

## **1. Male Betrayal in Marriage and Friendship**

Acts of betrayal are considered to be acts of moral violations. Trust and loyalty are considered to be very important in any relationship and even more so in marriage and friendship. Similarly, honesty, mutual understanding, truthfulness, faithfulness, and related concepts are generally thought as basic requirements in both marriage and friendship. Betrayal that violates the trust based on these relationships is thought to be violation of the basic foundation of loyalty and fidelity upon which these relationships are based. Fidelity is one of the duties based on the obligation to fulfill the commitments. This is seen as the issue of fairness and justice in the part of involved individuals. We keep our promises because of our past action of making promise and because it is our duty to keep up the promises that we make in our lives.

Marital relationships involve mutual understanding among individuals. Friendship involves people who are willing to share each other's feelings and even disclosing the most private thoughts with the belief that they will be kept as secrets. As these both relationships have many common features such as involving the mates who belong to the same age group or nearly the same. They also refer to the personal relationships involving trust and are of considerable importance. They also involve arrangements that are based on commitments and promises which are supposed to enhance the trust that exists in such relationships. Thus, both forms of betrayal involve the people who act as betrayers or the violators of the trust. The person, who betrays acts as the free agent because he is totally responsible for choosing one action over the other.

The literature on marital relationship and betrayal show that there are various reasons behind the betrayal. These may vary from the misunderstanding, lack of trust, lack of intimacy that may show dissatisfaction with the relationship to the desire of

the people for excitement in life with change of partners, anger and jealousy, insecure feelings about the relationship, lack of love and attraction in the ongoing relationship.

The idea of marriage implies that a wife is legally equal to her husband. But this does not seem to be the wish of man. Injustice has made men illogical and laws and practices seem to be in contradiction to each other. The ideals put them in similar views but the practices seem to be favorable exclusively for men. The historical context of marriage in terms of patriarchy shows the unequal distribution of power and this has been practiced all across the world throughout the centuries. And there seems to be an irreducible gap between the ideal as conceived and the real as practiced.

Men engage in a variety of different sociological strategies. They belong to some social group in school, college, workplace, teams and others. There is a vast difference between husband and wife and how they are culturally brought up. These differences show not only the sexual difference but also involve whole range of differences including differences in age, education, situation, profession, and their daily behavior. A man becomes the head of the family. He knows many things about politics, laws, and the world of affairs. Daily interaction in the clubs where the man belongs makes him feel superior in comparison to his wife who is immersed in household chores. He becomes the guide, sole mentor, counselor, moral support and the protector of his wife.

These unfair customs and unequal power relations seem to be the strongest reasons for the acts of betrayal. Beauvoir comments about this unequal power relationship of husband and wife as follows:

He relates the events of the day, explains how right he has been in arguments with opponents, happy to find his wife a double who

bolsters his self-confidence; he comments on the papers and the political news, he willingly reads aloud to her so that even her contact with culture may not be independent. To increase his authority, he tends to exaggerate feminine incapacity; she accepts this subordinate role with more or less docility. (483)

The law is biased and the customs are unfair. The husbands are more powerful as it allows husbands to inspect the activities of their wives in case of doubt but women are not allowed to do the same. Generally, men cannot forgive their unfaithful wives while women often forgive their husbands to keep the family intact. Historically, the double standard which gives more freedom to the men than women, has been operative almost everywhere.

In the light of the double standardness in the area of sexual attitudes of male, it is likely that male infidelity will be evaluated less negatively than female's; and that the most acceptable of all will be male infidelity as judged by males. However, outside the sexual domain, transgressions by males and females are likely to be judged similar. As a result they tend to have permissive attitudes regarding sexuality, in general and betrayal by males, in particular. In an extension of this argument, men in general are more concerned about less accepting of marital infidelity by females because it interferes with the likelihood that they are the father of their partner's offspring.

