

I. Rereading of *A Doll House* and *Man and Superman* with the Perspective of Marxist Feminism

This thesis explores how the capitalist men are dominating women with the strength of economic source which they have captured with the use of different capitalist patriarchal ideologies; and how women are resisting against it in Henric Ibsen's *A Doll House* and George Bernard Shaw's *Man and Superman*. In *A Doll House*, female characters, Nora and Christine Linde are commodified by male characters, Helmer, Krogstad, the rich businessman and Dr. Rank. Nora and Christine are obliged to conceal their individual desire, wish and freedom and are pretending as per their husbands' wish. If they do not react to their husbands according to their wish, they cannot exist in capitalist society because the male members have control over socio-economic and political domains.

Nora at the beginning acts as a conventional wife who is absolutely dependent on husband and her husband always wants, so because in capitalist patriarchy, a male always wishes to be superior by exploiting female. Nora has been treated as a doll child in her father's hand who is handed down to Helmer as a doll wife. It is vivid in Nora's disillusionment: "He used to call me his doll-child, and he played with me the way I played with my dolls. Then I came into your house" (472). It is the continuation of capitalist patriarchal system in which a male always make a female weak to confine her in unpaid domestic work, so that, he can perpetuate his control over her. Nora has been obliged to act as a doll because in her father's house, her father was the source of economy and in her husband's house as he owns the economy. She is made dependent on them even to fulfill her basic needs because Helmer works outside but Nora is confined in domestic activities of managing house, cooking, childrearing, shopping and so on which are unpaid jobs.

Similarly, Mrs. Linde is also oppressed by capitalist patriarchy because she is also coerced to conceal her individual desire as per capitalist patriarchal norms. She has to marry a rich businessman, whom she does not love, to support her family. When Nora asks why she had married the man whom she did not love. Then she responds that her mother was bedridden and helpless. She had two younger brothers' responsibility, therefore she agrees: "In all conscience, I didn't think I could turn him down" (448). She sells her sex to the man for economic cause because she has nothing to sell in marketplace. Thus, Nora and Christine are made marketable commodity for Nora also has to sell her sexy dance and sex to her husband even in her traumatic situation to get money from him and pay pack loan to Krogstad. In capitalism, nothing counts equal to money; Krogstad does not count humanity. He does not care Nora's predicament in front of his job.

Similarly, in Shaw's *Man and Superman*, the male characters, though tried to come out of capitalist males to socialist males; they also have traces of capitalist patriarchy in their subconscious mind. Mr. Whitefield thinks that female cannot be secure without male guardianship. He and his appointed guardians, Ramsden and Tanner, further think that female cannot take decision in any matter, like marriage and property. This idea is claimed in question about Ann to Octavius by Ramsden, "What does she know about the real value of men at her age?"(7). By giving such types of definitions to female, they want to control Annie Whitefield as well as to practice capitalist patriarchy in the society. They choose Octavius, a romantic lover to marry her. By pushing her in the romantic environment, they want to passivity her or make her a romantic weak female who cannot bear risk of life. In this way, they are practicing capitalist patriarchal ideologies so that they can rule over females. Though,

Ramsden and Octavius did not oppose Violet's pregnancy but they enforce her to reveal who has fathered it against her will.

Female characters of the both dramas are under the capitalist patriarchal oppression. However, they also resist against such victimization. In *A Doll House*, Nora who does not only lie and eat macaroons which are forbidden by Helmer, and borrows money to save the debt back, but also proves herself very conscious, courageous and intellectual enough to leave home, husband and children in search of her individual identity. She finds out at the end that her depended life on her husband is the main cause to loss her identity and individuality. So, she frees herself from the control of Helmer of complete emancipation finally.

Likewise, Mrs. Linde also resists the capitalist patriarchal ideology of monogamous marriage which is also a cause of female oppression. She no more remains the widow of the rich businessman, her late husband. She holds Krogstad's hand for second marriage.

In Shaw's *Man and Superman*, the female characters are more strong and intellectual enough to resist and subvert the capitalist patriarchal oppression and reach to their goal. Annie Whitefield resists capitalist patriarchal notion of marriage. She chooses not to live a passive and very luxurious life by marrying a rich and romantic lover, Octavius. She rather prefers to live an active life by marrying a realistic capitalist male, Tanner. She rejects to marry Octavius: "[M]en like that always live in comfortable bachelor lodgings with broken, and are adored by their landladies, and never get married. Men like you always get married" (191). She proves herself not as a laborer but as a competitor of capitalist male- very intellectual enough to plan to produce superman. She subverts the capitalist patriarchal policy to make female to be pursued. She takes the position of pursuer and pushes the male, Tanner as pursued.

Similarly, Violet also becomes able to get the right of individuality. She becomes pregnant secretly without revelation of husband. Thus she challenges the capitalist patriarchal ideology of legal child bearing system. She also becomes able to get the rightful share of capital from male, Mr. Malone.

Lee. A. Jacobus writes that Shaw was advocate of communism: “Shaw’s lifelong socialism affected his work and his thinking” (570). Shaw was advocate of communism. So, his male characters are also influenced by communism for they are more liberal in female’s individuality than in Henric Ibsen’s male characters because Ibsen was from the late nineteenth century society which was patriarchal. Nora’s slamming of the door is the Ibsen’s first step of feminism or the beginning of feminism though Ibsen himself declared that he has shown social problem realistically, not on the side of woman. To prove this, Lee. A. Jacobus’ idea can be cited: “Once Henric Ibsen found his voice as a realist playwright, he began to develop plays centering on social problems and the problems of the individual struggling against the demands of society” (442). So, Ibsen’s subconscious feminist thinking can be seen in his female characters’ subconscious resistance of capitalist patriarchal ideologies.

Shaw was follower and influence Ibsenian realism. So, in his dramas like Ibsen’s, female characters play major roles. He accepted himself as a feminist and socialist. Via *Man and Superman*; he is able to get victory of female resistance over patriarchal domination.

The social reality of financial upheaval can be seen in both dramas. The impact of economic system on individual is the aim of both dramatists. Therefore, due to the advocacy of feminism and capitalism in their dramas forced the researcher to explore the issue that female oppression in the hand of male is the result of capitalist

patriarchal ideologies which are created to exploit the female in productive activity without cost, so that, male can take full advantage from her. The researcher not only explores how females are oppressed due to the economic dependence on males, but also explores how female resists against it to create her own individuality and to celebrate her individual freedom as a human being. Therefore, the theory of Marxist feminism is applied in both of the dramas to find out the issue. The research has focused on the issue that how females have to go devoid of individual freedom due to the capitalist patriarchal ideologies which exploit women in the productive activities, so that, male always remain as a capitalist and female as a labor. The theory further helps to explore how a female can resist against capitalist patriarchal ideologies as the laborers resist against capitalists in Marxism.

Henric Ibsen himself commented the play *A Doll House* with the perspective of gender. He says the male and female have two kinds of separate spiritual law and conscience in them, consequently they cannot understand each other. But in practical life the woman is judged by man's law as if she were not a woman but a man. To cite him:

There are two kinds of spiritual law, two kinds of conscience, one in man and another, altogether, different, in women. They do not understand each other; but in patriarchal life the woman is judged by man's law, as though she were not a woman but a man. (475)

Here Ibsen declares that there is naturally difference between man and woman.

Therefore, their consciences are also different but are equally important for them. It is patriarchal society that has created hierarchy to make the male superior.

Oscar G. Brockett argues that it's not Helmer's defect but the defect of the then society which shapes the mentality of the people. He asserts: "Torvald is the product

of a society which values respectability and position more than it does a wife's love" (63).

Clement Scott, one of Ibsen's bitterest opponents attacks *A Doll House* in the moral grounds. He blames Nora as a restless, frivolous, cruel and undesirable companion and mother to Helmer and children respectively. He argues:

She, a loving, affectionate woman, forgets all about the eight years' happy married life, forgets the nest of the little bird, forgets her duty, instinct as a mother, forgets the three innocent children who asleep in the next room, forgets her responsibilities, and does a thing that one of the lower animals would not do. (21)

The quotation vividly shows that the critique is very patriarchal because it tries to ensnare Nora to be subservient domestic labor by forwarding the very patriarchal images of a woman as a mother and wife.

D.C.R.A. Gononetillke casts his view on *A Doll House* as a Marxist Feminist; but he simply talks about Helmer's superiority due to his consideration of economic power in his hand. The critic has simply incited the issue but has not elaborated it in detail. Only in the beginning two paragraphs, he has just introduced that the drama is preoccupied with the work and money, leading to a reduction of values from a moral to a material plane. He presents his argument as: "To him the man is the superior being, holding the economic reins and there by concentrating in his hands all power and responsibility in the household, making the women his slave" (723). But he further does not discuss on this matter like how Nora is made slave and where this issue can be applied. He simply discussed Nora's journey from unawareness to awareness in remaining paragraphs. So the present researcher wants to go detail in this matter.

Similarly, George Bernard Shaw explored feminist issue as the core of *A Doll House*. He casted eagle eye on character development of Nora from unaware to awareness with the epiphany of her husband's role. Regarding Nora's disillusionment; he says:

Then she sees their whole family life has been a fiction; their home a mere doll's house in which they have been playing at ideal husband and father, wife and mother. So, she leaves him then and there and goes out into the real world to find out its reality for herself, and to gain some position not fundamentally false refusing to see her children again until she is fit to be in charge of them. (Quintessence 66)

Thus Shaw has clarified that the notion of family life, and wife and mother is only imposition to female to confine and make her subjugated to male. If female is disillusioned from this, she will realize her individuality.

Magic Humm states that each and every event is the result of the circumstances which obliged Nora to leave her children and husband's house. To him Events in *A Doll House* are stimulated into activity by the forged events spring from the past causation: all continue through time. Man is not simply in situation. He is only in the respect that is just emerging out of one situation in another.

Raymond Williams also regards *A Doll House* as a social drama with the excitement of feminism. He argues:

A Doll's House is now, as it has always been, a social rather than a Literary phenomena. Its excitement lies in its relation to feminism, and, although Ibsen rejects the ascription of supports for feminism, in practical terms this hardly to matter. (75-76)

Similarly, in George Bernard Shaw's drama, *Man and Superman*, various critics have shed tremendous spotlight. Most of the critics have explored that Shaw's philosophy of Life Force has guided the whole story of the drama. Regarding this issue Desmond McCarthy critiques on Shaw's *Man and Superman* as:

Man and Superman remains a central exposition of Shaw's philosophy. This was the first time that his evolutionary religion, his conception of the life force as a will-striving through the mind and instincts of man to become a conscious of it, was set forth. (32)

Harrison also adds that every woman is not Ann, but Ann is every woman. With this statement, he has declared that Ann is a kind of break from other traditional woman but she is not an exception as she is also guided by the instinct of woman but differently from other. Archibald Henderson also explores Life Force in human being. He states that "in the last act Ann achieves her object, despite Tanner's struggle: the play ends with the announcement of their impending marriage and Tanner's submission to the Life Force" (611). Nicolas Green also critiques Shaw's Life Force based on Schopenhauer's will; but his positive evolutionary character was shaped by Samuel Butler and its ultimate goal was the Nietzschean Superman.

Likewise, G.K. Chesterton also explores Life Force working in drama and he further gives the female superior position that in marriage woman is more conscious than male. To quote him:

[T]he play *Man and Superman* has two main philosophic motives: one, the first is that what he calls the Life Force which desires above all things to made suitable marriage to produce a purer and prouder race or eventually to produce superman. The second one is that in this

effecting of racial marriages the woman is more conscious agent than the man. (208)

In this way, Chesterton shows philosophy of how to produce excellent generation and who is more active and conscious in this matter. Here, Ann's obstinate nature to get Tanner as a husband is proved.

R.N. Roy has analyzed *Man and Superman* through the perspective of Darwin's theory of creative evolution. He says that essence of Shaw's views on Life Force, and creative Evolution is to be found in *Man and Superman* and *Back to Methuselah*. Darwin and Lemark have both influenced Shaw, but at a stage there was a parting of ways.

