

I. Introduction

Eugene O'Neill, an American leading dramatist was born in Broadway hotel of New York City on October 16, 1888. He was the son of James O'Neill, a popular actor of romantic melodrama, and he spent his boyhood partly with his father on tour and partly in various boarding schools. As a result of prank, he was suspended from Princeton at the end of his freshmen year. He works briefly in a mail order house, and so on possibly influenced by Jack London. Joseph Conrad and Rudyard Kipling, as well as by his own rebellious spirit, he left in 1909 for a gold prospecting voyage in Honduras. Another voyage took him as ordinary seaman to Buenos Aires, where he worked at odd jobs for a time returning to play a small part in one of his father's production in New York and worked for about a year as reporter and columnist an a newspaper called New London. In 1912 an attack of tuberculosis sent him for five months to a sanitarium and it seems reasonable to suppose that the enforced idleness there brought him face to face with the self from which he had been trying to run away. He read Karl Marx, August Strindberg, and Ibsen, and during the year of convalescence following his release from the sanitarium, he wrote his first one act plays.

O'Neill as a modern dramatist has shown society shorn of the distinction between noble and peasant it is possible for audiences to see the greatness in all classes of people. The dramatic pattern is formed with the clash of the opposite forces. The plot of the dramas moves from inaction to action and again to inaction, either in the land and the sea, the characters are affected directly or indirectly by the sea. The dramatist has taken the language of the play from the lips of living men, explores the inner self of the characters.

An important aspect of O'Neill technique is his conscious and studied use of symbolism, it is done with care and designed to extend the scope and meaning of the play beyond the limited boundary of straightforward realism. The use of fog as a symbolic of a state of mind is rather trite, but serves to indicate that impatient and passionate quality of O'Neill's imagination which has made it possible for him to push his play out beyond the limitation of the boards on which it is acted.

From 1920 to 1935 he was the most provocative and widely publicized of American playwrights, but has so persistently avoided the limelight that he has become almost a legendary figure. Critical opinion of O'Neill's work is as varied in nature as is the work itself. He began with one act plays of the sea and sea faring people. *In Ile* (1917), *The Long Voyage Home* (1917), *Bound East for Cardiff* (1916), and *The Moon of the Caribbees* (1918)- excellent brief plays – he drew directly upon the experiences and acquaintances of his wander years to good effect, bringing a distinct note of naturalism into American drama. *Beyond the Horizon* (1920), which won the Pulitzer Prize, although somewhat mechanical in structure and unnecessary morose is perhaps his most nearly moving tragedy, a relentless story of frustrations and defeat. *The Emperor Jones* (1920) is a powerful and original expressionistic drama of terror, in which the mounting fear is added by the effective, if theatrical, use of the tom-tom off stage.

In *Anna Christie* (1921), which also won the Pulitzer Prize in 1922, there is something elemental and broadly primitive as there had been in O'Neill's own life after he left college. It also depicts how the sailors are lured, deceived, and tamed throughout their lives by the nature the sea. *The Hairy Ape* (1922), marks a further venture in

expressionism: it is the tragedy of the proletariat- a man who has lost his harmony with nature and not yet found harmony in his sole. *All God's Chillu Got Wings* (1923), deals with the hopeless marriage of a Negro and a white girl. *Desire Under the Elms* (1924) is bleak and sordid, without the universal significance of great tragedy. *The Great GOD Brown* (1926), which has been called the most profound and silliest American play, is notable for marks to show the dual nature of its character, but its obtrusive symbolism and its vagueness result often in confusion and mere pretentiousness. Even more baffling is *Lazarus Laughed* (1927). His most imaginative and poetic drama, dealing with Lazarus after his return from the grave. *Marco Millions* (1928), is a Freudian melodrama in nine acts which tries to utilize the sweep of the novel for the stage and which employs a fresh use of the soliloquy and the aside. Its great length and technical innovations are striking, but he play has no particular significance. A more important play is *Strange Interlude* (1928), a psychological study of neurotic woman deprived of her lover. *Mourning Becomes Electra* (1931). A trilogy, modernizes the story of Agamemnon and Electra in a somewhat violently melodramatic manner. *Ah, Wilderness* (1933) is a gently nostalgic yet ironic comedy which critics, probably unjustly, dismissed as unimportant because it is merely intelligible and highly entertaining- lacking those fierce and morose qualities which they feel earmark great drama. *Days Without End* (1934 and *Dynamo* (1929), are also interesting, though failures commercially and perhaps artistically.

Since 1933 O'Neill had completed two tragedies and it is said to be far advanced in the composition of a cycle of seven plays. In 1936, he was awarded the Noble Prize in literature. By his own desire, no productions were under taken and none of the texts were published until the autumn of 1946 when *The Iceman Cometh* was presented by the

Theatre Guild. The play is a vivid but very long portrait of social misfits and outcasts. His next plays are, *A Moon for the Misbegotten* (1957) and *A Touch of the Poet* (1959) both part of long sequence of drama upon which he was at work during his last years. *Long Day's Journey into Night* (1956), one of the plays produced on Broadway after his death, is a deeply impressive autobiographical play in which the members of the playwrights family are thinly disguised as the chief characters.

O'Neill, considered by Edmund Wilson in *The Shores of Light* (1952) "is the greatest American dramatist and by a few the foremost men of letters since Mark Twain and is the first American playwright to gain a truly international reputation" (99).

Anna Christie has been analyzed from various perspectives by various critics. The drama has been interpreted from various angles, yet it can be still viewed from an angle which brings the 'sea' with a special meaning. The people in these plays are simply victims. There are some critics like; Miss Ellis Fermor, who claimed that, "The sea is the only character in the play is very important *Anna Christie* suffers the evil of the sea indirectly since she doesn't live on the sea but Chris suffers the evil of the sea directly as he involves in the battle himself while living in the sea" (169).

Regarding the painful life of Chris in *Anna Christie* a psychologist Lionel Trilling remarks:

Anna Christie is symbolic of the darkness of man's ultimate fate. But critic Paul M. Cuddeback doesn't agree to call *Anna Christie* a drama of fate rather it is a drama of man's own conduct. He quotes *Anna Christie*

enviously raises the issue of man's moral responsibility for his own conduct. (255)

Another critic Shiley, T. Joseph remarks that the sea is the only cause of almost every problem in *Anna Christie*. He quotes:

Anna Christie speaks vividly and powerfully of the sea and the sea's influence upon three quite different persons. Like the sea, from which it springs, it is turbulent, it is sunny, with sudden storms: and within the 'very ordinary little drab', Anna, we can feel what is within most ordinary folk, the urge of a dream toward the fine self. (459)

The simple and ordinary backdrop given to the plays makes brilliant to present the realistic picture of human world; it also symbolizes the hardships of the human world. The struggle of the characters in the plays symbolizes the indomitable nature of human beings.

Observing Eugene O'Neill, Joseph Wood Krutch in his introduction to nine plays by Eugene O'Neill (1950) writes, "O'Neill is almost alone among modern dramatic writers in processing what appears to be an instinctive perception of what a modern tragedy would have to be" (xxii). His plays are almost cynically modern in their acceptance of a rationalistic view of a man and universe. Yet, he has created his characters upon such a large scale that their downfall is not merely pathetic, but terrible. The family name suggests correctly his Celtic ancestry, which in part accounts for the high strain of mysticism and poetry at times transfiguring his naturalism. One can find realism, expressionism, and the effect of August Strindberg in most of his plays. O'Neill, nevertheless, remains all but unique in his persistent and increasingly more nearly

exclusive attempt to deal with modern life in such a way as to achieve the effect of classic tragedy. In pursuit of that aim he has more and completely avoided the criticism of current social or political conditions or the characteristic feature of contemporary manners. Certainly no other significant playwright has so persisted in the conviction that, if a drama is to achieve great excellence, it must deal with man's relation to god-or, one prefers, with his relation to forces outside himself.

Perhaps the understanding of O'Neill's tragedy is that he suffered from lifelong feeling of guilt, born apparently of the fact his mother, a shy, devout catholic, innocently became a drug addict as a result of his birth. Recalling how wretched he felt on learning of her addiction to morphine and of role in her downfall, he says through his counterpart in *Long Day's Journey into Night*: 'God, it made everything in life seem rotten!' (77). Turning against his ancestral faith, the apostate began to question all orthodoxies, all authority. In regard of his feeling of tragedy, Martin Banham writes:

Despite his familiarity with the ancient Greeks and Shakespeare, his sense of tragedy grew from his own life, not from the classics. He was an emotional hemophilic whose family –inflicted wounds never healed. Here, then, we find the original of his somber outlook on life, the major source of the power and anguish pounding through his writings.(Banham 820)

After an unimpressive record at catholic and secular schools, he sought the lower depths in an attempt to experience real life. He went to sea, drifted on the water fronts of Buenos Aires and New York, and once became so depressed that he attempted suicide. O' Neill never thought of becoming a writer till his health broke down in his mid-20s, confining

him to a tuberculosis sanitarium for months. While recuperating, he really thought, about his life for the time and resolved to become a playwright. After his recovery in 1913, plays began to pour out of him. Most of them tell of the sea and the underside of life; what, in other words, had seemed misspent years, proved to be a major part of working capital as a playwright of tragedy.

