is nothing apart from money. Smoking cigarettes shows the wildness and modernity to impress guys, so guys should share the bed and she can earn more of what she needs.

Indeed, story of the novel is all about Bill Cosey and his family, Bill Cosey possesses, the power of money works, "commanding beautiful man, a dollar man"(43), money minded person he is. Whatever he does should follow by other or his acting is dominance: "Rich people could act like sharks"(45), intention of this: is to prove Cosey as a dollar man rather than entrepreneur. Instead of this Morrison could use other terminology to show Cosey as a rich man. Indeed, novelist shows the materialistic mind of the prominent character. In the Hotel, Cosey deliberately facilitates by professional prostitutes, so raunchy guys come to have clown relax: "People with no imagination feed it, with sex- the clown of love"(63). The only purpose of the hotel is to earn more money, no matter what kind of activities are done. It clearly shows swagger capitalism makes people a matter rather than spiritual. Cosey adores everybody in terms of matter and money:

Mr. Cosey knew her too, although if you asked him

he would deny it. Not

to me, though. Mr. Cosey never lied to me. No point in it. I knew his first

wife better than he did. I knew he adored her and I knew what she began

to

think of him after she found out where his money came from. Contrary

to the tale he put in

the street, the father he bragged about had earned his

way as a court-house informer. (67)

How the other person, here L is a symbol of all people, knew Cosey's wife than himself: it astoundingly shows the purpose of marrying her is to capture the parental property of his father-in-law.

Heed's hands, deformed, useless,

burned, and arthritic, map the pain of the Cosey women's lives. As Cosey's child bride--her impoverished family was happy to make the deal--Heed was thrust into adulthood, had no access to education, lost her best friend, suffered the humiliation of Cosey's affairs, and was broken-hearted that a man, for whom she intended to leave Cosey, did not share her affection. Heed's hands, "small, baby-smooth except for one scarred spot, each one curved gently away from its partner like fins" (28), are a testament to her disempowerment. These "fins" are alternately described as "wings" (99) that "fold" (141). While Heed's marriage to Cosey brought financial and socio-political gain, the uselessness of her hands, which are described through animal imagery, disclose her powerlessness.

The exercising of power is further illustrated through the hands of a teenaged boy, Romen. The reader is introduced to Romen through his act of compassion towards a girl:

He thought her name was Faye or faith and was about to say something suddenly he couldn't stand the sight of her. If she thanked him, he would

strangle her. Fortunately, she didn't say a word. Eyes frozen wide, she put on her shoes and straightened her skirt. Both of their coats, his new leather jacket and whatever she had worn, were inside the house. (47)

The teenaged Romen, with six other boys, is involved in a gang rape of a young girl named Faye, yet he refuses to take his turn with this girl, shunning the brutal display of hyper sexuality and machismo. Morrison uses Faye's hands, which are curved down from the snow white shoelaces that bound them to epitomize her helplessness. Romen, intending to strengthen his phallocentric bonds, steps up to the bed, yet "watched in wonder as his hands moved to the headboard. The knot binding her right wrist came undone as soon as he touched it and her hand fell over the bedside.

In the bank of the hotel, everybody wishes to be a naughty, "Go away now. This is private"(78). The private, in the plot of novel, they come on conclusion how much money to expend to share the bed. The preeminent manifestation of love, or its absence, is Cosey's composition of his last will and testament. Cosey's will, at the center of the legal and personal battle between Christine and Heed, leaves all his possessions to his 'sweet Cosey child.' Each woman believes the reference is to herself: Christine is, after all, the remaining blood relative to Bill Cosey, and Heed, who called her husband 'Papa,' claims that the term is her husband's endearment. Here, the will, scribbled on L's

menu, is an example of the word made material, as it inaugurates action, the transference of property and goods. Beyond receiving Cosey's wealth, each woman vies to hold the position of Bill Cosey's sweet child: The process of will making operated in a context in which the transfer of property was interpreted as a communicative event: the giving of gifts made statements about past, present, and future relationships and was, therefore, implicated in the reproduction of relationships beyond the grave. The vast

number of diamond rings on Christine's fingers takes on greater meaning as they function as multiple inscriptions of the self, registering a personal, legal, and aristocratic presentation. L's menu did indeed suture the Cosey women's lives. Sworn enemies nurtured and cared for one another until the time of their deaths. Heed, though verbally abused and taunted by May (Cosey's daughter-in-law), physically tends to her:

I sat at the foot of May's bed or on top of her dresser sometimes and watched Heed soap her bottom, mash badly cooked food to just the right consistency. She cut May's toenails and wiped white flakes from her eyelids. The girl May lived to mistreat was the one she depended on to hold her head over the slop jar. Nagging her every second, but doing it: airing, cleaning, spooning, rubbing, turning her over to the cooler side of the bed on nights hot enough to make you cry. (140) Not only does Heed tend to May, but Christine does likewise for Heed, whose arthritis incapacitates her from performing daily tasks. Christine cooks and serves Heed's food each day, although grudgingly. It is while the women are living together that each hatches a plan for claiming Cosey's inheritance--Christine hires a lawyer, and the semi-illiterate Heed, whose "grasp of handwriting skills was limited," pays an assistant, Junior, to forge a second will, printed on another of L's menus stored in Cosey's Resort and Hotel. This will was to identify herself, without question, as the sweet Cosey child. It is fitting that Heed's trip to this memorial site would end with her death, a noteworthy confluence of handwriting, love, and death. This time, it is Christine and Heed, former best friends, who must confront the ghosts of their pasts, their love and its continuation after death. All the dramatic imitations done by Christine and May is to capture the property from Heed.

May perceives her to be a distinguishing and dirty, and potentially contaminating object.

To May, Heed is "a butterfly let in through the door, already buzzing at the food table and, if it settled on Christine bound to swear her with the garbage it was born in"(139).

Cosey marries Heed, May is horrified. Viewing Heed's family through the lens of class prejudice, May condemns them as a people whom:

Shiftlessness was not a habit, it was a trait; ignorance was destiny; dirt lingered on by choice....the Johnson were not just poor and trifling, their girls were thought to be mighty quick in the skirt-raising department. So what must have attracted Mr. Cosey to Heed in the first place could infect her own daughter. (138-139)

Here Morrison emphasizes, in the character of Christine's mother, the shaping and the deforming influence of deeply entrenched middle-class prejudices against lower class black as neo-Marxists say people are discriminated in the dipper level within same status. Conflict arise in the top level between Christine and Heed, Christine consults to lawyer how could she able to achieve the property; "May was hopeless, the place filthy, Heed's arthritis was disabling her hands, and because nobody in the town could stand them"(86).Their, May and Christine, intention is to take house will not be fulfilled so they are always discussed about the parental property.

Christine knows that years are going, Indeed, she will become adult no men will not come to share their passion. So she wants to earn in the thundering age:

Maple Valley, Cosey's Hotel, Manila's whorehouse- all three floated in sexual tension and resentment; all three insisted on confinement; in all three status was money. And all were organized around the pressing needs of men. Christine's second escape initiated by a home life turned dangerous, was fed by a dream of privacy, of independence. (92) Not only

Christine most of the women need money through any work. It shows the money and property seeking tendency of the then African-American society and how the people were commodified/ materialized in the name of civilized attitude.

We can carry through the dialogue of Christine; Morrison is forcefully able to make 11 years old Heed's intention of marrying with her grandpa was to take the property. "One day we played jacks; the next she was fucking my grandfather. One day this house was mine; next day she owned it"(132). The

deliberate use of word 'owned' means Morrison wants to justify the little lady, Heed, seeks the property of Cosey; doing intercourse with Cosey in the pre-menstruation age.

Morrison's *love* represents the effects of trauma as a temporal disorder. The traumatic rupture of Heed's childhood with the friendship of Christine which followed upon her premature marriage to be Christine's grandfather disabled both girls' ability to respond appropriately to the offerings of time: like Freud's Emma, they always come too early or too late to life's events. The paradigmatic scene of temporal incongruity in *Love*--the prototype for all succeeding moments of temporal misfit--is the picture of Heed's honeymoon:

Every day for three days they shopped, [her husband] letting her buy anything she wanted, including Parisian Night lipstick....high-heeled shoes, ... and fishnet hose. Only in the evening was she alone, for a few hours while he visited friends, tended to business. None of which Heed minded, because she had coloring books, picture magazines, paper dolls to cut out and clothe. (128)

This scene comes as a shock to the reader, indeed, all that a romantic marriage could be. The conflation of honeymoon with paper dolls and coloring books emphasizes the temporal contradiction condensed in the figure of child-bride.