Nobody has viewed the drama *Man and Superman* with the perspective of Marxist Feminism. Bernard Shaw, himself, is a Marxist as well as feminist thinker. So *Man and Superman* cannot be devoid of the influence of this thinking. The present research compares and contrasts Shaw's thinking regarding females question in capitalist society with his Guru Ibsen in their masterpieces *Man and Superman* and *A Doll House* respectively. Similarly, it also explores the gap of the period in the same thinkers regarding female's issue. Henric Ibsen was born in 1828 Norway whereas George Bernard Shaw was born in 1856, Dublin, Ireland 50 years later Ibsen. So, Ibsen is the propounder of feminism in his drama and Bernard Shaw is the full practioner of feminism because females of *A Doll House* females are presented to realize and seek their individual identity by rebelling against capitalist patriarchy whereas in *Man and Superman* females are presented to achieve their individuality in capitalist society. Nora has begun her first step for woman's emancipation and it is Ann who is able to reach the peak.

This research work has been organized into four chapters. The first chapter provides an introductory infra-structure of the research including the goal of research, literary review of the texts and the importance of the present perspective in these dramas.

The second chapter is developed with theoretical modality that is applied in this research. First few paragraphs of this chapter introduce the feminism and remaining paragraphs elaborate what is Marxist Feminism; its emergence, propounders and definitions by various theorists in their texts. The third chapter provides the textual analysis of *A Doll House* and *Man and Superman*. In the former few paragraphs, statement of the problem in the texts can be read, then the hypothesis of the research with the brief introduction of the necessity of the application of Marxist Feminism in the dramas. In remaining paragraphs textual evidences are given with textual quotation to prove hypothesis by comparing and contrasting both of the dramas. The last fourth chapter is the conclusion of the entire study. It has presented the textual analysis in core form.

II. Marxist Feminism as an Interrogation to Dominant Capitalist-Patriarchal

Ideologies

Feminism is socio-economic, political and literary movement clamored to establish equality of women with men in the celebration of all human rights—moral, social, religious, political, educational, legal, economic, and many others by dismantling the long rooted patriarchal social norms and values. It is a commitment to eradicate gender discrimination so that to establish a healthy society for both men and women. *The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology* defines feminism as a doctrine suggesting that women are systematically disadvantaged in modern society and advocating equal opportunities for men. The major aim of feminist movement is to empower women for self judgment, so that, they can develop personalities. After long pervading patriarchy, the consciousness in women for their rights, and liberty from phallic oppression and suppression is named feminism. All women, who struggled against patriarchy for their dignified womanhood, were generally called feminists.

Feminism is a campaign to question the domination of women in many fields via different perspectives. So, feminism is an umbrella term which includes not only physical suffering and torture of women by men, but also exposes how women are obliged to be suffered and confined psychologically due to hegemonic cultural, economic, mythic, religious, biological, social stereotypes created by male. As a result, feminist approach is applied in every units of social network such as, literature, religion, politics, cultural and social practices woven by males on the favor of them from the beginning of civilization. Therefore, there are many perspectives in single term feminism. But whatever the perspectives may be all raise the issue of domination and confinement of female in patriarchal society and the way of liberation.

Rosemarie Tong on this issue, states that

[F]eminism is not one, but many, theories or perspectives and that each feminist theory or perspective attempts to describe women's oppression, to explain its causes and consequences, and to describe strategies for women's liberation. Feminist theorists are able to identify their approach as essentially liberal, Marxist, radical, psychoanalytic, socialist, existentialist, or postmodern. (1)

As literature is the mirror of society, the feminist approach in literary work is first appeared as a ground for political revolution against patriarchal dominance in society. Feminist criticism is a distinctive approach to literature which unfolds the cultural, economic and educational disabilities of women within patriarchal society that have hindered women from realizing their productive and creative possibilities. To prove this, Virginia Woolf shows Jane Austen's plight, "Jane Austen hid her manuscripts or covered them with a piece of blotting paper" (Woolf 821). Patriarchy is so pervasive that it mocks women's work of writing as incomplete, insufficient, straightforward, emotional and inartistic. So women have to hide while writing. Even without freedom of mind, women are able to write genius work. To prove this argument, Woolf gives the example of Jane Austen:

To Jane Austen, there was something discreditable in writing *Pride and Prejudice* have been a better novel if Jane Austen had not thought it necessary to hide her manuscript from visitors? I read a page or two to see; but I could not find any signs that her Circumstances had harmed her work in the slightest. That, perhaps, Was the chief miracle about it? (821)

By critical reading on Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*, Woolf proved that women are more genuine than men because they can show their intellectuality without being

deviated even in confined situation where male are in full freedom. In patriarchal system, only males' literary works are canonized where females' works are neglected. Females are discouraged to write so that patriarchy could rule over female by keeping them in ignorance forever. Feminists claim that the gender role in social system is not natural or biological but it is cultural– it is imposed by phallic ideologies stereotyping women as irrational, incompetent, gossipy, silly, stupid, petty, dishonest, over-sexed, and a host of other's ugly things: "I am man; she is woman. I am strong; she is weak. I am tough; she is tender. I am self sufficient; she is needful" (Ruthven 54). Such misogynous stereotypes culminate in the attitude that women must be dominated, controlled and subdued as well as abused. As mind does not know sex, females are not feminine by birth but they are made. Mary Wollstonecraft gives a view on this subject as:

Women subjected by ignorance to their sensations, and only taught to look for happiness in love, refine on sensual feelings, and adopt metaphysical notions respecting that passion, which lead them shamefully to neglect the duties of life, and frequently in the midst of these sublime refinements they plump into actual vice. (398)

Thus Wollstonecraft claims that the environment is created to subjugate women to their sensation which is the cause to be weak in their intellectuality.

Feminist criticism takes women and their situation as central to political analysis. Its central goal is to ask why in, virtually, all known societies' men appear to have power over women, and how this can be changed. It is, therefore, engaged to challenge and change society. So the target of feminist reading is not to gain abstract knowledge but the knowledge can be used to guide feminist political practice. Nature of inequality, gender politics, power relations and sexuality are the main concern to

understand for feminist criticism. So, discrimination, stereotyping, objectification, oppression on women are the themes explored in feminist reading of canonical texts. It shows, feminism is a voice against the inadequacy, the distortion as well as the ideologies which males have created. Feminism as “the movement for women’s liberation is a part of the creation of a new society in which there are no forms of domination” (qtd. in Bryson 257). The feminist campaign of literary criticism concentrates with the representation of women in literature and position of women in society.

The primary strain of movement is to liberate women from oppressive restraints especially the cultural restraint of society which fixes the women’s identity within narrow boundaries of male dominated canon. Some feminists seek equal status as the male in society in every discipline; whereas, there are some other feminists who take male as their enemy of their rights and freedom. So they want their own separate individual existence of identity not the identity given by males, so that they can create female subculture. Elaine Showalter created gynocriticism which have only concerns of females’ experiences. It does not concern about what males have done but only females experiences are studied in female’s models and theories: “Gynocritics must also take into account the different velocities and curves of political, social and personal histories in determining women’s literary choices and careers” (1258). Showalter has divided the writing of females into three phases: feminine (1840-1880), feminist (1880-1920) and female (1920 onwards). According to her, during the feminine phase, women wrote in an effort to equal the intellectual achievements of the male culture, and internalized its assumptions about female nature. Next, during feminist phase, women are historically enabled to reject the accommodation postures of femininity and to use literature to dramatize the ordeals of wronged womanhood.

They are guided by personal sense of injustice. Likewise, in female phase women reject both imitation and protest and turn instead to female experience as the source of an autonomous art, extending to the feminist analysis of culture to the forms and techniques of literature.

There is a huge debate regarding the beginning of feminism. Some argue that feminist criticism began with Mary Wollstonecraft at the end of eighteenth century. At the same time others argue that it already began from medieval time. Valerie Bryson argues that feminist theory did not begin with Mary Wollstonecraft at the end of the eighteenth century, but goes back at least to medieval times because women's voices were beginning to be heard from the fifteenth century. The first women to write about the rights and duties of female sex seem to her to have been the French-woman Christine de Pisan.

M.H Abrahams gives his view on the debate that the explosion of feminist writing began since 1969 as a distinctive and concerted approach to literature. He has given the cause as:

Behind it, however, lie two centuries of struggle for the recognition of women's cultural roles and achievements, for women's social and political rights, marked by such books as Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792), John Stuart Mill's *The Subjugation of Women* (1869), and the American Margaret Fuller's *Woman in the Nineteenth Century* (1845).

By studying so many books, he has concluded that feminist campaign moved two centuries to claim women's role in society is male subjugated and it is necessary for them to demand social and political rights as a human being.

Ferguson claims the first secular feminist Protestants to those women who for the first time challenged received ideas about their sex in pamphlets and in books. Some of these were published anonymously, but among these writers, the best known are Aphra Benn, and Mary Astell, who has recently been described as The First English Feminist as well as the first systematic feminist theoretician in the West.

Whatever view about feminism, the term, Feminist, according to Bryson, first came into use in English during the 1880s indicating support for women's equal legal and political rights with men.

Marxist feminism is one of the varieties of feminist perspectives that states class plays better account of role in women's oppression. Socialist feminists argue that gender and class play role in women's oppression. What distinguishes socialist feminism from Marxist feminism is that Marxist feminists believe class is core cause of women's oppression. Marxist feminists invite every woman, whether proletarian or bourgeois, to understand women's oppression as the product of political, social, and economic structures associated with capitalism. Marxist feminists focus on dismissing of capitalism as a way to liberate women because capitalism gives raise to economic confusion which is determinants of unhealthy relation between men and women. Marxist Feminism helps us to understand "[h]ow economic forces have been manipulated by patriarchal law and custom to keep women economically, politically, and socially oppressed as an underclass" (Tyson 93). To cut the matter short, a central tenet of all forms of Marxist feminism is the belief that women's situation cannot be understood in isolation from its socio-economic context. Any meaningful improvement in the lives of women requires this context be changed.

Marxist feminists see gender inequality as determined ultimately by the capitalist mode of production because in capitalist societies, people's capacities, needs

and interests are seen to be determined by the mode of production that characterizes the society they inhabit. For them, gender oppression is class oppression and subordination of women is considered as a form of class oppression maintained by capitalism as it has done to racism providing advantage to the capital and ruling class interests. So, Marxist feminism demands communism to end patriarchal domination. As the classless society emerges the class discrimination and gender discrimination will be diminished because in classless society all people become equal due to the equal distribution of property in everybody's hands. Only in such society women get their proper place and equality. In this context, K.K Ruthven argues:

Marxism identifies capitalism (and the modes of production which support it) as a material base of a class system which is the 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)

As per the above Marxist theory, there are two classes: the class of haves and the class of haves not. The class of haves always dominate and exploit the class of haves not. Males are the class of haves as they work outside wage job whereas females work inside home which is unpaid work. As a result, females have to be dependent on males economically that is the stimuli of women's oppression. Economic dependence of female on male is taken as a main factor of female's oppression. If women are employed in productive activities they can be liberated from the male dominance. There are Marxist feminists "who share the sanguine hope that the total absorption of women into productive labor will provide ultimately for their complete emancipation" (Elshtain 256). Until and unless women are not empowered economically, it is impossible to emancipate them from patriarchy as per Marxist feminists. But women

are always confined inside private job of household which is not paid nor publicized. These unpaid and unpublicized jobs are labeled as unproductive and petty by capitalists. Benston further argues:

Equal access to jobs outside the home, while one of the preconditions for women's liberation will not in itself be sufficient to give equality for women; as long as work in the home remains a matter of private production and is the responsibility of women, they will simply carry a double work-load. (Qtd. in Tong 53)

If the household activities and child rearing are publicized, women's economic power can be raised because all times household work is the responsibility of woman, women cannot manage double load of working inside home and to be involved in productive work force outside public place if they are provided opportunities.