Females, on the other hand, likely to be benefited from the assistance of a partner during child rearing strongly value intimacy and loyalty by both males and females. They find betrayal unacceptable because it could lead to loss of their partner's much needed time and resources in upbringing a child. Females have such insecure feelings in their marital relationship as they see that their husbands could get

along very well without them. They find themselves alone as they have very little chances of socialization. The laws and customs do not support them. The home no longer saves them from their empty liberty. They become desperate and become unable to do anything by themselves.

Men are invariably immersed in competition in their occupations. There is competition for promotion, for salary increments, and for recognition. Inherent in competition is the fact that all the involved people will not be successful. Thus, inevitably, stress, and frustrations can accumulate not only in the process of competing but also as a result of losing out in the competitive process. These stress and frustrations make men immoral and unfair promoting their marital incompatibilities. Lantz and Synder view that men become unethical in their work when they become unable to achieve their success goals by the means of conventional competitive ways. "The man who cannot become successful honestly may turn to lying and cheating and a set of ethical problems. Although finding dishonest patterns necessary, he may still be plagued by self-doubts, which he may wish to hide from his family, but which will nevertheless involve it" (287).

Despite widespread disapproval of marital betrayal and presumably of broken promises as well there is a growing recognition that moral evaluations are complex and that behaviors are rarely judged in absolute terms. Moral evaluations are rarely simple and are likely to be influenced by the justification or circumstances that surround the event. There are cultural relativists who argue that morality is created collectively by standards and values of groups of people or cultures. They assume that there are no objective universal moral standards that hold true for all the people in all cultures. The great diversity of marriage habits can be seen to illustrate differences in

cultural values. Polygamy is morally acceptable in some African and Asian cultures while it may be regarded as moral violation in other cultures.

Sex difference not only entails one to violate the moral values but also shows variation whether to accept the betrayal or not. Sex differences in the acceptance are pervasive, with females accepting it greater than males. The theorizing of Gilligan (1982) on sex differences in moral reasoning has the potential to do so. As Boss has suggested Gilligan thinks “[m]en tend to be duty and principle oriented; women are more context oriented and tend to view the world in a more emotional and personal way. Women’s moral judgment is characterized by ... attachment, and self-sacrifice” (219).

Because of women’s inferior social status in most cultures, their socialization generally involves internalizing the message that they should nurture and care for the needs of others. Thus, they are accustomed to the interpersonal consequences of action, whereas males with a greater focus on autonomy develop a morality of impartial justice. Men and women display different emotional and behavioral reactions to the marital infidelity basically due to their sexual difference. Men tend to divorce their wives for infidelity more often than wives divorce their husbands. In matters of telling the truth, women are still more harshly punished if discovered; men are less forgiving and more prone to revenge and acts of violence.

Miller and Maner in their study reveal the differences that males and females display in reaction to infidelity as they point out:

Although male violence appears to be a well accepted response to infidelity, while women are less likely to take such actions against their husbands. Just as men can suffer greatly from a partner’s infidelity, so too can women. The specific nature of their suffering, however, may

be somewhat different from that of men. Additionally, because males often provide protection for their female partners, women who have suffered an infidelity may be threatened by a loss of protection for their vulnerability to threats from predators and other people. (414)

Preservation of the relationship might be a desirable end and even after betrayal as many different things might have been invested in the relationship, such as time or money for men and protection for women. Women especially try to preserve the relationship presumably because of their inferior position in the society. As Beauvoir remarks, "If one's husband 'cheats' a little, one will close one's eyes" (487).

Betrayal in friend's confidence is also likely to be viewed in the same light as deception and a moral violation. It seems likely that a broken promise, like other forms of deception, might be judged more or less acceptable depending on circumstances. For example, a broken promise in order to help a friend might be judged as more acceptable than when the motive is self-gain or revenge.