Eugene O' Neill, "as a mystic, believed that the real important truths can only be conveyed symbolically and grasped emotionally. The only part of his original inspiration that O'Neill kept for beyond the Horizon was the idea of the hopeless hope" (qtd. in Alexander 261), which, even though unachieved, is in itself a victory. This idea represented his entire philosophy of life and tragedy. In an interview with Doris Alexander, O'Neill explains his philosophy:

Well I suppose it is the idea I try to put into all my plays. People talk of the 'tragedy' in them, and call it 'sordid', 'depressing', 'pessimistic-the words usually applied to anything of a tragic nature. But tragedy, I think has the meaning the Greeks gave it. To them, it brought exaltation, an urge toward life and even more life. It roused them to deeper spiritual understandings released them from the petty greed of everyday existence, When they saw a tragedy on the stage they felt their own hopeless hopes ennobled in arts. (qtd. in Alexander 261)

In *Anna Christie*, this hopeless hope is more found in the speech and life of Chris. O'Neill believes that any victory we may win is never the one we dreamed of winning. The point is that life itself is nothing. It is the dream that keeps us fighting. Achievement, in the narrow sense of possession, is a stale finale. The dreams that can be completely

recognized are not worth dreaming. The higher the dream more impossible it is to realize it fully. A man wills his own defeat when he pursues the unattainable. But his struggle is his success. He is an example of spiritual significance which life attains when it aims high enough, when the individual fights all the hostile forces within and without himself to a future of nobler values. O'Neill has learned this philosophy of life from Nietzsche. Doris Alexander remembers when O'Neill would cry about tragic life and he writes, "Life is a tragedy, hurrah!"(262). The very tragedy of life, he thought, was the means of by which man attained his personal greatness-in the striving the dreaming, the struggle itself.

O'Neill in the childhood knew only actors and stage and his mother nursed him in the wings and dressing rooms. His tragedy was begun from then because he, most of time, was away from his parents' love and concern. They had almost no time for him. Lacking everything from his parents for his future is the main reason that he was involved in voyage and prostitution in different seaports. Sophus Keith Winther has very much similar to say about his tragic life, "His tragedy, if it has universal appeal, must deal with the fall of man from prosperity to adversity in a manner that is shocking and causes that lie within man himself in relation to the outward forces of this world. He is brought to the disasters by forces that are stronger than he is" (298).

As a whole, The above –mentioned attitude toward man has been apparent in O'Neill's plays from last .The man and woman of his world are victims of cosmic trap, cold and impersonal as steel. They are forced to great depression, economic deprivation and social problems. M. H. Abrams defines tragedy as, "The terms broadly applied to

literary, and especially to dramatic representation of serious and important actions which eventuate in a disastrous conclusion for the protagonist, or chief character” (212). Most of his characters go on struggling till their death key take birth in misery and die in poverty. They try to uplift their way of living and see pipedreams but they could never meet their aim. They are always defeated in the battle of their life.

II. Marxist Feminism

The term “feminist” first came into use in English during the 1880s, indicating support for women’s equal legal and political rights with men. It refers to any theory that sees the relationship between the sexes as one of inequality, subordination, or oppression that sees this as a problem of political power rather than a fact of nature and that sees this problem as important for political theory and practice.

Regarding the definition of the term Feminism, *Encyclopedia Britannica VIII* refers:

Feminism as social movement seeks equal rights for women. Widespread concern for women’s right dates from the Enlightenment; its first important expression was Mary Wollstonecraft’s *A Vindication of the Rights of Women*, (1792). [. . .] called for full legal equality with men, including full educational opportunity and equal compensation; there after the women suffrage movement began to gather momentum. From Africa the movement spread to Europe. American women gained the right to vote by constitutional amendment in 1920, but their participation in the workplace remained limited, and prevailing notions tended to confine women to the home. (226)

Marxist feminism is a sub-type of feminist theory which focuses on the dismantling of capitalism as a way to liberate women. Marxist feminism states that private property, which gives rise to economic inequality, dependence, political confusion and ultimately unhealthy social relations between men and women, is the root of women's oppression in the current social context.

According to Marxist theory, the individual is heavily influenced by the structure of society, which in all modern societies means a class structure; that is, people's opportunities, wants and interests are seen to be shaped by the mode of production that characterizes the society they inhabit. Marxist feminists see contemporary gender inequality as determined ultimately by the capitalist mode of production. Gender oppression is class oppression and women's subordination is seen as a form of class oppression which is maintained (like racism) because it serves the interests of capital and the ruling class. Marxist feminists have extended traditional Marxist analysis by looking at domestic labour as well as wage work in order to support their position.

Radical Women, a major Marxist-feminist organization, bases its theory on Marx' and Engels' analysis that the enslavement of women was the first building block of an economic system based on private property. They contend that elimination of the capitalist profit-driven economy will remove the motivation for sexism, racism, homophobia and other forms of oppression.

Marxist feminism is a sub type of feminism which sees the oppression of women and seeks its resolution from Marxist point of view. Marxism can be used to help us understand “How economic forces have been manipulated by patriarchal law and customs to keep women economically, politically and socially oppressed as an underclass” (Tyson 93). Marxism which is used to understand the feminist issues, economic, political and social, is Marxist feminism. Thus, one of the primary task of Marxist feminism “is to create the kind of world in which women will experience themselves as whole persons, as integrate rather than fragmented or splintered beings”(Tong 45). Gender inequality is production of capitalism and determined by capitalistic mode of production.

In capitalistic system relationship between employer and employee is similar to the and its owner. Capitalist has everything but proletariats have nothing except their labor. This is the wedge for their emancipation. When proletariats come to know that they are exploited, they are not getting proper wage they try to find out where and how they are exploited. Then they revolt against the exploitation imposed upon them. The class consciousness inspires them to revolt against every kind of injustice. They revolt freely because they have nothing to loose but bourgeoisie have everything to loose. Then they establish classless society which is a society of every people. In such society women also get equal chances. Then hierarchy less society emerges. That is the result of class consciousness.

But capitalists, also represent patriarchy, exercise to create false consciousness to establish their empire. They try to hide all kinds of discrimination and injustice. For Marxist feminist gender oppression is class oppression and women's subordination is seen as a form of class oppression. It believes that women's situation in the society cannot be understood in isolation from its socio-economic context. As the Marxists see the alienation of labor from work, self, human beings and nature women are also alienated from sex, self, children and from whole surroundings. In capitalism labor is treated as a commodity which can be sold and bought. Capitalism intensifies alienation and generalizes it throughout all level of society. The end of alienation requires communism. So, in the society the end of patriarchal domination requires communism. As the class less society emerges the class discrimination and gender discrimination will be diminished. Because when the classless society is established, all people become equal

and property will be distributed equally to everybody. Then only in such society women get their proper place and equality. In this context, K. K. Ruthven writes:

Marxism identifies capitalism (and the modes of production which support it) as a material base of a class system which is source of all oppression, and holds that the specific subject of women will end necessarily in that general dismissal of oppression which is to follow the destruction of capitalism. (28)

Women are mostly confined in household activities and they are not allowed to go out and work because their strength, skill, ability are take inferior to the males in fact which not real but general assumption. Women are doing household activities without any payment. Their work plays vital role in outside work but they don't get any credit. In fact women enter the productive and important work before than the males of society because they pave the way for outward activities and make base for industry. This is why Tong says:

No women have to enter the productive workforce, for all women are already in it, even if no one recognizes the fact. Women's work is the necessary conditions for all other labor from which, in turn surplus value is extracted. By providing current (and future) workers not only with food and clothes but also with emotional and domestic comfort, women keep the cogs of capitalist machine running. (54)

Therefore, some Marxist feminists ask for the wage for their household activities. They say that from the production of capitalistic factory or from surplus value some amount of money should be given to women. State should pay for housework of women.