Similarly, Dalla Costa and Selma James claim that women's work is productive not only in the colloquial sense of useful but in the strict Marxist sense of creating surplus value. In their argument, no woman has to enter the productive workforce, for all women are already in it because women's work in home is necessary condition for all other labor that creates surplus value. If women do not work for them in home, they cannot give full time in creating surplus value. By providing current (and future) "workers not only with food and clothes, but also with emotional and domestic comfort, women keep the cogs of the capitalist machine running" (Tong 54). But this fact is either unrecognized or neglected.

Capitalism has created stereotypical image of women as weak, vulnerable, less witted creature who cannot work outside home in competition so that it can serve its interests to expand its empire. In fact women are doing productive and skilled job for capitalism being confined inside home unpaid. They are producing future workforce

for capitalism by proper care of the baby workforce. Likewise, they are empowering present workforce by providing them good environment of food, cloth, affection and love in the home. So to continue this, capitalism created ideology that women's work is unskilled to be paid. Women do not get their proper place because of being women:

Women are not paid less simply because they are unskilled, but because working class men have succeeded in protecting their own interest at women's expense; they have been able to do this because dominant attitude label any work done by women as inherently inferior to that done by men. (Bryson 241)

The above quotation shows labeling women's work 'inferior', male always makes woman economically dependent on him to control over her, so that, he can use her as he wants and benefit according to his will. Actually, from this exploitation, capitalist is getting benefited. Therefore, some of the Marxist feminists ask for wage for their household activities from the production of factory or surplus value. This means, state should pay for housework of women. Tong brings this Marxist feminist 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). According to the advocates of the Wages for Housework Campaign, the house wives should strike if the state refuses to pay wages for their household.

Although there is no concrete capitalist law mandating that the person who draws out of the work force should be female rather than male, almost the women will stay at home if the work to be done there is both time consuming and costly. This state of affair has the cause; as women's wages are generally lower than men's

wages, and historically, the exigencies of biological reproduction were such that women often had to leave work as a result of stresses and strains caused by multiple pregnancies and caring for newborn infants. The best way to destroy this vicious cycle is, in the opinion of many Marxist feminists, to pay women as well as men the wage that would permit all workers, regardless of gender, to work full time without either men or women being doomed to the double day. Some feminists probe the question: do all women have a single class? Holmstrom saw significant differences between the ways in which working-class women are oppressed and the ways in which middle and upper-class women are oppressed. She states that the working class women in comparison to middle class or upper class women “have less reproductive freedom in that they have less access to abortion, contraception and child care, and are also more subject to sexual abuse on the job and in the streets” (qtd. in Tong 57). Similarly, Rosa Luxemburg also sees the differences between working class women and middle or upper class women: “Bourgeois woman of her time is a parasite of a parasite but fails to consider her commonality with the proletarian woman who is the slave of a slave” (MacKinnon 68). On the other hand, Black women have different experiences of agonies as they are doubly marginalized by the patriarchy as well as racism. This all shows there should be different classes of women. But some Marxist feminists like, Dalla Costa and James opined that, to the extent she serves men, each and every woman belongs to the unitary housewife class. Similarly, Benston characterizes women as the class of people who produce simple use values for home consumption. These Marxist feminists argument shows that there should be a single class of women because all women whether upper class or lower class, or Black have common problems: they are oppressed by their husbands due to their financial dependence on them.

The state policy of private property made all women, whether proletariat or bourgeois or black, have nothing to own. This system of private property made women exploit on the hands of male as males are using women as a mean to transfer private property from generation to generation by confining them in monogamous system of marriage. As per Engels, the sole purpose of the institution of monogamy is to serve as a vehicle for the orderly transfer of a father's private property to his children. Male dominance, first in the form of patrilineage and then of patriarchy, is simply the result of the class division between the propertied man and propertyless women. Only the elimination of class society-of women's economic dependence on men-will allow men and women to enter marriage based love. The first presupposition for the emancipation of women is the socialization of household and child rearing. On the other hand, most women's domestic experiences bear enough similarities to motivate unifying struggles such as the Wages for Housework Campaign. By struggling to have domestic work recognized as a real work, many women have gained a consciousness of themselves as a class of workers, labeling on false consciousness that calls it inappropriate to view wifely and motherly duties as work, merely because they are done out of love.

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 surrounding. Selling oneself, whether as a wife or a prostitute, alienates one from one's work because that work is being done for another, not for oneself. So under capitalism, a woman's sexuality becomes a commodity. It also refers inequality of wealth is the cause of prostitution. There is no place for women's sexual desire to society. If a husband or a boyfriend wants to have sexual relation then that is desire of

wife/girlfriend also. In this way, woman is alienated from sex. Tong brings the concept of Marx and Engels to state,

Marriage is a form of prostitution, Marx and Engels implicitly accepted that the services that can be prostituted are not limited to sexual service. Child care and emotional support are also services sold by the prostitute-wife. (64)

In this way they try to prove women alienated from children as the children grows up father modes him what he wants. If the child is male, he starts to control her mother. Therefore, in patriarchal society husband-wife relation is like 'pimp-prostitute religion, which is similar to the bourgeoisie-proletariat or employer employee relationship. Males have constrained women in monogamous system of marriage only to conform their own generation to transfer their inheritance.

Women are alienated from surrounding, as what kind of suffering they are undergoing, they assume, is the cause of surrounding environment. Thus the whole female race is suffering under capitalist patriarchy via monogamous marriage system, private property system, unpaid domestic work system, which has caused alienation, fragmentation and disjunction to them. Tong concludes: "One of the primary tasks of Marxist feminism is to create the kind of world in which women will experience themselves as whole persons, as integrated rather than fragmented, or splintered, beings" (45).

Marxist believes that it is not the consciousness of man that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. They forward the idea that "[w]hat makes us human is that we produce our means of subsistence. We are what we are because of what we do- specifically, what we do to meet our basic need in productive activities" (Tong 39). This indicates woman's position is

determined by how much contribution she has done on productive work force; and how her work is taken in capitalist system. Friedrich Engels wrote *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* (1845), in which he showed how changes in the material conditions of people affect the organization of their family relation.

According to him, before the origin of private property in primitive time, women and men are free to each other sexually. Gradually, various kinds of blood relations were excluded which resulted very few women in tribal group is available for marriage that gave birth forcible claim by individual man on women as their private possession. As a result, the pairing family, in which one man is married to one woman, came into existence. This rape like act was not sign of women's subordination but women had vital role in producing the material goods (for example, bedding, clothing, cooking ware, tools) that could be passed on to future generations. So Engels concluded that early pairing family was matrilineal as well as matriarchal for mother had dominant role in family and society economically, politically. Whatever status woman had in times past, her position in the household derived from the primitive center of production.

Only after site of production changed, women loose her position. The domestication of animals and the breeding of herds led to an entirely new source of wealth for the human community because men were in control of the tribe's animals. Thus the relative power of men and women shifted in favor of men, as they were able to meet the tribe's milk and meat needs by raising not only enough animals but an actual surplus. In this way, production outside the household began to outstrip production within it. The traditional sexual division of labor between men and women, which had supposedly arisen out of the physiological differences between the sexes-specially, the sex act- took on a new social meanings. As men's work and

production grew in importance, not only did the value of women's work and production decrease; so, too, did their status within society. Suddenly men wanted their own children to get their possession; they exerted enormous pressure to convert society from a matrilineal one into a patriarchal one. Having produced and staked a claim to wealth, man took control of the household reducing women to the slave to his carnal desire, and a mere instrument for the production of his children. In this new familial order, the husband rules by virtue of his economic power, which led Engels to say the husband bourgeois and the wife proletariat.

Thus the emergence of private property degrades the women's household activities along with women's position. Zetkin as Marxist feminist emphasizes to talk about private property while analyzing women's issues: "All roads 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 foundation, private property" (qtd. in Bryson 125). The private job of women inside home benefits the males or capitalists because it is unpaid job which provides foundation for labor of factory by providing food, clothes, love and affection, etc. Women spend their whole life in household and child rearing which is fundamental work in society but looked down as an ordinary job by males. If domestic work and child rearing can be made as a communal or collective job, it would benefit women. Some of the Marxists raise the voice that household and child rearing are inevitable works for women in society. So women should not try to avoid these works to improve their economic position rather these household drudgery should be collectivized and paid so that the family structure will not be disturbed, for a child always needs motherly instincts. Kollontai, though, proposes communal child rearing to save the women from the sacrifice of everything in the name of motherhood, had not intention of forcible removal of children from

their mothers. Indeed she stressed the importance of the maternal instinct and the joys of motherhood that could be experienced once the drudgery, poverty and ill-health that surrounded it were removed. If the women leave household and child rearing on male's charge, capitalists will have to bear a number of losses: current labors who cannot manage to approach double day, and on the other hand, future labor power will not be as productive as mothers have produced.

Female's emancipation via socializing household drudgery is a demand of communism. Communal "child rearing would also mean that women would no longer have to sacrifice everything for motherhood" (Bryson 141). Communism provides both the material conditions and the sense of shared responsibility and affection that make collective childcare possible. Collective childcare promotes the values that will enable communist economic relations to work. It also allows women to enter social production, where they learn the good socialist values that they can feed back to their children. Soviet Power sees maternity as a social task. In communist society, there would no need for abortion. A pregnant woman must, as a responsible member of society, care for her fetus by looking after her own health, for in these months she no longer belongs to herself. She is serving the collective, producing from her own flesh and blood a new social unit of labor. To prove this the following lines can be cited,

Official Soviet line now emphasized natural differences rather than equality between men and women and argued that, both for their own benefit and for that of society as a whole, women should be enabled to fulfill themselves in the traditional roles of mother, wife and homemaker. (Bryson 233)

Marxist analysis of class has provided feminists with some of the conceptual tools necessary to understand women's oppression. Marx observed that every political

economy contains the seeds of its own destruction. To this, capitalism is no exception. Within capitalism, there are enough internal contradictions to generate a class division so severe that it will overwhelm the very system that produced it. These classes become conscious of themselves; class struggle inevitably ensues and ultimately topples the system that produced these very classes. Tong suggests: “If the state refuses to pay housewives wages, then housewives should strike” (55). Housewives can strike by refusing the order of their male counterparts. A woman can divorce her husband to refuse the extra work she has to bear for her husband. She protests large family work by using contraception or abortion. A nurse, a teacher or a secretary can say ‘no’ for extra work to do. Such rebellions by the women can change the system on their side.

Capitalism is a system of power relations as well as exchange relations. When capitalism is viewed as a system of exchange relations, it is described as commodity or market society in which everything including one’s labor power has a price and all transactions are fundamentally exchange transactions. Every kind of transactional relation is fundamentally exploitative and capitalism is a system of voluntary exchange relations as “workers are free to contract with employer only in the sense that no one is holding a gun to their heads as they sign on the dotted line” (Tong 42). But this so called freedom is conditioned or negated by the fact that because worker must work to those who own the means of productions. Thus Marxist feminists have also agreed that capitalism is not only exchange relations, but also power relations. The power is always on the side of bourgeois as they own the means of productions. Catharine Mackinnon argues that “[c]apitalist countries value women in terms of their merit by male standards” (MacKinnon 69). In this system, though, individual labor seems free to choose but in underlying level s/he is coerced by the

system to choose. Though prostitution and surrogate motherhood are seen as exercises of free choice for capitalists, but there are no options to females in market value of capitalism. Women are coerced to fall in prostitution as they have nothing else of comparable value to sell in the marketplace: "When a woman chooses to sell her sexual or reproductive services only because she has nothing else of comparable value to sell in the marketplace, chances are that her choices is more coerced than free" (Tong 42).