On one hand, Cosey is male prostitute; this is the unspoken identity by all characters, on the other he acts as a husband of Heed, 11 years old lass, biologically which is fakery.

It is the forced entry into patriarchy and premature sexuality that put them off course, that made their attention swerve from the thing that mattered (their friendship) to the only thing that seemed to matter--what the man wanted. But now, recentered in their friendship, reflecting on the past from the regained perspective of the pre-heterosexual world, they can see the enormity of Bill Cosey's actions and name them, accurately, as a crime as a theft of childhood, and more: "He took all my childhood away from me, girl," (194) Heed says.

Yet the reconciliation of the women raises questions about the deferred actions of the plot. First, why is the understanding of the original situation deferred for fifty years? My answer would be that once the premature marriage thrust both little girls into the world of patriarchal heterosexuality, they became locked into a system of meaning that robbed girlfriend love of value and made the only love that signifies the love of a man.

According to this world view, the man is the central figure of importance, and the woman's task is to capture his favor, or his support, or, in the romance plot, his love. While Bill Cosey was alive, all the women, May (Christine's mother), Christine, and Heed--revolved endlessly around the enigma of the man's desire, each claiming the place of the beloved:

Each had been displaced by another; each had a unique claim on Cosey's affection; each had either 'saved' him from some disaster or relieved him of an impending one. The only difference about this preburial quarrel was L, whose normal silence seemed glacial than because there was no expression on her face, no listening, no empathy-nothing. (98) The singular "each," "each," "each" sketches the isolation of each woman estranged from the others by their competition for the only subject of importance, the man. And a question inevitably arises, Bill Cosey died twenty-five years before the present moment, and the women have been living together in the Cosey house for some twenty years: why did they not rediscover each other and renew their childhood love before? Counting only the twenty years they have been living together under one roof. Morrison expands the time frame to make a point, to illustrate the force of patriarchal discourse: after Cosey's death, Heed and Christine remain preoccupied with the signifiers of capitalist patriarchy, with the terms that the Law of the Father endows with meaning: inheritance, property, legitimacy. Repeatedly, Heed and Christine identify their positions within a patriarchal domestic order--Heed insisting redundantly that she is Bill Cosey's lawful wedded wife and Christine going to law to establish, again redundantly, that she is "the last, the only, blood relative of William Cosey" and hence the 'sweet Cosey child' his will designates as heir (95). (L's disclosure at the end of *Love* that the will is a fake emphasizes the futility of their lifelong obsession.)

Within the patriarchal order, Christine and Heed can see each other only as rivals--first for the man's favor, then for the man's estate. It is only from a retrospective vantage-point in a changed frame of reference that Heed and Christine can perceive the real relations of power that prevented their living full lives. The text's disjunctive temporal schema exaggerates the schism. Cosey has achieved financial success in a world that systemically deprives black men of the patriarchal position.

IV Conclusion

Morrison's *Love* talks about the post-war African-American tendency to step in the commodification of human. Heed, along with all characters is obsessed with material possession. It is human nature that one wishes for what one has not got. Being from the rural society as well as the poor family, it is natural for all characters to dream possessing the great amount of property which could help them to fulfill materialistic desires. No doubt, Cosey, Heed and Christine are committed in doing anything for the sake of their ambition. Mr. Cosey

operates Hotel and Resort where matter determines everything. Morally, consciousness and other elements are subsidiary and money is prioritized everywhere. In fact, one should have either raunchy beauty or money in the materialistic society to survive. Regarding beauty, Cosey makes women as commodity in his hotel by selling the body of poor women to earn for their survival. Relation and adoration between Cosey and his first wife is property oriented. All property of Cosey came from his dead wife's family. So Cosey is of selfish nature constantly influenced by materialistic thoughts and action. As it is stated, naturalism can seek its value only within the periphery of human features and experiences. Feelings and impression of Cosey has attempted to all living characters in the name of social and material beings in the context of immoral, self centered, money minded characters and experiences.

May and Christine are made property-less people although they are living in the Cosey's house where Heed, daughter-in-law and granddaughter respectively, hold all property of Cosey. They represent the materialistic world. When plot moves ahead, Heed represents as a conscientious character.

The ambition of the Cosey is to earn more money. Christine, sensual and mysterious goes, on alerting her sexual relation with different male to earn money. She really seems to have ignored all morals and customs as boundaries established against the human society. In Heed's mind, wishes to kick out Christine from the house and doesn't ready to share parental property to step granddaughter and daughter-in-law. This is the rude way of tackling the situation keeping her status safe and secure.