Friendship enhances level of happiness among people insofar as human being is a social animal, no one can achieve the good life without aid and nurture from others. He can carry on only through cooperation and competition with others and he has needs which are satisfied only through exchanges with each other. Human beings value common human sentiments rather than self-interest. There are some ethical egoists who assume that human nature is such that we find happiness by pursuing our own self-interest. They maintain the idea that people who value independent lifestyles and rationality should be in general happier people. However, a life spent pursuing our personal self-interest does not lead to maximize our happiness since such self-interest sacrifices communal values.

“To have friends” according to Duprat, “is a moral duty; the man who has no friends is not in general a moral being. In antiquity, friendship took precedence of love. It became in the days of Aristotle, Epicurus, and the Stoics, a kind of social virtue from which even the selfishness of the Epicureans did not venture to free itself” (326). Friendship is important as a means of connecting with others. Friendship also contributes to development of our moral character by inspiring virtues such as compassion, wisdom, generosity, and happiness-virtues that make it easier for us to act in harmony with good motivation.

In its ethical sense, friendship signifies completeness of devotion among the dedicated ones. Such an interest is marked by temperance because it demands a harmony which can be attained only by subordination of particular impulses and passions. It concerns for the welfare of each other and such complete consideration is the only way in which justice can be assured.

It has been generally found that happiness levels are actually relatively low among people who place a high value on rationality or intellectual values like wisdom, logic, and understanding. These values are considered as negative correlations and are most pronounced among males. On the other hand, it is usually regarded that happiness is relatively high among the ones who give a high ranking to social values such as love, sympathy, friendship, forgiveness, tolerance, and group participation.

Friendship is the highest degree of humanity which contributes to the expansion of our generous nature in favor of healthy relations between men who have daily relations with each other. However, selfishness and pursuit of happiness in self-interest among men have made them fail to remember their generosity. Material gain and commercialism is fatal to such healthy relationship among men. Either because

the strength of economy or because competition has developed to its full extent selfishness has become general. Selfishness is harmful to collective morality that inspires friendly behavior among men. A man may use his friends simply as aids to his personal advancement in his profession. In this case he is not interested in them as friends or even as human beings on their own respects. He is interested in what he can get out of them; calling them 'friends' is a false pretense.

Material progress puts men in an obligation to acquire personal happiness rather than communal feelings. As men are comparatively more involved in economic fronts they place their success in terms of their material prosperity. Moreover, those men who have immersed themselves in such competition cross the ethical boundaries of fidelity and honesty in friendship to achieve these success goals. These men who have internalized success goals create an unsurpassable stress upon themselves. The competitive nature of our society which is evident in almost all walks of life imposes still another series of stresses. One competes for jobs, for advancement, for popularity and prestige.

The circumstances under an act of betrayal will affect the extent to which such behavior is viewed as acceptable or unacceptable. For example, to lie openly is generally unacceptable; however, if the lie is the means to save innocent lives, it is more beyond the nature of the act itself. The choice and deed are not wrong merely because they fail to conform to the current laws and the customary codes of duties. An unintentional disclosure of a friend's secret, especially if the friend's identity is not divulged, might be evaluated less negatively than a deliberate disclosure made in the knowledge that the betrayed friend would do nothing about it.

Men fail to understand the moral values that what satisfies and pleases them does same to the other. If a man feels grieved by someone else's act then it is likely



that the others will feel the same. However, even the wrongdoer counts upon good faith and honesty. Men refuse to extend the goods to others which they seek for themselves. “Wrong consists in faithlessness” says Dewey, “to that upon which the wrongdoer counts when he is judging and seeking for what is good to him. He betrays the principles upon which he depends, he turns to his personal advantage the very values which he refuses to acknowledge in his own conduct towards others” (84).

Thus, it seems reasonable to expect that justification for betrayal will influence the acceptability of betraying a friend’s confidence, just as it is likely to influence the acceptability of sexual betrayal of romantic partner.