The question of female's oppression in socio-economic context was identified in Marxist approach in early nineteenth century. Engels, Babel and Zetkins are the precursors of Marxist feminism. Although the fathers of Marxism have not taken women's oppression as seriously as labors exploitation, some Marxists offered the explanation of women's exploitation. Engels wrote *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State* (1845) in which he showed how changes in the material conditions of people affect the family relation and organization: "The subjugation of woman to man did not exist in premonogamous, preprivate property familial modes" (Bethke 258). He argued that in primitive time women have dominant role in the family as they are the producer of food, cloth and affections to their family. At that time these works of females were considered valuable, that resulted their better position in family and society. So, the then system of society was matriarchal and matrilineal. In the course of time, the value of work went on males domestication of animals which became source of economy to provide basic needs in family. This made male in power and the society changed into patriarchal. Man took control of family by his economic power which gave birth private property in which man became property owner and women became propertyless. For him, the oppression of women is due to class society-of women's economic dependence on men. The

solution of this oppression is “the reintroduction of the entire female sex into public industry” (Tong 49).

Valerie Bryson forwards the argument that Babel’s *Woman under Socialism* was the single most important work in establishing the official party line on women’s question. She sees Babel’s analysis had much in common with Engels’. They shared the basic idea that women’s oppression is caused by class society that will only be eradicated after proletarian revolution brings socialist society in which female will have full economic independence, and domestic drudgery will be collectivized. Babel went beyond Engels by giving women’s issues centrality. He insisted that socialism could not succeed without active participation of women and the emancipation of humanity is impossible without social independence and equality of sex. Unlike Engels, he argued that under condition of capitalist competition a woman cannot earn as much as a man, for she is additionally worn down by domestic toil and restrictive effects of conventional female dress. For him, the solution for women could ultimately be to join the fight against capitalism. The proletarian man and woman must realize that they were both tugging at the same rope.

Clara Zetkin, the leading woman of European socialism, addressed the theoretical and practical problems involved in recruiting women to the socialist cause. She has insisted on the primacy of class over gender interests and denied that middle-class and proletarian women could ever share a common goal. She has extremely hostile to bourgeois women with their demands for improved education, employment prospects and legal status. For emancipation of proletariat women, she states that proletarian men and women must see each other not as oppressors and oppressed but as the comrades, fighting together for the common goal.

Nadezhda Krupskaya, in 1900, made first serious attempt to apply orthodox Marxism to the situation of Russian women in her pamphlet 'The Woman Worker'. She followed Engels, Babel and Zetkin in arguing that women's participation in the labor force was ultimately progressive and that liberation could only come about through participation in the class struggle. Lenin never prioritizes women's issues as political agenda. But, Trotsky claimed that such neglect of social and personal agendas of women's oppression shows a narrow concept of liberation. He saw changes within the home as central for the success of communism: "Freeing the mother means cutting the last umbilical cord linking the people with the dark and superstitious past" (Bryson 134).

Alexandra Kollontai was the person who made first serious attempt to extend Marxist analysis to question of sex, morality and family life. In October 1917, Kollontai became the first woman in modern history to hold cabinet office as Commissar of Social Welfare. Her first task was to complete the process by giving women full legal independence and equality within marriage, legalizing abortion. Ending illegitimacy within marriage, legalizing abortion, ending illegitimacy as a legal category and establishing the principle of equal pay Marxist feminism came into developed.

In this way, due to the unequal power relationship in capitalism, males are using females as if they are their possession by making them economically weak via different capitalist policies: private property system, monogamy system, labeling domestic work as unproductive, etc. Women are commoditized in capitalist patriarchy because male can buy women easily as capitalist can by labor. Women have become market thing in capitalist society because they don't own source of economy. So they have to be what males want them to live, for males own economy as capitalist own

means of production. So to emancipate women from this capitalist exploitation, they should be, at first, empowered economically.

III. Voice of Resistance against Capitalist Patriarchal Ideologies in *A Doll House* and *Man and Superman*

George Bernard Shaw's drama *Man and Superman* and Henric Ibsen's drama *A Doll House* explore the male oppression over female with the imposition of capitalist patriarchal ideologies. Males of both of the dramas have attempted to weaken females by creating the ideologies that ensure the females in male superiority. Helmer, the central male character in *A Doll House*, always treats Nora as a child wife as if she is no more than a pleasure giving stupid wife. He always tries to make her dependent on him by promoting her stupidity of spending money so that he can always possess her as a pleasure giving and children rearing commodity. Likewise, in *Man and Superman*, Roebuck Ramsden and John Tanner also tried to practice their male superiority by treating Annie Whitefield merely a woman who can not guard herself. Roebuck Ramsden attempts to control Annie Whitefield by imposing the ideology that Annie is merely a young and inexperienced woman who cannot think herself so that he can approve his guardianship. John Tanner practices his male superiority by inferiorizing Ann's intelligence as a nature of woman to trouble and entrap male into marriage as if marriage is a trap to male casted by female.

Nora and Ann's activities and principles are judged by patriarchy. Nora's notion of debt to save husband is disapproved in patriarchal court of Helmer. Similarly, Ann's attempt to get the husband of her choice is disapproved by Tanner as woman's devilish side of mind to entrap males. He never accepts Ann's intelligence and cleverness equal to male to adjust in capitalist society rather he stereotypes it a cunning woman's trick to entrap a capable man to get married him. He avoids marriage and repeatedly pinches Ann with the notion of woman so that he can have control over her by killing her vibrancy and intelligence. Such a suffocating male

superiority is challenged, resisted and subverted by female characters in both dramas. Nora proves herself as an intelligent wife who can save every penny and manage money to save her husband from terrible disease. Moreover, she disillusioned Helmer at the end that she also has self and a woman also needs her self identity which she can create without her husband's help. So her courageous abandonment of home and children is a resistance to capitalist patriarchy. Henric Ibsen is a feminist cum realist, so in his drama social problems are depicted but George Bernard Shaw is a realist as well as feminist. Therefore his female characters are more intellectual, stronger, revolutionary, determined and capitalistic. Annie Whitefield, the convincing heroin of George Bernard Shaw in his drama *Man and Superman* not only resists but subverts patriarchy that pursues woman. She takes subject position as a pursuer of male, Tanner, and becomes successful in her plan to get him as husband.

Capitalist patriarchal domination is apparent in Henric Ibsen's drama *A Doll House*. All the male characters have practiced their male superiority over females on the strength of capital on their hand and females have subjugated to males due to their economic dependency on them. Helmer, the provider of confined Nora, very much proudly, defines Nora's supposed expenditure nature: "Spendthrifts are sweet, but they use up a frightful amount of money. It's incredible what it costs a man to feed such birds" (446). This argument of Helmer indicates he is clever enough to maintain capitalist patriarchal position. On the one hand, he tries to keep Nora always dependent on him by naming her extravagancy sweet and in the same time, he does not hesitate to inferiorize and hurt her ego by indicating that only females spend frightful amount of money without meaning. He confidently shows his position as a owner of Nora as if Nora cannot feed herself and it is Helmer whom costs to feed her. Nora can resist such types of patriarchal pinch with her argument against him that she

is saving every penny; but she consents herself lark and squirrel and utters her resistive voice in very subjugated tone with the roundabout argument, “Hm, if you only knew what expenses we larks and squirrels have, Torvald” (446). With this argument, her inner wish is to show how economic she is but she cannot go against her husband’s stereotypical image to women as spendthrift because the very image is helping her to get more and more money from him. So, she has to be subjugated to him.

Helmer, Krogstad, and the off stage businessman have tried to restrain and make puppet to the female characters. They are freely practicing capitalist patriarchy because in Ibsen’s realistic representation of the society, it is working hegemonically. Women also get consented to be puppet and confined in the hands of males. Nora feels happy in the promotion of her husband in the bank:

Oh, we’re simply delighted, believe me! He’ll join the bank right after New Year’s and start getting a huge salary and lots of commissions. From now on we can live quite differently-just as we want. Oh, Kristine, I feel so light and happy! Won’t it be lovely to have stacks of money and not a care in the world? (448)

Her feeling of light and happy in the above argument indicates her preference to be Helmer’s plaything rather to go outside to work herself. She is shameful to be self dependent by working herself and finds no position in working herself: “Really, we have been in no position for me to go squandering. We’ve had to work, both of us” (448). She feels proud to squander husband’s money.

Similarly, this hegemonic capitalist patriarchy which has made Mrs. Linde be dependent on a male’s money rather to struggle herself for it is clarified in her argument of marrying rich businessman, “My mother was still alive, but bedridden

and helpless-and I had two younger brothers to look after. In all conscience, I didn't think I could turn him down" (4489). This dialogue indicates Mrs. Linde also prefers easy money marrying a rich businessman rather to work hard as a male does to support her family.

Whereas, Shaw's *Man and Superman* presents subtle capitalist patriarchy it is not working hegemonically but palimpsest of capitalist patriarchy can be explored after deep reading in Shaw's socialistic representation. Although, Shaw's male characters are influenced by his advocacy of socialism, they are not entirely purified from capitalist patriarchy. So, a suffocating and confusing voice can be heard in their ideas about females. Late Mr. Whitefield has protected patriarchy of confining women in the strength of his property by appointing guardians while Ann is no more a child. This issue is explored in Ramsden's argument,

[N]ow Tanner is a grown up man and Annie a grown woman. And her father is gone. We don't as yet know the exact terms of his will; but he often talked it over with me; and I have no more doubt than I have that you're sitting there that the will appoints me Annie's trustee and guardian" (8).

He would not appoint guardian if he had son of Ann's age. Her intellectuality and vibrancy are restricted with her father's stereotypification-she is simply a female. Similarly, Ramsden though believes in Ann's free thinking and decision he also censors her with his argument: "I quite intend that Annie's wishes shall be consulted in every reasonable way. But she is only a woman, and a young and inexperienced woman, at that" (15). Thus, Ramsden though advocates Ann's freedom in decision making, he, too, is preoccupied with the capitalist male's notion of female. So, Ann's wishes are barred with his tricky argument that she is only a young and inexperienced

woman. In fact, he tried to keep Ann in confusion with his double tongue to justify his hypocrisy of being socialistic man.

Tanner the latest philosopher of Shaw refuses the guardianship of Ann, “Ramsden: get me out of it somehow” (11). This rejection of guardianship is suggestive of his idea of woman’s emancipation. He counts Ann’s inner capacity equal to male:

Stand by her! What danger is she in? she has the law on her side; she has popular sentiment on her side; she has plenty of money and no conscience. All she wants with me is to load up her moral responsibilities on me, and do as she likes at the expense of my character. I cant control her; and she can compromise me as much as she likes. I might as well be her husband. (13)

With this reason, he approves that there is no need to stand by her as urged by Octavius. But still he is preoccupied with capitalist male’s ideology. On the one hand, he tries to emancipate Ann counting her law, popular sentiment, plenty of money, at the same time he attempts to weaken her economic position with the phrase money without conscience. He knows he cannot control her not because she is obstinate but she is economically strong. He charges Ann that she will load up all her moral responsibilities on him so that with this charge he can be superior as a male on whom Ann is dependent. Thus, he insults Ann throughout drama but never comes out of guardianship symbolizes his hypocrisy that at the core, he does not want Ann to live in freedom but to live in his control. This is clear when Ramsden urges him to “refuse to accept the guardianship” (13). Tanner escapes from the refusal very hypocritically blaming Ann: “Refuse, you might as well refuse to accept the embrace of a boa constrictor when once it gets round your neck” (13).

The palimpsest of capitalist patriarchy can be explored in Violet's case of pregnancy, too. Octavius, Ramsden and other characters attempted to practice continual capitalist patriarchal system in which a male always seeks rightful heir in monogamous marriage. All the characters are in great worry while Violet doesn't reveal the father of her pregnancy. Octavius and Ramsden are not absurd about Violet's so supposed adultery but they are worried who fathered it. As Violet reveals: "I have kept my marriage a secret for my husband's sake" (51). All are found in joyous mood after the knowledge of her marriage. Octavius feels inexpressible relief "You are married" (51). Mr. Ramsden, Miss Ramsden, Tanner and Octavius apology Violet for their mistreatment on her pregnancy. This shows, they are on the side of monogamous marriage system which is confinement to female and advantageous to male to get rightful heir. So, at the beginning, Ramsden and Octavius are obstinate to marry Violet with the so supposed scoundrel who has done sin in their eyes. This issue is clear while Octavius asks "But who is the man? He can make reparation by marrying her; and he shall, or he shall answer for it to me" (31). Ramsden also agrees with Octavius: "He shall, Octavius. There you speak like a man" (31). The argument to get marry Violet with the so called "heartless scoundrel" for Octavius and "[a] damned scoundrel" for Ramsden due to her pregnancy from him is very patriarchal (31). It is the practice of preserving monogamous marriage system where woman's happiness is not counted.