Tong brings this concept from Mariarosa Dalla Costa and Selma James, who, “proposed that the state (the government and employers) not individual men (husbands, fathers and boyfriends), pay wage to housewives because capital ultimately profits from women’s exploitation” (55). But there are some Marxist feminists who reject the demand of wage for housework. Housework is related to feelings and emotions for them. In her book *The Economic Emergence of Women* Barbara Bergman advocates dislikes for wage of the housework. If women demand wages for housework, “the sexual division of labor would actually ossify” (56).

Except housework women have to perform their natural works. One of them is childbearing which women’s unquestionable task is. But in patriarchal society childcare is also women’s essential work. They give birth and bring up the baby but male members do not take it a vital work and if any woman does only child caring in the house she is called workless. But the father or may be so called father takes away the child when he wants. This injustice is in patriarchal society. As Engels says, “women give birth, the mother of any child is always known. However, the identity of the father is never certain because a woman could have been impregnated by a man other than her husband” (Tong 49). Later this child, if male, tries to control mother.

Marxist feminists argue that in class society, rights can benefit only a few middle class women; most women, like most men, will remain oppressed until the capitalist economic system is replaced by communism. Women’s liberation is their entry into the paid labor market and their participation in the class struggle; it is only in communist society that the economic dependency that is the basis of women’s oppression will disappear, and communal child care and house keeping free them from domestic

drudgery and allow them to participate fully in productive life. Such change can not be achieved simply by demanding justice, for they are the product of a particular stage of economic development; sexual equality can not therefore be achieved at will, but only in specific historical circumstances.

Marxist and socialist feminism do not attribute women's exploitation entirely to men. They see capitalism rather than patriarchy as being the principal source of women's oppression, and the capitalists as the main beneficiaries. They relate women's oppression to the production of wealth. Marxist feminist also place much greater stress on the exploitation of women in the paid employment. The disadvantaged position of women is held to be a consequence of the emergence of the private property and subsequently their lack of ownership of the means of production which in turn deprives them of power. They agree that women as a group are exploited, particularly since the advent of capitalism; they are more sensitive to the difference between women who belongs to the ruling class and proletarian families.

Marxist feminist share with radical feminists, a desire for revolutionary change; they seek the establishment of communist society. A society where the means of production will be commonly owned, they believe gender inequalities will disappear. There is no clear cut division between Marxist and Socialist feminists; they share much in common. Marxist feminists tend to seek more swiping changes than Socialist feminists; while socialist feminists tend to give more credence to the possibility of capitalist societies gradually moving towards female equality.

Some Marxist feminists have argued that women's position in society primarily benefits capitalism and capitalists rather than men Margaret Benton argues:

Capitalism benefits from a large reserve of labor force of women to keep wages down and profits up. In their roles in secondary breadwinners, married women provide a source of cheap easily exploitable labor because women have been socialized to comply and submit, they form a docile labor force that can be readily manipulated and easily fired when not required. (607)

Compared to male workers, women are less likely to join unions to go on strike or take other forms of militant actions against employers. Even when women join unions, they often find themselves in male dominated organization where according to Barron and Norris, men often do not share the interest or outlook of their fellow female unionists. Some Marxists also believe that women benefit capitalists and the capitalist system in their capacities as mothers and housewives by reproducing labor power at no cost to employers.

Heidi Hartmann compares the situation to a marriage in which the husband represents Marxism, the wife represents Feminism, and it is the husband who has all the power. She says, "The marriage of Marxism and feminism has been like the marriage of husband of wife and wife depicted in this common law; Marxism and feminism are the one that one is Marxism" (607).

In terms of the Marxist theory women appears insignificant: she sits on the sidelines of the grand struggle between capital and labor. Marxism may explain capitalism, but this does not explain patriarchy. Marxism can explain why capitalist exploit workers but not why men exploit women. Michelle Barrett attacks Marxist theories which see capitalism alone benefiting from the exploitation of women. She

points out that working class men can benefit from the labor of their wives as well as capitalists.

Hartmann and Barrett accept the Marxism can play an important part in explaining gender inequalities; however they believe that feminism must be fully incorporated into any adequate theory. Both these writers attempt to comment a marriage between Marxist and Feminist theory. Following radical feminists, Hartmann argues that Patriarchy provides the key to explaining the sexual division of labors. She believes that patriarchy has a 'material' base which is not directly related to biological differences to men and women. Men largely deny access for working women to jobs that pay a living wage. They force women into financial dependence on husband and there by control the labor of women in their capacities as mothers and housewives. Because of men's dominance within the family they also control women's bodies and sexuality; women who are married become almost their husbands' property. She ensures that capitalism and patriarchy are very closely connected, termed as 'intertwined' but she does not believe that the interests of men as a group and capitalist as a group are identical. For example, ruling class men may benefit from increasing numbers of women entering the labor force, where as working class men may prefer their wives to stay at home to perform personal services for them.

Hartmann accepts that the increasing participation of women in work today has made them slightly less depended on men. There are more opportunities for women to become independent. She claims, women's wages allow every few women to support themselves independently and adequately.

In *Women's Oppression Today*, as a Marxist, Michelle Barrett believes that it is necessary to go beyond Marxism in order to explain women's oppression. Like Hartmann she sees the origin of women's oppression today as lying in the 19th century, and she argues that a coalition of men and capitalist led to women being excluded from work and being forced to take on a primarily domestic role. In this process women's oppression became lodged in what she calls the family-household system.

In 20th century, the family-household system became an entrenched part of capitalism. Although there is no inevitable reason why capitalism needs women to do the unpaid household, the capitalist class do benefit politically from this division of labor. According to Barrett, the working class is divided by the family-household system; husbands and wives, men and women, fight each other instead of uniting to fight capitalism. Most feminists believe that the position of women in the labour market is an important source of female disadvantages. Some radical feminists see lack of employment opportunities - as one but only one - of many sources of gender inequalities. Marxist feminists with their greater stress upon material, economic factors, generally attach rather more importance to employment opportunities.

Marxists feminist approaches to women and employment stress the relationship between the economic system and women's work. Marxist feminism tried to combine with those of radical feminists to explain the disadvantages experienced by women in the labour market. They argue that there disadvantages are a consequence of both the operation of the capitalist economy and the attempts of men to maintain patriarchal control.

Jill Rugbery has drawn attention to the activities of trade unions as a factor affecting gender division in employment:

To make workers who wish to maintain a strong position in the labour market, women workers may pose as great a threat as new technology. Women may undercut male wages, depress wages level generally, and increase unemployment. If there is an influx of women into a particular occupation it may make it easier for the employer to define that occupation as acquiring little skill. (623)

Sylvia Walby argues that unions have been an important factor producing female disadvantage in employment. From a study of engineering, clerical work and textiles in Britain she claims that two main strategies have been used by males in these industries – the exclusion of women altogether, or the confinement of women to the lower grades of work.

Although she follows Marxists in describing societies as capitalist, she puts particular stress on the concept of patriarchy in trying to explain gender inequalities in employment. She sees unions as a patriarchal institution. Her own research suggests that they are usually dominated by men, and they tend to act in the interest of male employees even when women are a majority of the union's membership. She also believes work is the major factor shaping domestic relationships. Women suffer such disadvantages in the labour market that they become too willing to accept the main responsibility for domestic tasks. As she puts it, "housework is as good as anything else a woman is likely to get".

Heidi Hartmann takes a similar view to Walby. She too believes:

Unions play a major role in disadvantaging women, and she also uses the concept of patriarchy. Hartmann is perhaps even more critical of the way patriarchal power has been used. She claims that men have deliberately used jobs segregation as a way of reinforcing their dominance over women in the domestic sphere. Women have come to rule on their husbands' wages for financial support. Men have managed to maintain a patriarchal society despite the increased use of female labour by capitalists. A vicious circle has been created for women in which low-paid work strengthens women's dependence on men in the home, and their domestic dependence makes it easy to recruit women to low-paid and low-status jobs. (Haralmbos 623)

A discourse is similar to sociologist call an "ideology": a set of statements or beliefs which produce knowledge that serve the interest of a particular group or class- why, then, use, 'discourse' rather than ideology?

One reason which Foucault gives is that ideology is based on a distinction between a true statements about the world (science) and false statements (ideology), and the belief that the facts about the world help us to decide between true and false statements.

Clara Zetkin extremely argues with 'bourgeois feminists' and she has a hostile relationships with their demands for improved education, employment prospects and legal status, and she refuses to point-blank to co-operate with them in their campaigns for the vote. This position is backed up by a materialist analysis of the modern women's movement which argues that it is composed of three separate strands based on three

opposing class position: the “Upper Ten Thousand”; concerned with freeing property rights from their last feudal restrictions by granting them to women. Women of the petty bourgeoisies and intelligentsia needed economic independence at a time of capitalist crisis when many men could no longer afford to maintain a wife; and working class women are struggling alongside their men to bring about an end to capitalism.