Love is mirrored by a sadomasochistic affair between local boy, Romen, and a tough reform-school girl, Junior, who both work for Heed. In "Father" the section mainly devoted to Christine past, Morrison condenses material that would easily provide a dozen novels for another writer.

The deepest love story in the novel is between Christine and Heed, who met as little girls on the beach, and formed a pre-sexual bond cruelly destroyed when Cosey, 45, decided to take the 11 year old heed as his child bride. More or less sold to the old man by her shiftless parents, the illiterate Heed learns be a lady and to fight with Christine for primacy of power in the Cosey family; as adults their childhood roles are reversed, with Heed the heiress and Christine her servant. Their relationship is almost gothic in its ferocity and passion.

Cosey's the best and best known vacation spot for colored folk on the East Coast- a hotel flourished as African-American got right in the every aspect from the state, later, hotel's denouncement as non-white abasement within.

The lesson for non-white is as compared with how Romen's relationship with his grandfather, Sandler especially, reflects the importance of intra-class/race management, plays a significant role in his development in to strong human. Indeed, Morrison wishes for blacks, within, as Romen becomes an example of goodness from his clown and rude behavior, that can evolve when people take times and identity rationally themselves. Apart from L, by presenting characters with materialistic obsession Morrison emphasizes the prevailing condition of the then existing society of America Materialistic pretending love.

Works Cited

- Adams, Hazard, and Searle, Leroy. *Critical Theory since 1965*. Florida State: Florida University Press, 1985
- Awkward, Michael. *'Unruly and Let Loose': Myth, Ideology, and Gender in Song of Solomon*. Callaloo, 1990
- Althusser, Louis. *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1970
- Forgacs, David. *Marxist Literary Theory, Modern Literary Theory*. Ed. Ann Jefferson and David Robey, London: Bast Ford Ltd, 1986
- Gibson, Donald B. *Text and Counter Text in The Bluest Eye*. New York: Gates Press, 1984
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Prison Notebooks 2 Vols*, 2nd ed. New York and Oxford: Columbia, 1975
- High, Peter B. *An Outline of American Literature*. New York: Longman, 1986
- Marx, Karl. *The Communist Manifesto, Creation of Knowledge*. Eds. SPL, RPA and ANS. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar, 1996
- The German Ideology: Critical Theories since Plato*. New York: HBB College, Publishers, 1992. 624-26

- McCarthy, Jonne. *Love Magill's Literary Annual*. New York: Longman, 2004
- Mobley, Marilyn Sanders. *Narrative Dilemma: Jadine as Cultural Orphan in Tar Baby*. New York: Gates Press, 1985
- Morrison, Toni. *The Art of Fiction*. Interview with Elissa Schappell and Claudia Brodsky Lacour. *Paris Review* 35.128 (1993). (83-125)
- - -. *Beloved*. New York: Plume, 1987
- - -. *The Bluest Eye*. 1970. New York: Plume, 1993
- - -. *Jazz*. New York: Plume, 1992
- - -. *Love*. New York: Knopf, 2003
- - -. *The Nobel Lecture in Literature*, 1993. New York: Knopf, 2000
- - -. *Song of Solomon*. New York: Knopf, 1977
- - -. *Star Power. Interview with Adam Langer Book*. November/December 2003 (40-46)
- - -. *Sula*. New York: Knopf, 1973
- Rubenstein, Roberta. *Home Matters: Longing and Belonging, Nostalgia and Mourning in Women's Fiction*. New York: Palgrave, 2001
- Shafir, Gershon. "Intellectual and the Popular Masses": *An Historical and Sociological Study of Antonio Gramsci's 'Prison Notebooks'*. California: Berkeley Press, 1980
- Smith, Valerie. *Song of Solomon: Continuities of Community*. New York: Gates Press, 2003
- Stewart, Jon. *Introduction: The Hegel Myths and Legends*. New York: North-Western University Press. 1996
- Tong, Rosemarie. *Feminist Thought*. New York: Boulder Press, 1989
- Willis, Susan. *Specifying: Black Women Writing the American Experience*. Madison: Univ. Of Wisconsin Press, 1987
- Walter, Kaufmann. *Hegel: A Reinterpretation*. London: Anchor Books, 1996
- Waugh, Patricia (Edited By). *Literary Theory and Criticism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006