There is vivid depiction of transactional relationship between male and female in Ibsen's *A Doll House*. Helmer and Nora's relationship has exchange value for Nora gives emotional support and Helmer economic support. Nora looks after Helmer's children, manages household and gives sexual pleasure for that Helmer bears her extravagancy and provides her money as much as possible. Helmer insults

Nora in love making words: “Has the little spendthrift been out throwing money around again?” (446). He neither can fully love her nor can chide for her extravagancy because Nora is pleasure giving thing for him whom he bears for its pleasure. Nora also does not oppose Helmer’s insult rather subjugates more to him and pretends to be more squandering: “Oh, but Torvald, this year we really should let ourselves go a bit. It’s the first Christmas we haven’t had to economize” (446). Her pretension to be more squandering bearing Helmer’s insult is due to her economic urgency and Helmer is her only source of economy.

Nora and Helmer are not in healthy marital sexual relationship despite being husband and wife for Nora has to sell sexual service to her own husband to pay back secret loan for which she has no other option. Nora danced Tarantella madly even in her traumatic situation of Krogstad’s threatening. She is obliged to dance to keep Helmer away from the reading of letter. After dance Nora was so tired and worried that she was suffered from Helmer’s leech: “Torvald don’t look at me like that” (468). But Helmer is so patriarchal that he tries to involve her in sexual intercourse even without her consent “Go away Torvald! Leave me alone. I don’t want all this” (469). In response, Helmer is trying to suppress her emotionally to have monopoly on her as a husband: “What do you mean? Nora, you are teasing me. You will, wont you? Aren’t I your husband?” (469). In this dialogue Nor is found revolting through her rejection of Helmer’s presence while Helmer is found still trying to maintain his dominant role by claming himself as a husband as if being husband is itself proof of being superior.

Mrs. Linde, the confident of Nora also has transactional relationship with the rich businessman whom she married. He bartered her on the strength of money that she was extremely in need to support her sick mother and two young brothers. She

had to be a prostitute of her own husband because the businessman used her as a pleasure giving machine throughout his life. It is vivid from the conversation between Nora and Mrs. Linde about the relationship between them. Nora asks, after his death:

He left you nothing?

Mrs. Linde: No.

Nora: And no children?

Mrs. Linde: No.

Nora: Nothing at all, then?

Mrs. Linde: Not even a sense of loss. (447)

Leaving no children, no property and even no sense of loss means, he had consumed her as a prostitute. Their marital relationship is without emotional nexus but transactional nexus. The rich businessman just wanted her body and Mrs. Linde his Money.

Krogstad also commodifies Nora compelling her to be the mean of his job in the bank while Nora rejects his proposal: “It’s simply not in my power to help you” (453). With this threatening, he obliged Nora to confide her husband not to fire him from the job in the bank. For him Nora’s life is petty in front of his masculine social position. Even after hearing Nora’s condition of committing forgery which is wholly opposite to Helmer’s conscience he still claims Nora to do something for his job which is his pride. So, he again threatens her: “If I get shoved down a second time, you are going to keep me company” (455). For his reputation he staked Nora’s happiness.

Helmer loves Nora as long as she is advantageous to him as a pleasure giving wife. Nora’s blunders and tricks are counted as her love for husband while all is well with them. Helmer has nothing to do with the emotion of Nora because he doesn’t

care her love and sacrifice that saved his life from terrible disease but he only sees Nora the cause of moral loss in the society. In such a case Nora tries to justify: "I've loved you more than all this world" (170). But Helmer stops loving her and also misunderstands her love as a trick and false acting "Ah, none of your slippery tricks"(170). He assumes Nora merely a pleasure giving commodity. So in the critical situation of Nora, he starts to hate her as if she is commodity not a human being. Her pleasure giving words to Helmer at the beginning turns out to be slippery tricks immediately after her being out of usefulness.

We cannot see the vivid transactional relationship between male and female in *Man and Superman* unlike *A Doll House* but if we go consciously, there is also transactional relationship. Roebuck Ramsden is Ann's guardian because he has got some amount of money for it from Mr. Whitefield. This is expressed by Tanner while conversing to Ramsden: "He leaves you two thousand five hundred for your trouble" (14). There is no emotional attachment between Ann and Ramsden as Ann assumes him as her Granny.

Transactional nexus can be somehow found out between father and daughter if we become more conscious in the research. Mr. Whitefield is the ego of patriarchy. As per Tanner, Ann is a mature girl. It is clear from his rejection to stand by her, "What danger is she in? She has the law on her side; she has popular sentiment on her side; she has plenty of money and no conscience" (13). But her father has handed down Ann, the young enough girl, on the hand of Ramsden and Tanner for her proper protection which is a male ideology to weaken and confine female. Ann's obeying of her father: "My father's wishes are sacred to me" is simply because she is wholly dependent on her father's property throughout her life (22).

Tanner though doesn't like to be Ann's guardian who symbolizes emancipation of female but he remains her guardian. He doesn't have Whitefield's property: "He leaves me nothing but the charge of Ann's morals, on the ground that I have already more money than is good for me. That Shews he had his wits about him doesn't it?" (14). There may be patriarchal politics of not giving and taking property. Tanner may have not took property because he wants her follow his moral to make himself male superior that is only possible by making her dependent on his property. Mr. Whitefield, too, wanted his daughter to maintain a good marriage life with a rich man, Tanner. In capitalist patriarchy, a good marriage life is only then possible as a woman follows her husband. That may be the cause not to give property so that her daughter never thinks to go against her husband.

Similarly, Mr. Malone wishes his son to marry a poor girl: "His grandmother was a barefooted Irish girl that nursed me by a turf fire. Let him marry another such, and I will not stint her marriage portion" (168). He argues that he wants to marry a poor girl due to socialistic purpose: "There must be profit for someone" (168). Actually he wants servitude from economically dependent poor girl. In the gratitude of providing economical support, the girl can do whatever the provider wills. Mr. Malone's family is advantaged from a barefooted woman. So he again wants advantage by marrying a poor girl to Hector. It is also his hypocrisy to say that it is a socialistic purpose.

Capitalist patriarchal tendency of being superior, talent, and brave to protect and define women turns out to be hypocrisy in both of the dramas. In *A Doll House*, Helmer's going against Nora's expectation as a protector, lover and provider is broken out. When Nora is in great worry that Krogstad can do anything to harm their family tie, at that time Helmer has promised: "Whatever comes, you'll see: when it

really counts, I have strength and courage enough as a man to take on the whole weight myself” (460). From the quotation, Helmer has created ideologies that strength and courage belongs to man. So, he promises Nora to save from any kind of crisis. When the real time to show his strength of fighting against Krogstad’s blackmail and love Nora comes, Helmer proves himself very hypocrite because he turns out to be very coward to face the reality of forgery: “The thing has to be hushed up at any cost. And as for you and me, it’s got to seem like everything between us is just as it was- to the outside world, that is” (471). Such arguments of Helmer help to hush up Krogstad rather than to fight against it and to push their husband- wife relationship for showing which proves Helmer a hypocrite capitalist male who only promises female to grip her but never fulfills the promise.

Helmer also prefers Mrs. Linde, an economically helpless lady, as his bank employee to replace Krogstad. Helmer was displacing Krogstad to Mrs. Linde, not merely his incompetence in job and moral illness, but because he thought Krogstad, a lower ranked employee’s calling him by christen name insults his power position among bank employees as per reason firing Krogstad out,

And I hear he’s quite efficient on the job. But he was a crony of mine back in my teens- one of those rash friendships that crop up again and again to embarrass you later in life. Well, I might as well say it straight out: we’re on a first name basis. And that tactless fool makes no effort at all to hide it in front of others. Quite the contrary- he thinks that every other second, he comes booming out with his, ‘Yes, Torvald!’ And ‘Sure thing, Torvald!’ ‘I tell you, it’s been excruciating for me. He’s out to make my place in the bank unbearable’. (459)

This reason of firing Krogstad out exposes Helmer's hypocrisy. He was displacing Krogstad to Mrs. Linde on the official reason that he is morally degraded. In fact, he is taking revenge of childhood insults as well as showing himself powerful to his wife appointing her request. This situation is created mainly due to the competition between two capitalist males in marketplace. They have competitor-competitor relationship. But a female can superiorize a male because they have owner- labor relationship. So, with the expectation that Mrs. Linde, in the gratitude of providing job, will promote his boast of power position by adoring him in office which was not doing by Krogstad, he replaces him to her.

Helmer's hypocrisy can be marked in his giving money to Nora more than her demand even knowing that she is extravagant. He tries to prove himself very loving and caring husband by giving money and pitying her hard work outside:

Remember last Christmas? Three whole weeks before, you shut yourself in every evening till long after midnight, making flowers for Christmas tree, and all the decorations to surprise us. Ugh, that was the dullest time I have ever lived through. (447)

Apparently his pitying to Nora's work seems as if he is a loving and caring husband, but it is capitalist patriarchal tendency of Helmer to make Nora dependent on him so that he can utilize her as per his wish. His pity to Nora's working capacity is a bar not to be competent in handicraft so that she will never be competent to earn money. By the fact, he was himself the man to pity because he was overexerting to maintain financial crisis in home as Nora argues, "He needs to earn money. But that first year he drove himself terribly. He took on all kinds of extra work that kept him going morning and night" (448). He is male; therefore, he never wants to be weak by

showing himself as a man to sympathy. So he never thinks to decrease the overburden of overtime by letting Nora work outside.

Likewise, hypocrisy of male can be found everywhere in *Man and Superman*. At the beginning, Tanner avoids marriage with the pretension: "Marriage is me apostasy, profanation of the sanctuary of my soul, violation of my manhood, sale of my birthright, shameful surrender, ignominious capitulation, acceptance of defeat" (190). He avoids Ann's love in the ground that women are boa-constrictor in males' freedom. He pretends to be the man of moral passion: "Moral passion made our childish relations impossible" (42). With this reason, he tries to maintain guardian-ward relationship between him and Ann. He shows himself very moral who can't have affair with the ward. When Ann is following him, he pretends to avoid her so as to prove women are obsessive to marry or to fulfill Life Force. It is all his tactics to undermine women as inferior sexy as well as very dependent creature. At last, Ann begins to avoid him "Well, if you don't want to be married, you needn't be" (190). His hypocrisy comes out who answers Ann "I have a frightful feeling that I shall let myself be married because it is the world's will that you should have a husband" (190). He himself is in grip of Life-Force, but he charges Ann that he is marrying for her sake. It is Tanner's hypocrisy to defend from his own former utterance: "I haven't the slightest intention of marrying her" (185). In fact Tanner loves Ann and also wants marry but he pretends to avoid it for his freedom. He blames women as the bar in the male freedom. It is all his capitalist male vanity. Actually, he is escapist of marital responsibilities as a coward, but to hide this reality he charges females as a bar to his freedom. It is all clear from the conversation between Ann and Tanner at last. Ann tries to release herself from Tanner's grip with realization: "Well, I made a mistake: you do not love me" (190). Tanner confesses: "It is false: I love you. The

Life- Force enchants me: I have the whole world in my arms when I clasp you. But I am fighting for my freedom, for my honor, for my self, one and indivisible” (193).