This could be no common ground, and that class loyalties would reassert themselves as soon as legal and political rights were won. Proletarian women therefore needed political and legal rights only as part of their fight against capitalism, and there could be no common front with ‘bourgeois feminists’ involved in a superficial struggle against men. She argued that the lack of property in the working class and the entry of proletarian women into industry meant that there was no material basis or motivation for the continuation of gender inequality. Proletarian men and women must see each other not as oppressors and oppressed, but as comrades, fighting together for the common good.

According to Zetkin ‘all roads lead to Rome. Every truly Marxist analysis of an important part of the ideological superstructure of society... had to lead to an analysis of bourgeois society and its foundations, private property’ (124). However, when Lenin expressed doubts as to whether such analysis actually occurred, she agreed and said that she had therefore ensured that personal matters were no longer the focal point of discussion. The problem here was that for Zetkin such issues could only be seen as part of the ideological superstructure rather than as subjects in their own right. This reduction of the most intimate problems to an economic basis in one which many modern feminists

find unsatisfactory, for removing male oppression from the political agenda did not mean that it disappeared in the home.

Although the 'bourgeois feminists' (or women's righters) were sometimes more able to identify instances of sex oppression, their liberal individualist perspective did not allow for the possibility of the systematic domination of women by men, or for the ways in which such oppression might serve the needs of capitalism. Some of course did criticize social inequality, but many were in most respects highly conservative, and few were prepared to work with or join a party which was still formally committed to class war and revolution and which refused to allow the reality of any cross-class gender interests.

Modern Marxist feminism launched itself in the late 1960s. From the start, one of its core theoretical questions was that of how best to analyze women's oppression under capitalism. In her contribution to this special issue, Martha Gimenez discusses her own approach to this question. She begins with a strong critique of what feminism, for the most part, has made of Marx's work. Taking it to be laden with failures and lacunae, early second wave feminism produced at best a dual systems approach in which an ahistorical theory of patriarchy explains male domination while Marxist theory is useful only to explain capitalism. More recently, postmodernist feminist theory has dismissed Marx's work entirely, turning instead to a kind of discourse determinism that paralyzes social analysis and political action. Meanwhile, Marxist scholars, concentrating on political economy, the state, and so forth, see themselves as having little to say about women's oppression; paradoxically, they thereby capitulate to the weaknesses of ahistorical dual systems theorizing.

According to Encyclopedia Britannica VIII, prostitution is a practice of engaging in sexual activity, usually with individuals other than a spouse or friend, in exchange for immediate payment in money or other valuables. Prostitutes may be of either sex and may engage in either heterosexual or homosexual activity, but historically most prostitution has been by females with males as clients. Prostitution is a very old and universal phenomenon; also universal is condemnation of the prostitutes but relative indifference toward the client. Prostitutes are often set apart in some way. In ancient Rome they were required to wear distinctive dress; under Hebrew law only foreign women could be prostitutes; in Pre-war Japan they were required to live in the special section of the city. In medieval Europe prostitution was licensed and regulated by law, but by the eighteenth century an epidemic of venereal disease and post-reformation morality led to the closure of brothels.

Susan S.M. Edwards defines prostitution as, in the public mind, defined as the sale of sexual intercourse. Women who sell sex become prostitutes in the commodity exchange of sex for favors in kind or for money.

In debates dealing with prostitution as exploitation there are those who argue that if prostitution were to be accepted within society and prostitute women assimilated and treated as any other women this would negate any exploitations because women would be control of their lives.

Prostitution however is not just about the hardship of women forced to enter prostitution as means of survival. Even where women had the opportunity for work and a good level of living, prostitution would still persist. The fundamental inequality in power

relations means that even if there were not a class of poor women then prostitution would still exist as a means of men controlling women.

Prostitution is frequently added to the lists of characteristic of freedom quality of urban life. Prostitution is simply added as an example of small scale commerce.

Prostitution is understood as transgressive activity, which occurs in the 'Dead Zone', the in-between land of the city. Prostitutes are the put with street vendors and buskers and together they transform the architecture 'much more radically than the common user of the public space or the built environment. Prostitution is therefore romanticized with the implication that it is a freely chosen alternative, 'lifestyle' and profession.

The Domestic Labour Debate

Labour history is full of vicious little time warps, where archaic or long foresworn practices and conceptions of work are reinvented in a fresh context. The "sweating system" of farming out work to competing contractors in the nineteenth century garment industry was once considered an outdated exception to the rule of the integrated factory system. Disdained as a pre-industrial relic by the apostles of scientific management, this form of subcontracting is now a basic principle of almost every sector of the post-industrial economy and has emerged as the number one weapon in capital's arsenal of labour cost-cutting and union-busting.

Classic Marxism was that as capitalism developed, women and children would increasingly be drawn into the paid labour market, and that this would represent and increase in exploitation through a depreciation in the value of the male worker's labour power, as he need no longer be paid the cost of maintaining his family as well as himself.

Domestic labour to capitalism is related to the kind of political action that might be taken by women. Thus some writers argue that because domestic labour does produce value in the same way as other forms of productive labour, then the role of the housewife is as strategically important as the factory worker, and the home itself can be seen as a site of anti-capitalist struggle, for 'woman is the slave of a wage-slave, and her slavery ensures the slavery of her man'.

The international 'Wages for Housework' campaign has been heavily criticized for alleged misunderstanding of Marxist concepts, for perpetuating the assumption that housework is women's responsibility and for the impracticality of its demands. Its opponents however argue that it corresponds to the real needs of working-class women who will never be liberated by the kind of paid work available to them, and that to demand that housework be paid for by the capitalist state is both to make visible its importance as part of the class struggle and to challenge the assumption that its performance is some kind of natural attribute of womanhood. Some argue that the housework done by women does not simply represent a personal service to individual men, but that it serves the interests of the capitalist economy by reproducing and maintaining the workforce in a particularly cheap efficient way.

The unpaid work performed by women in the home is connected to the wider economy and to explain that the family under capitalism continues to perform important economic as well as ideological and psychological functions which any overall strategy for change must take into account. It therefore in principle allowed the actual economic situation of women to be addressed rather than assuming that domestic work is an important issue that will automatically be resolved 'after the revolution'.

Engles says, “To secure their wives marital fidelity, men supposedly seek to impose an institution of compulsory monogamy on women” (Tong 49). If any woman goes to other man, she is called prostitute and socially outcasted. She should be careful while meeting other males. But in man’s case it is different. Patriarchal society does not seek such strict marital fidelity from males simply because in family males’ condition is similar to the condition of the capitalists in society. As workers are commodity in capitalistic economic system, women are commodity in family because of influence of capitalistic social system. As Engles says, “If wives are to be emancipated from their husband, women must first become economically independent of men” (Tong 49). For that dismantling of capitalistic economic system is needed where exploitation of labor is working very strongly. By this reason women are suffering from the adjective like weak, passive, emotional in patriarchal society.

Women are treated as commodity in capitalistic society. They see freedom but can not experience it. In family their voices do not get any place where her husbands, boyfriends, fathers and other male members are dictators. Their relatives, supposed nearest persons try to impose their desire upon women. Therefore, they feel alienated from nature and surroundings. Working class women are more suppressed than the higher or bourgeoisie class women because working class women are treated badly by the higher class women and working class men also try to manipulate working class women according to their will, but bourgeoisie women suffer only from the male members of their own class. Similar is the condition of black women. First of all they have to suffer from racial discrimination and then patriarchal discrimination.

Marxist feminist's see similarities between male/female in the family and bourgeoisie/proletariat in society. Husband, father or male member in the family is like bourgeoisie in the society and wife in a family is like a proletariat in society. It does not mean that women are suffering only within family but family itself is initiating point women domination. Women are being exploited in the society on the basis of patriarchal norms and values which are constructions of economic power position. Women are the victims of men's comfort and "men's control of women is rooted in the fact that he, not she, controls the property, the oppression of women will cease only with the dissolution of institution of private property" (Tong 49). Women are unable to practice their freedom and desire. Their needs and feelings are condemned to be suppressed because property is in the patriarchy which believes that there is no desire of women different men's. Therefore, women are being exploited sexually, psychologically, physically etc. The root cause is such oppression of economic system of the society.