Moreover, Tanner shows his capitalist masculinity: man is a protector and provider to women. It is dragged out in his argument:

Of course I am going to her. She wants help; she wants money; she wants respect and congratulation; she wants every chance for her child. She does not seem likely to get it from you. She shall from me. Where is she? (30)

Though Tanner thinks he is giving a chance to Violet for her freedom, but his utterance like this without knowledge of the real situation of Violet and her wish merely shows his ego as a capitalist male. He assumes himself as an institution from which women can get economic support, respect, congratulation more than that a kind of identity. Despite he insults Ann’s freedom of choice and application of intellectuality to get a choiced husband, he praises Violet’s freedom of so supposed adultery

We suddenly learn that she has turned from these silliness’s to the fulfillment of her highest purpose and greatest function- to increase, multiply, and replenish the earth. And instead of admiring her courage and rejoicing in her instinct; instead of crowning the completed womanhood and raising the triumphal strain of Unto us a child is born. Unto us a son is given, here you are- you who have been as merry as grigs in your mourning for the dead- all pulling long faces and looking as ashamed, and disgraced as if the girl had committed the vilest of crimes.” (30)

In this way, Tanner defends Violet's so seemed adultery as a courageous game, but he never admires Ann's intellectuality and courageous game to get her choiced husband simply because Violet is vulnerable as all other are against her. Tanner grab the opportunity of being superior to show the pity and help to the vulnerable lady where as Ann is in very strong position that he cannot overtake.

Formerly, Mr. Ramsden abuses Violet's so seemed adultery as a vilest crime and wants her out from his name. As tanner intends to help her, he also utters to help her: "I am ready to put down my last penny to save her from being driven to run to you for protection" (31). Both Ramsden and Tanner in the name of protection are competing to own Violet disregarding her own wish to exist themselves as superior capitalist males.

Similarly, Mr. Malone seems to give profit to poor class by marrying his son to a poverty ridden lady but in real sense, he wanted poor lady only to be advantaged from her service due to her dependency on his property. If he married Violet a middle class lady to his son his desire to be provider and protector couldn't be fulfilled. So, formerly, he rejects to accept Violet as his daughter in law. He turns out to be hypocrite as he accepts Violet as his daughter in law later finding her business sense and dependency on his property in Violet's urging: "You had better give me the remittance. He will want it for his hotel bill. I'll see whether I can induce him to accept it. Not now, of course, but presently" (176). As Violet accepts remittance, Mr. Malone gets opportunity to take back revenge of his son who has left him spitting his property. He gets back the insult by his son when she shows interest in his property. Therefore, he accepts her as a daughter in law.

Personal identity and individuality of woman is seized in *A Doll House* by verifying the women's laws and activities in the ground of masculine judgment. In

Nora's conscience, it is absolutely right to forge her father's signature for debt to save dying father to be informed of his son in law's terrible disease on the other to save husband's life who is against debt. For her forgery is not a crime if it is done on the condition to save father and husband's life. This law of Nora is questioned by Krogstad's patriarchal law: "Laws don't inquire into motives" (455). He further tries to drag her into court: "If I introduced this paper into court, you'll be judged according to law" (455). Nora forwards her counter argument: "This I refuse to believe. A daughter hasn't a right to protect her dying father from anxiety and care? A wife hasn't a right to save her husband's life?" (455). Thus Nora resists masculine law by pointing that they are fault as they don't see motive of forgery. It is more lawful to borrow money than to let her husband die in woman's law. So, she is very proud in her debt while expressing to Mrs. Linde: "I've also got something to be proud and happy for I am the one who saved Torvald's life" (449). Nora's pride is undercut by Helmer's argument about debt, "Because of that kind of atmosphere of lies infects the whole life of a home. Every breath the children take in is filled with the germs of something degenerate" (456). Due to such kind of judgment of Helmer Nora is so tortured that she even scares to touch own children when Annie Marie says: "The children are begging so hard to come into Mama" (457). She is so tortured that she rejects "No, no, no, don't let them into me! You stay with them, Annie Marie" (456).

Helmer calling Nora by the names "little lark", "squirrel" (445), "little spendthrift" (446), "my little songbird" (456), "my richest treasure" (468) unfolds commodification of Nora as if she has not a fixed identity as a human being. Her identity is put in verge of crisis by Helmer. Helmer's calling her by 'my' everywhere as if she has not her own personality, identity and individuality indicates his ownership on Nora or his possessive masculine behavior.

In Shaw's *Man and Superman*, the male characters are seen torturing females by seizing the individuality, their personality and identity by creating different capitalist patriarchal ideologies. Though the males are not oppressing females but they don't wish the females to follow in their own individual path. They have cast a kind of bar by verifying their activities with capitalist judgment. Tanner, the latest philosopher of Shaw is not an exception of capitalist male in his philosophy of females. When he feels Ann's superiority to pursue male, he does not accept her intellectuality, instead he gives her intellectuality a negative definition

You had acquired by instinct that damnable woman's trick of heaping obligation on a man of placing yourself so entirely and helplessly at his mercy that at last he dare not take a step without running to you for leave. (43)

He stereotypes Ann as a damnable woman which is wrong because it is man who makes woman damnable. He identifies female totally dependent on male with his argument that female heaps obligation on male. The vocabularies entirely and helplessly are suggestive of female's parasitic nexus to males and the term mercy is the indicative of male superiority over female.

Tanner also gives Ann animal's names like "boa constrictor" (13) and "tame elephant" (68). She is only the woman of male definition who is only the restrictor not an individual of her own feelings and common sense. He stereotypes Ann as a boa constrictor because for him Ann is going to do monopoly on him by restricting his freedom as a boa constrictor tightens its prey. He again calls Ann tame elephant simply for the very reason that a woman cannot use her own conscience but what they are taught. His argument with indignation to Miss. Ramsden "Cats would have more sense" indicates he stereotypes woman as suspicious creature (33). They suspect even

unnecessary matter. For him, Miss Ramsden is unnecessarily suspending Violet by keeping her inside housemaid's room.

Tanner judges Ann's practicality of marital life "Hypocrite" (192). Ann treats Octavius as a friend. She doesn't want to hurt him directly rejecting his proposal making activities. But Tanner thinks Ann a hypocrite who pretends to love Octavius as well as Tanner himself discarding their emotionality. For him, all women are hypocrite to male because they pretend. But, Ann defines the very hypocrisy from women's perspective,

You had better marry what you call a hypocrite, Jack. Women who are not hypocrites go about in rational dress and are insulted and get into all sorts of hot water. And then their husbands get dragged in too, and live in continual dread of fresh complications. Wouldn't you prefer a wife could depend on? (192)

This argument of Ann explores women are obliged to be hypocrite to maintain marital and family life because male are always in rational dress due to their self dependency. If women try to point out male law with rational dress, male cannot bear it, as a result, the warm relationship can be broken out. Therefore, this hypocrisy of women is due to male chauvinism. Females are hypocrite to maintain family life which is misjudged by Tanner as if hypocrisy is the instinct of women.

In capitalist patriarchy, females have to do body politics to fulfill their needs with the males. In *A Doll House*, Nora's position due to her dependency on Helmer is so vulnerable that she even cannot talk eye to eye to Helmer to ask money. She asks money "fumbling at his coat buttons, without looking at him" (446). In this way, she has to perform body politics to appeal her husband. She fumbles at his coat buttons for sexy touch. Without such types of activities, Helmer doesn't give money.

Similarly, Ann also uses body politics to show Tanner's consent of marrying her. As she asks violet if Tanner said anything when she fainted Violet responds no. Ann pretends to faint "Ah [With a sign of intense relief she relapses]" (195). Actually, she is not faint. She has pretended this all to lure Tanner to snatch her so that Tanner also may be weak to touch her. This is all vivid in conversation between them after Tanner "[Suddenly walking determinedly to her, and snatching her hand from Violet to feel her pulse] Why her pulse is positively bounding" (195). Then Ann responds him: "Yes: I feel strong enough now. But you very nearly killed me, Jack, for all that" (195). Thus after she shows the world how Tanner cares her, she confesses that she feels strong after his touch. Tanner is bound to snatch her as she faints otherwise he is hypocrite who never shows his love to Ann.

Male treatment of female as if they are their possessive thing can be explored in both of the dramas. In *Man and Superman* Mr. Whitefield has taken Ann as a pet animal because he has appointed guardians to look after her while she is young enough to take care herself. Tanner expresses who the guardians of Ann to Ramsden "You and I, man. I! I!! I!!! Both of us" (11). Likewise, Tanner also talks to Ramsden as if Ann, their ward is their possessive thing: "I mean our Ann, your Ann, Tavy's Ann, and now, Heaven help me, my Ann" (11). This argument clarifies Ann is simply a male possession. She has her no individuality. In the name of guardian Tanner is not fulfilling his duty but showing possessiveness.

In the same way, Helmer also shows his capitalist patriarchal possessive behavior to deal Nora. In every call he uses 'my' instead of calling her by her name. Helmer calls Nora: "Is that my little lark twittering out there?"(445). He has misidentified her and treated her as his commodity that can be used or named as per his whims. He again shows his love with possessive words: "Is that my squirrel

rummaging around” (445). He even shows his ownership while giving money to Nora: “Don’t deny it, my dear little Nora” (446). In every time of love or wooing, he uses the word ‘my’ to Nora so that he can show himself superior to protect her emotionally and economically. He even takes Nora’s body parts as his parts of commodity while convincing Nora not to eat macaroons: “My sweet tooth really didn’t make a little detour throughout the confectioner’s” (417). Thus Helmer is so possessive of Nora that he even didn’t want Nora to be ugly by damaging tooth eating macaroons. He trains her not to speak lie as if she doesn’t know what to speak or what not “[m]y little songbird must never do that again” (456). When he asks Nora Krogstad’s being there, Nora lies no. But Helmer has already seen him outside. So he asks Nora not to lie as per his principle because she is his songbird (possession) that should be follow his principles. Helmer becomes more possessive in the time of sex. He talks to Nora so possessively as if Nora is sexual pleasure giving thing which Helmer doesn’t want to share with other at any cost. When Helmer looks at her after dance so amorously that even Nora, her wife cannot bear “Torvald, don’t look at me like that” (668). This argument of Helmer clarifies that he has fear of Nora’s beauty whether she will sell to other people. So, to restrict her from doing so, he shows himself the owner of the Nora, the richest treasure.

Capitalist patriarchy has nothing to do with emotion of women; rather it only concerns to seek profit from women. Helmer never cares Nora’s love and sacrifice for him. He loves Nora till he gets profit (pleasure). As he is enlightened of his social position in auction due to Nora’s blunder of forgery, he only sees Nora the cause of loss of morality in society but does not try to see her greatness, love and care for him which she showed saving him from life taking disease with the very money of forgery. Nora loves Helmer more than the worldly rules, “It is true. I have loved you

more than all this world” (170). But Helmer is concerned with worldly pleasure from Nora but doesn't concern with Nora's emotionality, “Ah, none of your slippery tricks” (470). As long as Helmer was pleased with Nora's tricks, he takes it as a love. But as he no longer sees advantage from her, he defines her love as a trick.

Same is the case with Mr. Malone in *Man and Superman*. Mr. Malone has nothing to do with the emotions of Violet and Hector who are in love. He seeks profit even in love affair. As he sees the profit by dismantling the affair, he no more hesitates to break the affair. He neither concerns his son's happiness in front of profit “He will get over it all right enough. Men thrive better on disappointments in love than on disappointment in money” (169). Capitalist male, Mr. Malone assumes that emotion is the thing that can be bought. So, he is ready to sacrifice his son's love but not money. In the expectation of service from the poor girl, Malone is ready to break Hector and Violet's love affair.

Where there oppression, there is resistance, too. In both dramas not only males have oppressed females singularly but females also have resisted the oppression in some way. Though they have different purposes of resistance, they have challenged the capitalist patriarchy. In *A Doll House*, the resistance of female characters is more unconscious in comparison to *Man and Superman*. Females' activities which are unconsciously resisting patriarchal ideologies in *A Doll House* indicate the repression of resistive powering female. Helmer's patriarchal nature to possess even the body parts of female is resisted by Nora. Helmer has restricted to eat macaroons to save her teeth from being rotted. By shaking an admonitory finger, he asks Nora, “Surely my sweet tooth hasn't been running riot in town today, has she?” (446). But Nora lies “Here? No” (456). But Helmer has already met Krogstad outside. So he corrects Nora's lies, “Didn't you say that no one had been here? My little songbird must never

do that again. So songbird needs a clean beak to warble with. No false notes. That's the way it should be, isn't it" (456). Capitalist male always wish their wife to be loyal and truthful. So they have created the ideology to speak truth. The policy of this ideology is not to be cheated on the hand of Nora which is also a mean to have control over her forever. Nora lies not to go against her husband's idea of truth but to maintain husband- wife relationship for Helmer doesn't like Krogstad to be in home and on the other it is obligation of Nora to let Krogstad be into home.

Though, Nora forges her father's signature to borrow money for her husband's sake, she has gone against her husband's ideology "No debt! Never borrow! Something of freedom's lost- and something of beauty, too-from a home that's founded on borrowing and debt" (446). Anyway, she has resisted patriarchal law unconsciously. She has also resisted Helmer's patriarchal ideology of woman. When Nora argues to borrow money in the time of crisis Helmer understands it as a woman's immaturity "Nora, Nora, how like a woman" (446). This definition of women by men is resisted by Nora showing that women are also equally intellectual in business for she is able to manage secret money to take Helmer abroad for treatment.

Even though Nora resists capitalist patriarchy unconsciously at the beginning her resistive power previously in unconscious mind comes out in light suddenly at the end. At the beginning, her eating of macaroon, borrowing money, lying are done not to resist knowingly her husband's laws. At that time, her own confinement as well as commodification is not enlightened to her. But, at the end after the revelation of letter, Helmer only concerns his social position not her great sacrifice. He blames Nora: "Now you've wrecked all my happiness-ruined my whole future. Oh, it's awful to think of. I'm in a cheap little grafter's hands; he can do any thing he wants with me,

ask for anything, play with me like a puppet-and I can't breath a word. I'll bet swept down miserably into the depths on account of featherbrained woman" (470). Then Nora is full knowledge that her husband is simply using her as a commodity to get pleasure. After being saved from Krogstad Helmer argues that her father and himself have loved Nora more than anyone else. Then Nora responds "You never loved me, that's all" (471). Now she resists his false love very consciously being no more dupe. She breaks all the bonds of a wife and a mother by leaving home, husband and children.

After the disillusionment that Helmer does not love her but only pretends to love her to use her. Nora realizes weak at that time, that lack of education and economic dependency on father and husband is making her weak. She feels she is made doll by her father formerly and by her husband later: "I've been wronged greatly, Torvald-first by Papa and then by you" (472). So to resist this inhuman treatment, she determines to educate herself first: "There's another job I have to do first. I have to try to educate myself. You can't help me with that, I have got to do it alone. And that's why I'm leaving you now" (472). The argument shows that she is very conscious about her identity, selfhood as a human being. She wants to educate herself all alone without husband's help indicates she no more wants to learn capitalist patriarchal lesson to inferiorize women.

As Helmer request Nora to stay in his home till tomorrow, Nora resists her husband, "I can't spend the night in a strange man's room" (474). This dialogue of Nora shows her resistance against capitalist patriarchy which makes a woman a prostitute. Her estranging of Helmer means her identification of their relation as pimp prostitute. As Nora realizes Helmer doesn't love her but kept her in his home to fulfill

his selfish purpose of managing household, taking care of children and getting sexual pleasure at the very time Helmer's house is strange man's house for her.

Child rearing and domestic works are the main charges taken by Nora without wage which gives advantage to Helmer. Helmer has confined Nora in domestic work and child rearing which are unpaid job as a result he makes Nora financially dependent on him so as to rule her. Nora neither stays home nor takes charges of children: "Good bye, Torvald. I won't look in on the children" (474). This dialogue also shows her resistance against female confinement in home by child rearing and managing household. Nora's volcanic resistance will not let Helmer to realize how much oppressive he is. At first, she resisted her husband unknowingly, and at the end very knowingly: "I'm beginning to understand everything now" (470). After Helmer's promise to save Nora from any disaster turns out false, Nora understands her position as a doll in Helmer's house and starts to resist against it very consciously. It shows her journey from unconsciousness to consciousness. The subplot character Mrs. Linde's double marriage with businessman formerly and with Krogstad later indicates the resistance of monogamous marriage system of capitalist patriarchal ideology. It is clear from Nora's dialogue that Mrs. Linde is formerly married, "Poor Kristine you've become a widow" (447). Mrs. Linde holds the hand of Krogstad to get remarriage, "I need to have someone to care for, and your children need a mother. We both need each other. Nils I have faith that you're good at heart- I'll risk everything together with you" (467). This dialogue of Mrs. Linde shows that she is urging Krogstad to marry.

Mrs. Linde's counsel to Nora to unfold the secret business with Krogstad and Nora's consent to let Helmer read the letter from Krogstad indicates an important step of woman's union to fight for their right, liberty and emancipation in capitalist

patriarchal society. Mrs. Linde advises Nora, “You must tell your husband everything”(468). But Nora responds, “I won’t tell” (468). Again Mrs. Linde advises, “Then the letter will” (468). This advice of Mrs. Linde consents Nora, “Thanks Kristine. I know now what’s to be done” (468). This counsel of Mrs. Linde is the main cause of Nora’s enlightenment that Helmer doesn’t care Nora’s individuality only pretends to love her to get fun from the love. Nora becomes conscious of her identity and individuality after the knowledge of Helmer’s falsity that is revealed due to the very letter. This important union between Nora and Mrs. Linde to demand the right, liberty and emancipation is unconsciously made.

Whereas, in *Man and Superman*, we can see the conscious resistance against capitalist patriarchal ideologies. The female characters are conscious enough from the very beginning for their right, liberty, emancipation and equality. Annie Whitefield is very determined in her right to choose her husband from the very beginning. She goes against father and Ramsden who wants her to marry with Octavius. She is following Tanner from the very beginning. This is clear from following dialogue, “He asked me who I would have as my guardian before he made that will. I choose you” (192). Then Tanner asks, “The will is yours then! The trap was laid from the beginning” (192). Ann declares, “From the beginning-from our childhood-for both of us-by the Life Force” (192). Thus Ann has intention to pursue Tanner. Capitalist patriarchal father or guardian always seek economic, moral, social security to his daughter or ward from her husband. So, Octavius is perfect gentleman for Ann to marry as per their ideology. Mr. Whitefield wanted to marry Ann with Octavius. We can mean from Ramsden’s dialogue, “Well, he said he was glad, after all, you were not his son, because he thought that someday Annie and you- [Octavius blushes vividly]” (6). Mr. Whitefield was happy with Octavius of not being his son because he can marry Ann. Ramsden

also wanted Ann to marry with Octavius, therefore, he advised Octavius to win her heart: “ But when you win her on your own merits, it will be a great happiness to her to fulfill her father’s desire as well as her own” (7). Likewise Tanner also sees Octavius perfect for Ann to marry as Ann argues that the man of Octavius type cannot marry. Tanner praising Octavius asks, “What! A man who idolizes woman! Who sees nothing in nature but romantic scenery for love duets! Tavy, the chivalrous, the faithful, the tenderhearted and true! Tavy never marry” (191). He adores Octavius so much to woo Ann to marry him. But Ann celebrates her own choice and uses her own whims and intellectuality to choose her husband discarding her guardian’s capitalist patriarchal choice. Ann responds to Tanner: “All the same, Jack, Men like that always live in comfortable bachelor lodgings with broken hearts, and are adored by their landladies, and never get married. Men like you always get married” (191). She doesn’t like old fashioned poetic temperament in her husband. She is much updated girl. So she celebrates her right to use veto to reject the old fashioned capitalist patriarchal choice of husband, “Oh, it’s the same with women. The poetic temperament is a very nice temperament, very amiable, very harmless and poetic, I daresay; but it’s an old maid’s temperament” (191). Ann chooses Tanner as a suitor as per her whims not according to patriarchal ideology. She thinks Tanner is suitable person to be her husband rather than Octavius. Ann subverts the capitalist practice of making a female victim of male desire.

The most notable resistance by Ann to patriarchal society is that she, a female, becomes the pursuer of Tanner, a male. In patriarchal society, a male always makes a female victim of his desire by stereotyping her as a weak creature. Ramsden also have stereotyped the young girl Ann to impose his desire “What does she know about the real value of men at her age?” (7). He assumes being a female Ann cannot distinguish

the value of men. So he decides Octavius as her husband for he is his favorable man because he always adores him. Tanner also tries to impose his desire to marry Ann with Octavius so that he can escape from the wife who is more intelligent than him. They try to pursue Ann but Ann has subverted this patriarchal system. She, anyhow, entraps her preys, her father, Ramsden and Tanner, “He asked me who I would have as my guardian before he made that will. I chose you” (192). He at the end is enforced by Ann to express his love to her, “It is false: I love you. The Life Force enchants me: I have the whole world in my arms when I clasp you” (193). At the end Ann becomes victorious to overcome Tanner. Tanner himself have to accept this “Ann looks happy; but she is only triumphant, successful victorious” (196). Thus Tanner, being a male, cannot escape the grip of Ann. Ann, a female, makes Tanner, a male to surrender in front of her wish.

Violet, too, resisted the patriarchal ideology of marriage. Patriarchy always tries to interfere woman’s private matter by demanding clarification from her. Octavius and Ramsden try to find out who may be the father of Violet’s pregnancy. Octavius asks immediately after the knowledge of Violet’s so supposed illegal pregnancy “but who is the man? He can make reparation by marrying her; and he shall, or he shall answer for it to me” (31). Ramsden agrees Octavius, “He shall, Octavius. There you speak like a man” (31). This conversation between Ramsden and Octavius shows capitalist tendency to get marriage first and then pregnancy so that patriarchy cannot get rightful heir for the property. Violet resisted this capitalist tendency keeping her matter secret and dares to be pregnant without revealing who fathered it. It is a challenge to patriarchy.

Violet also becomes able to get property from Mr. Malone who wanted to disown his son if he gets married against his wish: “Yes: you’re very plucky now,

because you got your remittance from me yesterday or this morning, I reckon. Wait it's spent. You wont be so full of cheek then" (174). When Mr. Malone knows Hector married without his consent, he warns him that he will not provide his remittance. Hector chooses to work rather to be dependent on his father's property but Violet doesn't leave the ground easily. She takes remittance from his father in law. And he at the end surrenders to her and even consents, "I wont, I'll do nothing without consulting you, never fear" (176). Thus Violet shows her practical mind to claim the property. This shows she is expert in economic business equal to men. She protests the patriarchal ideology that women are weak, inexperienced and less intellectual in economic business. She is very conscious about poverty from the very beginning so she kept their marriage secret to manage this.

Similarly, despite Mendoza loved Louisa madly

Myself! I have thrown myself away for her sake: that is why I am here. No matter: I count the world well lost for her. She had, I pledge you my word, the most magnificent head of hair I ever saw, she had humor; she had intellect; she could cook to perfection: and her highly strung temperament made her uncertain, incalculable, variable, capricious, cruel, in a word, enchanting. (93)

In this way, Mendoza sees the world's perfection in Louisa due to his love. Louisa rejected his marriage proposal because, "She objected to marry a Jew" (93). In capitalist patriarchy, it is said that females are emotional which is the cause of their weakness in comparison to males. This ideology is protested by Louisa because she turns out to be strong enough to reject the emotional wooer as per the situation.