Before marriage and after marriage women become the victim of sexual exploitation. Marxist feminist Catharine Mackinnon compares sex to work, capitalist to man, worker to women, commodity to sex/women, capitalist accumulation to male sexual desire etc. there is no place for women's sexual desire in the society. If a husband or boyfriend wants to have sexual relation than that is desire of wife/girlfriend also. Tong brings the concept of Marx and Engles and sees, "marriage as a form of prostitution", Engles implicitly accepted that the services that can be prostituted are not limited to sexual service. Childcare and emotional support are also services sold by the prostitute wife" (Tong 64). Therefore, in patriarchal society husband wife relationship is like "pimp-prostitute" relation, which is similar to the bourgeoisie-proletariat or employer-

employee relationship. Marriage relation itself is the beginning of prostitution. Tong again quotes from *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* by Marx: “Position is only a specific expression of the general prostitution of the labor and since it is relationship in which falls not the prostitute alone, but also the one who prostitutes- and the latter’s abomination is still greater-the capitalist etc. also comes under this head” (Tong 64).

Prostitution begins with marital relationship because a wife sleeps with her husband whenever he wants so that she can get support for livelihood. It does not mean that before marriage women do not suffer sexual exploitation. For her survival a woman sleeps with a man but there the woman is wronged because she is helpless, she does not have money but male has money. Money protects him where as 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). Man exploits women in home and then they are treated as weak and passive and paid less than sufficient for survival. To survive in the society they are compelled to sleep with the male who give money. They have to do according to the will of men, it may be sexual, emotional, physical, psychological etc. men use women whenever and where they want because men can buy women easily, as a capitalist can buy a work or who does not have money because men/capitalist are property owner. That’s why; women are commodity for men, in patriarchal society who are source of economy in the family. Sometimes males do not care about the problem of family then women should struggle for the survival of her and children. And in working place they do not get proper salary for survival. Then they are compelled to sell their flesh, means they become prostitute. The economic situation of unemployed or

underemployed women explains why they, like labors sell themselves to others.

Therefore prostitute like labor, is a class phenomenon:

There is a bourgeoisie demand for prostitutes and as long as most women are paid to no wages or inadequate wages economically dependent 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 decent wage until the capitalist system that depends upon their exploitation is smashed. (Tong 65)

End of capitalistic system is also an end of patriarchy and therefore is end of prostitution. Prostitutes are also alienated in capitalistic society because they are treated as if they are commodity. As the wage labors are estranged from their work, themselves, human beings and nature prostitutes (wives-prostitutes) are also alienated from all the aspects that labors are alienated. Tong gives reason why prostitutes are alienated:

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

Both wives and prostitutes are alienated, essential human capacity is alienating. Both become dehumanized and their real existence and proper value as a person is turned and reduced into market value. How much they can sell themselves that much they can

get benefit. Selling and buying becomes the surviving method of their lives. They get examined as if they were sell able commodities in the capitalist market to end this treatment, women as commodity, first of all women should get economic independency. If the economic basis is changed the women will get full freedom which will be an end of patriarchy also: "Patriarchy can not be ended without fundamental economic change" (Bryson 258). Until and unless women get living wages this dependency and exploitation remain as a social norms and rooted practice.

III. Prostitution and Exploitation of Female Characters

Prostitution plays a significant role to form the plot of the play *Anna Christie*. The play opens in Johny-the-Priest's seedy New York waterfront Saloon, where a sea man Christopherson, spends his shore time when not working on a coal barge. A letter has arrived from Chris's daughter Anna, whom he has not seen for more than 15 years, writes to her father, mentioning her desire to come back to her father. Since Chris was a sailor who rarely saw his family, Anna's mother brought her to Minnesota to live with her cousin's farm. After her mother died she was forced to stay on the farm where she made to work like a dog, though her father never came for her. After her cousin raped her, she left the farm and took a job in Saint Paul a nanny. Soon, however biological and environmental influences propelled her into a life of prostitution thinking as her need for freedom, combined with the sexual needs of the men she encounters in the city, contribute to her downfall. When she walks in it is clear to everyone except Chris that Anna is no stranger to the darker side of life. She has just got out of the hospital, where she finished her jail term for prostitution. She was seduced by a cousin at her young age and driven into earning her keep as a prostitute, Anna has never experienced any of life's better moments she has been so battered and bruised by living that she seems only to be waiting for the next blow to fall. When she appears in the scene she has much grumble over her father's irresponsibility regarding her brought up. The painful reality of Anna's life makes Chris very tragic.

Chris offers her shelter on the coal barge and when the two of them sail for Provincetown, Anna discovers that the sea has a rejuvenating effect on her. Then after a storm, the barge picks up a lifeboat filled with its sailors from a capsized vessel, one of

the sailors, a large crude, yet, gentle man named Mat Burke, falls in love with Anna, as if he is collapsing from his ordeal in the lifeboat. The crisis arises into the play when Mat falls in love with Anna despite the strong objection of Chris. Chris does not like Anna to marry Burke because Burke is the sailor whom he hates the most.

The conspiracy of the play reaches to climax (in third act) Anna reveals her sordid past of seducing by her cousin in Minnesota. The revelation of Anna's sordid past make Mat almost mad. He decides not to marry her. His uncontrollable passion makes him more and more tragic. Although he tries to forget his beloved, he can not. But (in act four) he marries her, that brings some relief to the audience, because of the reunion of the two, and their effort to put aside their victimized past and establish an honest, trusting relationship to each other.

Throughout the drama, in fact, perfectly compliment O'Neill's exploration of the question of free will and destiny due to the causes of environmental and biological influences can overwhelm us.

As Marxist Feminists, intend to inquire about the class and gender processes working and interacting at our chosen site. De liking history from theory and realigning it afterwards identify class and gender processes that determine the entity of the prostitute. In this strategic use of theory, we propose a better understanding not only of labor but also of pain and pleasure being enacted on the body in the sexual nature of work Thus while pointing out the limits of the analysis, we invoke the process of gendering at the level of meaning that constitutes a prostitute and epitomizes the contradiction therein. The extention of the class analysis from the public into the domestic sphere is in itself a feminist gesture.

Regarding as Swasti Ghos' research, she resembles the position of flying woman and the prostitute, reinforces that "the aspect of economic exploration and gender oppression constituting the flying women are addressed in relation to identify, power and subjectivity" (199).

Engles has rightly said that if women are to be emancipated from their male counterparts, they must first become independent of men. When Anna works as a domestic labour, she does not hold the economic freedom because of which she is sexually exploited. As Anna says:

ANNA--[Not heeding his interruption--revengefully.] But one thing I never wrote you. It was one of them cousins that you think is such nice people--the youngest son--Paul--that started me wrong. [Loudly.] It wasn't none of my fault. I hated him worse 'n hell and he knew it. But he was big and strong--[Pointing to Burke]-- like you! (110)

She has been raped by her cousin in the farmland where she has been working because her father abandoned her after her mother's death. Domestic servants are caught up highly exploitative relation to their mistress and masters, where for a puny wage they have to perform a range of household tasks for others on a daily basis. The ideological difference in 'norms of respectability and notions of morality' attached to sex-work with relatively higher earnings as if to compensate for the victimized image, marks the prostitute. Similarly, to a domestic servant, the moral respectability of a prostitute is constantly challenged and her economic reward is far from adequate. But unlike a domestic servant she is denied the status of worker because of her ignoble profession, in spite of being oppressed within the work.

Anna further says:

ANNA--[Violently.] Well, living with you is enough to drive anyone off their nut. Your bunk about the farm being so fine! Didn't I write you year after year how rotten it was and what a dirty slave them cousins made of me? What'd you care? Nothing! Not even enough to come out and see me! That crazy bull about wanting to keep me away from the sea don't go down with me! You just didn't want to be bothered with me! You're like all the rest of 'em! (110)

This conversation makes clear that she has been in a problem economically because of her lack on economic power structure and lack of parental care.

An individual such as the flying prostitute operating outside the capitalist production system may participate in multiple class processes at any one time through out her life span, and all contribute to her identity. With the contradictory, fragmented and fractured self, she comes to inhabit an exclusive and imperceptible space of her own.

But capitalists, also represent patriarchy, exercise to create false consciousness to establish their empire. They try to hide all kinds of discrimination and injustice. For Marxist feminist gender oppression is class oppression and women's subordination is seen as a form of class oppression. It believes that women's situation in the society cannot be understood in isolation from its socio-economic context. As the Marxists see the alienation of labor from work, self, human beings and nature women are also alienated from sex, self, children and from whole surroundings. It is not that the prostitution contract allows the client to buy the person of the prostitute while the

employment contract merely allows the employer to buy the worker's fully alienable labor power.

In this drama, Chris, Anna's father though never cared his daughter, wants to control Anna's freedom and her decision making. When she falls in love with Burke, a sailor, who proposed for Anna to marry with, Chris strongly rejects the proposition. As Chris speaks:

CHRIS--[A bit placated, in spite of himself, by BURKE'S evident sincerity--but puzzled and suspicious.] Vell--Ay don't vant for Anna gat married. Listen, you fallar. Ay'm a ole man. Ay don't see Anna for fifteen year. She vas all Ay gat in vorld. And now ven she come on first trip--you tank Ay vant her leave me 'lone again? (97)

Though Anna likes Burke she can not totally agree with his purpose of marriage, because she has had a past of a prostitute. Without revealing the past incidents with her going to be husband, she thinks it will not last long.

Prostitute has got a confused identity i.e. for a prostitute a precise libidinal identity marks her: in spite of the derogatory connotation of her work, the commercial exchange of sexual service is recognized as a definite profession. For prostitutes, the earning potentials are not only unrecognized with in family and community, the question of morality looms large in having to spell as to the nature of their profession. It is too known that, the family tries to maintain secrecy in having to accept living off her through a socially immoral act while the community wants to discipline the element of debauchery that violates the purity of family norms. Thus for prostitute non-recognition marks the struggle for survival for her self and her family. (202)

Chris' irresponsibility has alienated not only Anna but also her mother. As Chris himself reports talking with his barge friend Larry:

CHRIS--[Suddenly growing somber--in a low tone.] No. Ven she vas little gel, Ay vas bo'sun on vindjammer. Ay never gat home only few time dem year. Ay'm fool sailor fallar. My voman--Anna's mother--she gat tired vait all time Sveden for me ven Ay don't never come. She come dis country, bring Anna, dey go out Minnesota, live with her cousins on farm. Den ven her mo'der die ven Ay vas on voyage, Ay tank it's better dem cousins keep Anna. Ay tank it's better Anna live on farm, den she don't know dat ole davil, sea, she don't know fader like me. (53)

In order to stay with his daughter Anna who has been living in his absence, Chris betrays Marthy Owen, an old prostitute with whom he is involved in voyages. In response to his betrayal, Marthy satirically says she was not emotionally attached with no man and will not be hurt if he leaves her. She says:

MARTHY--That's the talkin'! In all my time I tried never to split with a guy with no hard feelin's. But what was yuh so scared about--that I'd kick up a row? That ain't Marthy's way. [Scornfully.] Think I'd break my heart to lose yuh? Commit suicide, huh? Ho-ho! Gawd! The world's full o' men if that's all I'd worry about! [Then with a grin, after emptying her glass.] Blow me to another scoop, huh? I'll drink your kid's health for yuh. (56)

According to Kamala Bhasini, empathies the compulsion of being female subjectivity in society 'In most sexual relations men are subjects; their desires likes and dislikes and their satisfactions are paramount. Women at best are junior and passive

partners, at worst commodities, intended to satisfy men's desire or lust. A woman living in a basti (slum) in Delhi was asked by a social worker if she ever initiate sex with her husband. She looked very surprised at the question and said "kya kabhi roti bhi kisi ko khehti hai mythe khao?" (Does a piece of bread ever ask to be eaten?) (29)

Sex work is in no way a 'pleasure' for the prostitute. She produces a determinate form of pleasure in a limited period of time according to the desire shaped by purchasing power of the customer. Sex-work involves the female body being used as an object for producing sexual stimulation, for her client. Since, she is forced to act in compliance with the desire of the other, withholding herself, the act is coercive. This coercion is less a physically abusive act, than a violation of selfhood for the woman. The control of the male customer over the female body of the service-provider need not be aggressive and cruel in every performance, the pain and coercion resulting from the domination and control on part of the client over the female self implicates a violation of the intimate sphere of personhood that bleeds into the violence of non-recognition. The prevalent gender process that locates a woman in/out side the family helps to fashion the violence in its present form and to foreclose the violence as it is operative on the prostitutes. That's why, in drama, Anna to be economically capable escapes from the farmland where she was raped by her own cousin and runs to Saint Paul to work as a 'nanny'. Soon, however, biological and environmental influences propelled her into a life of prostitution.

The essence of the prostitution contract is that the prostitute agrees, in exchange for money or another benefit, not to use her personal desire or erotic interests as the determining criteria for her sexual interaction. What this means is that the prostitute must, at least during working hours, assume her or himself as the Other, fix her or himself as an

object, in order that everyone else may always be able satisfy their erotic "needs" on demand. In other words, the existence of a market for commodified sex leaves room for every non-prostitute to become, in Simone de Beauvoir's (1953) terms, a "despotic subject" should she or he so choose.

Anna admits that her need for freedom compelled her to leave her position as a nanny. She explains, "I was caged in, I tell you — yust like in yail — taking care of other people's kids — listening to 'em bawling and crying day and night — when I wanted to be out — and I was lonesome — lonesome as hell. So I give up finally" (111).

Her need for freedom, combined with the sexual needs of the men she encounters in the city, contributes to her downfall. She ridicules her father's assumption that there would be , as Anna says, "With all them nice inland fellers yust looking for a chance to marry" in Saint Paul, when she confesses, "Marry me? What a chance! They wasn't looking for marrying" (111).

As pointed in Swasti's research, within domesticity the sole of the housemaid/wife is constituted by child care and homework, where as at work she is a pleasure-giver, perfecting a job profile that possesses the dangerous sexuality of the non-mother, similarly in drama's episode, Anna's work imbibes her sexuality selling sexual service for many. Anna keeps playing between the home and the street, from one woman-position to another with in the zone of social sanction and illegality.

Anna admits that loneliness prompted her to give in to their sexual advances. As a result of her experiences in the city, she claims that she does not expect much from her father, since men "give you a kick when you're down, that's what all men do."(62) She tries to force her father to admit his responsibility for her fate, when she demands,

“You're like all the rest! [To CHRIS--furiously.] And who's to blame for it, me or you? If you'd even acted like a man--if you'd even been a regular father and had me with you--maybe things would be different!” (11).

O'Neill exposes the weakness in Chris's attitude toward the sea as he presents irrefutable evidence that Chris's abandonment of Anna contributed to her downfall. Another challenge to Chris's belief comes from Mat, who echoes Anna's feelings about the sea when he tells Chris:

Burke: you know the truth in your heart, if great fear of the sea has made you a liar and a coward itself. The sea's the only life for a man with guts in him isn't afraid of his own shadow. Tis only on the sea he's free(99) . . . the sea give you a clout once, knocked you down, and you're not man enough to get up for another, but lie there for the rest of your life howling bloody murder. (100)

Anna appears to take control of her own destiny while she is living on the barge. She enters freely into a relationship with Mat, even against her father's wishes, and she stands up to both of them when they threaten her freedom. When Mat uses physical force to try to convince her to marry him, telling her “I'll make up your mind for you bloody quick,” (81) Anna is “instinctively repelled by his tone,” and tells him, “say, where do you get that stuff.”(81) As Mat and Chris battle over her fate, Anna, who feels as if she is being treated like “a piece of furniture,”(109) explodes. She insists:

ANNA--[Laughing bitterly.] What a chance! You make me laugh, honest! Want to bet you will? Wait 'n see! [She stands at the table rear, looking from one to the other of the two men with her hard, mocking smile. Then

she begins, fighting to control her emotion and speak calmly.] First thing is, I want to tell you two guys something. You was going on's if one of you had got to own me. But nobody owns me, see?--'cepting myself. I'll do what I please and no man, I don't give a hoot who he is, can tell me what to do! I ain't asking either of you for a living. I can make it myse lf-- one way or other. I'm my own boss. So put that in your pipe and smoke it! You and your orders! (109)

Yet environmental determinism soon re-exerts its influence over her. After she tells Chris and Mat about her past, Mat rejects her, unable to break free of the social stigma of prostitution.

As Julia O'Connell reinforces the rights of prostitute, ' John Locke is famous for this dictum: "Every man has a property in his own person. This nobody has any right to but himself. The labor of his body, and the work of his hands, we many say, are properly his" (274). This dictum allows for the commodification of a person's bodily capacity to labor. Locke also considered that "a man does not stand in the same relation to his body as he does to any other type of property [. . .] So a man does not have the right to kill himself, or put himself into slavery, because he is the work of God" (3).

In the last act, O'Neill continues his questioning of free will and determinism as Anna and Mat reunite. Environmental and biological forces seem to be held at bay when Mat decides that he will marry Anna.