Main heroines of both dramas have taken advantages of the male created stereotypical images about them. Helmer stereotypes Nora an extravagant woman. He

argues for this: “You’re never at a loss for scaring up money; but the moment you have it, it runs right out through your fingers: you never know what you’ve done with it. Well, one takes you as you are” (446). Nora never opposes Helmer’s such types of insulting blames rather she protests it by cheating him. In fact she buys cheap clothes to save the money to pay back loan. This is clear from her showing of purchasing to Helmer, “But come here so I can show you everything I bought. And so cheap” (446). She again clarifies Mrs. Linde how she manages money:

Every time Torvald gave me money for new clothes and such, I never used more than half; always bought the simplest, cheapest outfits. It was a godsend that everything looks so well on me that Torvald never noticed. (450)

This argument indicates Nora is not actually extravagant rather pretends to be so, so that, she is able to deceive Helmer from her savings to pay loan. It is also a kind of resistance against patriarchy via using same patriarchal images.

Helmer always assumes himself as a guide of Nora because for him Nora does not have her own idea. Nora takes advantage of this male assumption. She keeps Helmer busy in the guidance of dance for she pretends to forget the steps of Tarantella dance so that she will keep him out of reading the letter of Krogstad. This idea of Nora is clear from her urge to Helmer: “Yes, take care of me, Torvald, please promise me that? Oh, I’m so nervous. That big party- you must give up everything this evening for me. No business- don’t even touch your pen. Yes? Dear Torvald, promise?” (465). Nora requests Helmer to give up everything so that he will not touch letter from Krogstad.

Similarly, Ann in *Man and Superman* also uses the very stereotypical images given by capitalist patriarchy to female. Patriarchal ideology always expects a

daughter to follow her parents' wishes. So, parents decide how to and with whom she should live. The daughter who adopts her parents' wish and advice is assumed as a good daughter in patriarchal concept. Ann pretends to be patriarchal good daughter pretending to follow her parents' wish consequently; she can reach her aim of making Tanner her husband via the means of daughterness. To stop Tanner from rejecting guardianship and to make Ramsden accept, his opponent as his fellow guardian, Ann states: "It is not for me to approve or disapprove. I accept it. My father loved me and knew best what was good for me" (21). Ann imposes the charge of the question on her father to approve the guardian between himself and Tanner. Ann neither can approve Ramsden alone nor Tanner. She Needs both. To escape from this problem, she pretends to follow her father's wish. Actually, it is her own wish. She does so because she knew that Tanner rejects her proposal but cannot reject her parents. Thus, if she had to escape from the complexities, she had to state that it is not her wish but her father's or mother's.

She again forwards her mother to avoid Octavius' marriage proposal. When Octavius expresses, "It belongs to you, Ann. Forgive me: I must speak of it. I love you. You know I love you" (178). Ann, not to hurt Octavius directly by her decision, responds, "What the good, Tavy? You know that my mother is determined that I shall marry Jack" (178).

The research explores the cause of different ending of the dramas due to different economic position of the heroines. Nora is economically dependent on her husband. So Helmer is using Nora how he wanted. But Tanner hates Ann because he was not able to use her as the way he wanted. This issue is clear in his argument:

Stand by her! What danger is she in? She has the law on her side; she has popular sentiment on her side; she has plenty of money and no

conscience. All she wants with me is to load up all her moral responsibilities on me, and do as she likes at the expense of my character. I cant control her; and she can compromise me as much as she likes. I might as well be her husband. (13)

As Octavius asks Tanner to stand by Ann for Ann is orphan, Tanner argues that he cannot control. The cause of not being able to control is due to Ann's strong economical position for she has inherited father's property. Tanner hypothesizes that she will load up all her moral responsibilities on him on the strength of money.

Violet is also a daughter of rich class. So she argues with her father in law, Mr. Malone confidently and gets her destination of getting Malone's property along with Hector as her husband. Violet: "What objection has you to me, pray? My social position is as good as Hector's, to say the least" (168). When Mr. Malone brags of his property and tries to down trodden Violet, she objects Mr. Malone easily. It happens, may be due to her good economic position.

But, Louisa a working class poor girl did not her lover, Mendoza, as a husband. She was a poor working class girl and Mendoza is a rich class man. It is clear from his argument, "I can honestly say that I would have sold the lot, faces, dowries, clothes, titles, and all, for a smile from this woman. Yet she was a woman of the people, a worker" (93). Louisa may have rejected to marry Mendoza not simply on the ground of his Jewishness but on the ground of economic difference. She cannot marry such a crazy lover due to her poverty.

Poor Nora had to leave her home at the end because she has nothing of her own. It is clear from her dialogue to leave home: "I can't spend the night in a strange man's room" (474). Nora argues the home belongs to Helmer (strange man). She can't take it as her because she has not contributed in cash to run or build it. Due to

her economic dependency on Helmer she has to leave the house or apparently she is defeated.

On the other hand, Ibsen's subplot character Mrs. Linde is able to get her long departed lover, Krogstad, on the strength of job. It is clear from Krogstad's joy to listen Mrs. Linde's propose to be together. Krogstad is delighted, "Kristine, thank you, thank you- now I know I can win back a place in their eyes. Yes – but I forgot" (467). Krogstad is delighted to accept Mrs. Linde's proposal because she is going to support his children and home with her job. She is victorious to get back her lover due to her economic position.

To wrap up, capitalist patriarchal domination of male characters and resistance of female characters against it is found in both of the dramas. In *A Doll House* apparent patriarchy can be seen whereas in *Man and Superman* subtle patriarchy. The main issue of capitalist patriarchy-transactional relationship between male and female is found in both of the dramas. Stereotypical images given by males to females; male judgment on female's law, economic dependency of female characters on male characters, seize of personal identity and freedom of choice of female, male commodification of female, male hypocrisy, no emotionality, body politics of female, female consciousness to economy are the issues explored in both of the dramas. In *A Doll House*, we can see the hegemony of capitalist patriarchy but in *Man and Superman* the capitalist patriarchy is working as a palimpsest. Female characters have resisted the capitalist patriarchy in *A Doll House* unconsciously formerly and very consciously at the end. But in *Man and Superman* female characters have resisted capitalist patriarchy very consciously from the beginning.

IV. Conclusion

Both Henric Ibsen's *A Doll House* and George Bernard Shaw's *Man and Superman* portray how capitalist patriarchy functions and how women can resist against such discrimination. The male characters in both plays assume themselves intellectual and strong enough to be a provider. They think themselves as protector and provider of females. So, females are defined as a dependent creature, simply taken as a male's fulfillment. They are treated as if they have no individuality, personality, emotion as human beings.

In Ibsen's *A Doll House*, male characters Torvald Helmer, Dr. Rank, Krogstad and invisible businessman have treated women members in the level of commodity: Nora and Christine Linde by discarding their emotionality and individuality. Helmer without knowing real cause, names Nora as Skylark, Squinderbird, Squirrel respectively for her activities. He thinks Nora is doing all childish activities and blunders because of woman's instinct, to him, a woman cannot think and do more than that because they have no wit and strength to act like males. He, a capitalist male, further believes that it is his duty to earn money for family not his wife's. So, he never encourages her to do wage job outside. Instead, he works himself day and night to maintain home financially.

However, Nora resist against these assumptions of Helmer unconsciously at first and very consciously at the end. Nora, who seemed very weak at the beginning, becomes very strong woman in course of time who can go any extent if it is needed. She goes against Helmer's codes secretly: she borrows money, eats macaroons, lies which are strictly banned by Helmer. All these activities are done by Nora very unconsciously though consciously she does not want to go against her husband. All these show her desire in unconscious to stand herself as an individual human being

who has her own whims, emotion, personality and way of life. This unconscious desire comes into consciousness when she is disillusioned that her husband is not her provider and protector but a possessor; she is not treated as a wife but as a pleasure giving thing. So, she resists this capitalist patriarchal commodification of woman by leaving his home and children. This indicates her no more dependency on her husband's property which is the main bar of her emancipation.

Similar oppression and resistance of women can be found even in George Bernard Shaw's *Man and Superman*, too. But the case is a bit different since the male characters in this play seem to give female their freedom. They still have the sense of male superiority. Though Ann Whitefield is young and intellectual enough to take care of her property and family, her father appoints a guardian after his death to look after herself, her family and property. This event shows that her father is preoccupied with capitalist patriarchal ideology that females are insecure without male.

Likewise, Ramsden, Tanner and Octavius always suggest Ann to decide herself not by her parents wish. However, they try to load their wish on Ann because they think Ann simply as a weak woman without experience of the world. Though they want Ann to act herself, they do not realize Ann's superior mind and her being out of their code. Tanner does not notice Ann's intellectuality. Rather he gives negative definition of her cleverness as a damnable woman's instinct; boa constrictor and elephant. Similarly, Ramsden tries to give Ann right of decision but keeps a bar against it by taking her a weak woman without experience. Octavius is confident enough that Ann will marry him because they think Ann simply a woman who cannot correctly choose her husband.

However, Ann resists this capitalist patriarchal tendency of making female a pursued by male for their advantage. She takes the position of pursuer of a male,

Tanner for her own advantage. She resisted whole patriarchy by going against her father and guardians' wish to marry with Octavius who can keep her financially and as a loving and caring husbandly secure. She discards the passive life with full security in every respect of capitalist patriarchal society. She chooses a very energetic life taking risk to create herself of her own security by marrying Tanner. She wanted to create her own individuality by debating and arguing with Tanner's philosophy rather to pass a life being a passive listener of Octavius' praises to her every activity whether they are right or wrong.

Thus, in both dramas the males are preoccupied with the capitalist patriarchal ideologies to stereotype females. In *A Doll House*, capitalist patriarchy can be seen apparently whereas in *Man and Superman*, subtle capitalist patriarchy can be felt. Female characters of both dramas resist the capitalist patriarchal ideologies. In *A Doll House*, females very unconsciously show that they are also equally intellectual and strong with business sense like males. But in *Man and Superman*, females very consciously prove themselves so. They have actively resisted and subverted the capitalist patriarchal ideologies.

A Works Cited

- Brockett, Oscar G. *Perspectives on Contemporary Theatre*. Louisiana State: University Press, 1971.
- Bryson, Valerie. *Feminist Political Theory*. New York: Paragon House, 1992.
- Chesterton, G.K. *George Bernard Shaw*. London: Bodley Head, 1909.
- Elshtain, Jean Bethke. *Public Man Private Woman: Women in Social and Political Thought*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1981.
- Goonetilleke, D.C.R.A. "A Doll's House: Overview." *Critics on Global Perspectives on Drama*. Ed. Shankar Prasad Bastakoti. Kathmandu: Durga Prakashan, 2008. 723-725.
- Henderson, Archibald. *Bernard Shaw, Playboy and Prophet*. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1939.
- Ibsen, Henric. "A Doll House." *The Bedford Introduction to Drama*. Ed. Lee. A. Jacobus. Boston: Bedford, 1996. 445-474.
- Ibsen, Henric. "Notes for the Modern Tragedy." Jacobus. Boston: Bedford, 1993. 475.
- Jacobus, Lee.A. *The Bedford Introduction to Drama*. Boston: Bedford, 1993.
- MacKinnon, Catharine. "Feminism, Marxism, Method, and the State: An Agenda for Theory". *Feminist Social Thought: A Reader*. Ed. Diana Tietjens Meyers. New York: Routledge, 1997: 65-78.
- MacCarthy, Desmond. *Shaw*. London: Macgibbon and Kee, 1951.
- Ruthven, K.K. *Feminist Literary Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Scott, Clement. "A Doll's House". *The Theatre*. 14. 79. (July 1889): 21.

Shaw, George Bernard. *Man and Superman*. London: Longmans Green and Co., 1903

Shaw, George Bernard. *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*. London: Constable, 1922.

Showalter, Elaine. "Toward a Feminist Poetics". Adams. 1224-1233.

Tong, Rosemarie. *Feminist Thought*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1989.

Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today*. New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1999.

Williams, Raymond. *Drama from Ibsen to Eliot*. London: Penguin, 1951.

Wollstonecraft, Marie. "A Vindication of the Rights of Women". *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College, 1992. 394-399.

Woolf, Virginia. "A Room of One's Own". Adams. 818-825.