The economic condition of her existence is complex labour process. Her body is the site of work, and the client who buys a piecemeal ownership over her body dictates the nature of the service she provides. She uses her body to produce another person's

pleasure mediated through the dissipation of sexuality and thus remains different from other kinds of service labour.

The ending does, in fact, perfectly compliment O'Neill's explorations of the question of free will and destiny. Just as he seems to present a traditional, romantic ending to Anna's story, he imbues it with a sense of doom. When Mat insists to Anna, "I've a power of strength in me to lead men the way I want, and women, too, maybe, and I'm thinking I'd change you to a new woman entirely," Anna agrees, "yes, you could." Yet, her fierce sense of independence and her aversion to feeling caged may create problems in their marriage. Also, Mat and Chris are both sailing the next day for South Africa, leaving Anna alone again. While Mat assures Anna that he will return safely, Chris, looking out into the foggy night with a sense of foreboding, insists, "Fog, fog, fog, all bloody time. You can't see where you was going, no. Only dat old devil, sea — she knows." O'Neill seems to echo Chris's sense of doom when he ends the play with the "mournful wail of steamers' whistles."

The prostitute is an independent worker. The implication of the body as the site of work is a significant marker of difference for her. The production of pleasure is not comparable to the production of commodity in the capitalistic framework, and the surplus value from the producer to the non-producing owner does not take place in her case.

In *Anna Christie* O'Neill refuses to provide a definite answer to the questions of free will and destiny. He does suggest that environmental and biological influences can sometimes overwhelm us. Anna reinforces this viewpoint when Chris asks for her forgiveness, and she gives it freely, admitting, "It ain't your fault, and it ain't mine, and it

ain't his neither. We're all poor nuts, and things happen, and we yust get mixed in wrong, that's all"(119).

Yet Anna has also demonstrated that courage, love, and forgiveness can sometimes help shape destinies.

In the eyes of the law, incidents of sexual abuse and harassment do not seem to convey any sense of violation towards her, mental or physical, and access to legal protection in her case, remains unheard of. When Anna is taken for jail due to the evidence of prostitution or illegal act but it does not pay attention to her male counterpart, who equally participates in such illegal act.

Therefore, to look at social process of identity formation of the prostitute belong to the over determined space of the economic political and cultural categories where all social processes constitute each other and bring each other into existence by fixing same vantage point.

Anna's hatred for prostitution as a profession is revealed in her conversation with Mat and Chris, while revealing her past life. She says:

ANNA--[Infuriated by his action--stridently.] You will too listen! [She leans over and pulls his hands from his ears--with hysterical rage.] You--keeping me safe inland--I wasn't no nurse girl the last two years--I lied when I wrote you--I was in a house, that's what!--yes, that kind of a house--the kind sailors like you and Mat goes to in port--and your nice inland men, too--and all men, God damn 'em! I hate 'em! Hate 'em! [She breaks into hysterical sobbing, throwing herself into the chair and hiding her face in her hands on the table. The two men have sprung to their feet.]. (111)

In traditional Marxist analysis, a prostitute would be designated as unproductive labour outside the capitalist production system, neither generation surplus value nor exploited for unpaid labors.

The moments of production and appropriation of surplus labour are not separable, and the woman becomes instrumental to the process of both production and appropriation of surplus. The self appropriative gesture makes the system non-exploitative.

Anna's hatred for prostitution is revealed in order to blame he father for his abandonment that was the main cause for her ruin. Anna wanted to keep her past a secret from Burke but she loved to him too much, that's why she wanted to reveal all her past. As she says:

ANNA: [. . .] I wanted to marry you and fool you, but I couldn't. Don't you see how I'd changed? I couldn't marry you with you believing a lie-- and I was shamed to tell you the truth--till the both of you forced my hand, and I seen you was the same as all the rest. And now, give me a bawling out and beat it, like I can tell you're going to. [She stops, looking at BURKE. He is silent, his face averted, his features beginning to work with fury. She pleads passionately.] Will you believe it if I tell you that loving you has made me--clean? It's the straight goods, honest! [Then as he doesn't reply--bitterly.] Like hell you will! You're like all the rest! (113)

Before knowing the truth of Ann's past life, Chris and Mat began arguing as though Anna was their property. But as soon as the revelation of the truth both of them changed their attitude for Anna. Then, Chris realizes that the safety of growing up on

land was an illusion for Anna and suddenly he believes it is best for Anna to marry Burke. Chris says;

“No you don’t go. Ay tank may be it’s better Anna marry you now.” (114)

After Anna’s revelation of her past life of prostitution, Burke who was in love with Anna rejects to marry her and regrets for his love. Burke says:

BURKE: [. . .] God help me! I'm destroyed entirely and my heart is broken in bits! I'm asking God Himself, was it for this He'd have me roaming the earth since I was a lad only, to come to black shame in the end, where I'd be giving a power of love to a woman is the same as others you'd meet in any hooker-shanty in port, with red gowns on them and paint on their grinning mugs, would be sleeping with any man for a dollar or two! (114)

His hatred is further extended through his another dialogue. He wants to delete all the signs of her love on him. Burke says:

BURKE: [. . .] His anger rushing back on him.] I'll be going, surely! And I'll be drinking sloos of whiskey will wash that black kiss of yours off my lips; and I'll be getting dead rotten drunk so I'll not remember if 'twas iver born you was at all; and I'll be shipping away on some boat will take me to the other end of the world where I'll never see your face again! [He turns toward the door]. (114)

The prostitute, thus, participates the fundamental class process at work in generating and appropriating surplus labour and also partakes in subsumed class process by distributing and receiving a part of the surplus labour offer it ha been appropriated.

In Marxist literature, the term class refers to a group of people and the concept of exploitation is appropriation of surplus labour from the group of direct laborers to the group of 'parasitic' non-producers. The Marxist tradition has made visible economic exploitation in analyzing the capitalist production system in different socio-economic settings, and has specified different forms of class structure in different historical periods. Traditional theory is inadequate to handle the problematic of the flying women in its complexities. The 'noneconomic' identities and the 'unproductive' labour forms of the flying woman, devalued and subordinated to class, have been denied a place in our familiar language of Marxian political economy.

A relation of power exists within the household with respect to participation in reproductive work which is conventionally considered a 'woman's job'. The power process is slanted against the wife in her performance of household duties, whereas her husband is not an active participant bound by social norms. The process would surface as egalitarian if surplus labour could be collectively produced, appropriated and distributed both by husband and wife. The political conditions reinforcing feudal class process are such that, within the perspective of family based on marriage, the rights of women at home are different from the rights of citizens outside the household. Gender, as a component of ideology, influences (and is influenced by) the feudal class process in the household, and the multiple class positions of the husband and the wife are differently implicated by gender meanings. Behavior, expectations and aspirations within the family are shaped by gender processes just as cultural and ideological ties of religion, loyalty and tradition bind husband and wife in their corresponding social roles.

In spite of belonging to a non-capitalist, non-exploitative class position, and taking part in the processes of production and appropriation of surplus labour in various ways, she remains a recipient of necessary labour. Her subjectivity is framed from within such interactions, and she internalizes the conventional gender norms that foreclose her. She bears the foreclosure at home and carries on through it at work. Meanwhile, with a contradictory and fractured self, the prostitute remains isolated, dominated and oppressed. She bears the brunt both as a homemaker and as a whore.

Noting that the early feminist movement called for the labor involved in mothering and caring for the old, the sick, or the disabled to be recognized as work, Mary McIntosh argues that the term "sex worker" both means that prostitutes "are women who are paid for what they do" and that "as with other women, what they do should be respected as a skilled and effortful activity and not considered simply as a natural capacity of every woman" (13). But feminist calls for the labor involved in social reproduction to be recognized and rewarded have generally been advanced on the basis that this labor has intrinsic social worth, not simply because it is skilled and effortful. Indeed, this is partly why domestic and caring labor remains a difficult issue for feminists, for as Anderson's work shows, socially reproductive labor does not simply fulfill physical needs but "is bound up with the reproduction of life-style and, crucially, of status" (14). So, for example, the tasks performed by paid domestic workers often serve to demonstrate or raise their employer's status rather than having an inherent social value. There are even employers who demand that their domestic worker wash the anus of the family pet after it has defecated (Anderson 26), something which requires skill and effort, but is hardly necessary either to any individual or to our collective survival.

Given the enormity of the stigma that attaches to female prostitution and its consequences for women's lives, it is easy to understand sex workers' rights activists' impulse to try to reconstruct prostitution as an intrinsically honorable profession that serves socially valuable ends. But without insisting that human beings have sexual "needs," rather than socially constructed desires, this position is difficult to sustain. It is fairly easy to make the case that we should attach social honor to the task of changing a baby's diaper, but hard to see how one would argue that social honor should be attached to the task of cleaning the anus of a perfectly healthy dog, or to the tasks performed by prostitutes in order to satisfy their clients' sexual whims.

To attempt to destigmatize prostitution by insisting on its social value also carries risks as a political strategy. There is a danger of simply creating new hierarchies and fresh divisions. If prostitutes are to be respected because they undertake socially valuable work, surely those who specialize in working with severely disabled clients will be deemed somehow more respectable than those who give blow jobs to able-bodied men out on their stag night, for example? This division already exists in the Netherlands where "sex surrogates" who work with disabled people are legally and socially constructed as different from prostitutes who work with able-bodied clients. And does this argument not construct the prostitute who meets a client's erotic needs as somehow more worthy of respect than the domestic worker who acquiesces to an employer's demands?

In an unequal world, opportunities to devote one's life to socially honored goals are classed, gendered and raced. The fact that an individual engages in a form of labor not considered socially valuable thus says nothing about her personal integrity or honor, and

vice versa. Becoming a heart surgeon is not proof of the nobility of spirit of a white middle-class man, and becoming a university professor does not demonstrate the personal integrity of a white middle-class woman. A person's human, civil, and labor rights, and their right to respect and social value as a human being, cannot be contingent upon whether or not they perform labor that is socially valued. The university teacher, the heart surgeon, the prostitute, and the domestic worker are all equally entitled to rights and protection as economic actors. Those who work in prostitution have rights and deserve respect not because or despite the fact they work as prostitutes, but because they are human beings. Likewise, our claim to legal recognition, rights, dignity, and respect lies in the fact that we are human beings, not that we are able-bodied or disabled, black or white, straight or gay, shoe fetishist or vanilla sex fetishist.

In *Anna Christie*, the females are exploited within own family members through different ways as economical, physical and mental. The protagonist Anna Christie is forced to turn to prostitution. Therefore, Anna Christie, the protagonist of O'Neill's *Anna Christie* reveals that male bourgeois discourse institutionalizes prostitution in order to render even the female's subordinate position in society in an apparent form.

IV. Conclusion

O'Neill incorporates realistic depiction of the shattered and tortured lives of men at sea and of the interactions between family members. The play explores the tension that can arise between family members as a result of feelings of abandonment and guilt. It also illuminates the harsh reality of women's lives in the early part of the twentieth century.

There are the segments of society: ordinary lives are led by common people, working – class people, down trodden and earth people represented with realistic fidelity to hovel, tenements, farm-house, dive or water-front that was their world. The plays of O'Neill are for the most part unpleasant plays wrought out of the agony and pain of life. His most successful characters are people of rather primitive instincts, misfits, suffering from disease, economic inhibitions, and frustration from soul-destroying powers which they cannot understand. These poor souls are usually beaten in the battle of life by a force either within or outside themselves that makes for their confusion and ruin.

A person's human, civil, and labor rights, and their right to respect and social value as a human being, cannot be contingent upon whether or not they perform labor that is socially valued. The university teacher, the heart surgeon, the prostitute, and the domestic worker are all equally entitled to rights and protection as economic actors. Those who work in prostitution have rights and deserve respect not because or despite the fact they work as prostitutes, but because they are human beings. Likewise, this research claims to the legal recognition, rights, dignity, and respect lies in the fact that prostitute are too human beings, not expulsion them from society. They have equally rights to set within same environment. Female prostitutes are legally and socially constructed as a

separate class of persons, and as such are subjected to a range of civil and human rights abuses.

Mostly the human suffering is due to the social cause and the familial relationship that always trap human beings within the circle of suffering. Anna suffers even though she does not live that old devil sea. After the death of Anna's mother, she was brought to Minnesota to live with her cousin's farm. She was forced to stay on the farm where she worked like a dog, though her father never came for her. After her cousin raped her, she left the farm and took a job in Saint Paul as a nanny. Because of the biological and environmental influences, she is propelled into a life of prostitute, seeking her need for freedom, combined with the sexual needs of the men she encounters in the city, contribute to her downfall. At the end of the drama, when Anna revealed her truth of past life, then Chris realized about his irresponsibility towards her caused by his abandonment. Though Chris tried to appear to Anna as a man who wanted to be a good father but the society that was guided by male bourgeois ideology, Chris did not keep untouched self. Not only Chris but also other male characters, Mat too, highly influenced by such ideology, i.e. after revealing past life of Anna Mat's rejection to accept a normal woman, did not fit the ideal of a wife and illuminated society's restrictive attitude towards women.

Throughout the whole drama, especially three characters are faced with the choice of whether or not to forgive themselves and each other. After Chris finally admits his failings, he begs Anna's forgiveness. She tells her father "it ain't your fault, and it ain't mine and it ain't his neither: we're all pair nuts and things happen and me just mixed in

wrong that's all" (119). These lines reinforce and claim that the impoverished people are hunted due to the domination of capitalist society and male bourgeois ideology.

Thus, the protagonist of O'Neill's *Anna Christie* intensifies that male bourgeois discourse institutionalizes prostitution in order to render even the female's subordinate position in society in an apparent form.

Work Cited

- Abrams, M. H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Banglor:Prison, 1995.
- Alexander, Doris. *The Tempering of O'Neill*. New York: Harcourt, 1962.
- Anderson, Bridget. *Doing the Dirty Work? The Global Politics of Domestic Labour*. London: Zed, 2000.
- Banham, Martin. *The Cambridge Guide to Theatre*. USA: CambridgeUniversity Press, 1995.
- Barrett, M. "Rethinking Women's Oppression; a Reply to Bernner and Ramas". *New Left Review*. London: Verso, 1980.
- - -. *Women's Oppression Today*. London: Verso, 1980.
- Bergman, Barbara. *Economic Emergence of Women*. London: River Oram Press, 1990.
- Benston, M. *The Political Economy of Women's Liberation in Glazer*. New York: Malbin and Wachter, 1972.
- Bhasin, Kamala. *Exploring Masculinity*. New Delhi: Raj Press, 2004.
- Bryson, V. *Feminist Political Theory: An Introduction*. London: Macmillan, 1992.
- Edwards, Susan S. M. "Selling the Body Keeping the Soul: Sexuality, Power, the Theories and Realities of Prostitution". *Body Matters*. Eds. S. Scott and D. Morgan. London: Falner Press, 2005.
- Encyclopedia Britanica VIII*. London.
- Engels, F. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. London: Lawrence and Wishatt, 1991.
- Fermor, Miss Ellis. *Irish Dramatic Movement*. Dublin: Penguin, 1986: 78-91.
- Ghosh, Swati. *The Flying Prostitute: Identity of the (Im) possible Other: Hecate*.

- London: Oxford, 2003:103-9.
- Gimenez, Martha. *Science and Society*. New York: University of Colorado, 2005.
- Haralambos, M. *Developments in Sociology*, Ormskirk: Causeway Press, 1989.
- Hartmann, H. *The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Toward a More Progressive Union in Lydia Sargent*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- Krutch, Joseph Wood. *American Drama Since 1918*. New York: George Braziller, 1957.
- Locke, John. "The second Treatise on Civil Government". *Locke's political writings*.
London: Penguin, 1993.
- McIntosh, Mary. *The Feminist Debate on Prostitution*. Paper Presented to BSA Annual Conference: Sexualities in Context. UK: Preston, 1994.
- O'Connell Davidson, Julia. *Prostitution, Power and Freedom*. Cambridge: Polity, 1998.
- O'Neill, Eugene. *Anna Christie*. New York: Vintage International, 1995.
- Rubbery, J. *Structured Labor Market, Worker, Organization and Low pay*: New York: The Harmondsworth, 1980.
- Ruthven, K.K. *Feminist Literary Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Shipley, Joseph T. *Dictionary of World Literary Term*. Boston: The Writer, 1970.
- - -. *The Crown Guide to the World's Great Plays*. New York: Crown, 1965.
- Tong, Rosemarie. *Feminist Thought*. London: Westview Press, 1989.
- Trilling, Lionel. *Three Plays by Eugene O'Neill*. New Work: Modern Library, 1974.
- Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory today*. New York: Garland publishing Inc., 1999.
- Walby, Sylvia. *Patriarchy at Work*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1986.
- - -. *Theorizing Patriarchy*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.
- Wilson, Edmund. *The Shores of Light*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Young, 1952.

Winther, Sophus Keith. *Eugene O'Neill: A Critical Study*. New York: Russell and Russell, 1961.

Zetkin, Clara. *Bourgeoisie Feminism*. London: Oxford, 1992.