Even Jesus Christ experienced betrayal at the hands of a friend who was very close to him. For Judas who betrayed Jesus for the sake of thirty pieces of silver the repentance meant death, death by his own hand. Historically, betrayal ultimately cost more than any sin past, present or future. Betrayal cost the Son of God his life. It was the direct cause of the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D.

Repentance seems to be the way through which the betrayer can feel better and make the betrayed feel less harsh at the same time. Betrayal is best met with love and forgiveness. Love and forgiveness challenge one to forsake one’s immoral behavior. This only secures happiness for both the parties whether it is the betrayer or the betrayed as God grants forgiveness only to those who can forgive others. In Margalit’s words:

By expressing remorse the offender presents himself in a new light, a light that can be projected into the past. His ability to feel remorse attests that he is not basically evil, even if the act that he performed was abominable. The sinner does not deny the badness of his deed is

supposed to create rift between the act and the doer. Thus, an offender can be forgiven even if the offense cannot be forgotten. (199)

Thus, if the person is violator of moral law by his act of betrayal, he is also follower of moral laws if he is able to remorse for his offenses and violations. By forgiving the offender, the betrayed also follows the moral law of forgiveness. There are differences in the thoughts of moral norms and codes and they are never simple insofar as they are relativistic, subjective, and subject to change with change in circumstance. However, no society and no common sense morality look with favor upon infidelity. We are not born as isolated but into familial and social situations, as a result, we cannot defy what the society expects of us and what we think ourselves to be otherwise we lose our self-esteem feeling remorse and guilt.

However, as people make their moral choices themselves no matter whether by following what society has conditioned them to be or they have chosen the moral codes through self-criticism and reflection by going against the social norms. When they betray their own ideals and moral laws that they have made to judge any sort of actions whether by themselves or by others, they feel remorse and guilt to such an extent that they lose their self-esteem and become unable to continue to live.

## **2. Moral and Immoral Perspectives**

Moral and immoral perspectives are concerned about the moral judgments, standards, and rules of conduct. Moral values are considered to be the qualities that are in accord with standards of right or good conduct. These include not only actual judgments, standards, and rules that are usually developed by the traditional socio-cultural standards and are to be found in the moral codes of the existing societies. But these also include the ideal judgments, standards, and rules that are based on principles, theories, and rational grounds. Basically, in every society there seems to be a divergence between the notions of how we ought to behave morally and the reality of how we behave, so there has been an irreducible gap between hypothetical theoretical philosophy and real morality. Thus, the moral values are the codes of conduct which aim at establishing social order and achieving the idea of society.

Moral perspectives provide systematic judgments and principles that are developed on the basis of traditional, cultural, religious, rational, psychological, and philosophical grounds that help the human beings to determine whether any action is morally right or wrong. Whether real or ideal, morality has to do with right and wrong conduct and with good or bad character.

Ethics is a philosophical inquiry into the nature and grounds of morality. It is the branch of philosophy that tries to analyze, evaluate, and address the moral issues on the basis of systematic rational grounds. It comprises the issues of right conduct, good life, right or wrong behavior. The word 'ethics' has been derived from Latin 'ethica' which means moral philosophy. It is also linked with the adjective 'ethos' meaning custom or habit. Ethics tries to develop the philosophical grounds that aim in evaluating whether any action is morally right or just. Every society develops its rational grounds to evaluate and inspire people to adhere to the moral principles. On

the basis of the same philosophical evaluations it provides the codes, the systems, and principles that aim in improving the society taking it to the ideal level as it conceives.

Whether in an ideal or actual level moral judgments have to do with the conduct and intentions behind them. Moral judgments are made not only about people's actions but also about their motives or reasons for doing them. That is why the same action might be judged morally unjust at one level while at other as just. To kill someone is morally wrong but the act of killing in self-defense might be judged less harshly.

Thus, we can say that we judge a person to be morally acceptable according to the degree to which he fulfils some ideal of human virtue. And we think of a person as vicious when he has motives we consider morally evil or blameworthy. It is usually found that an individual is considered to be morally good when he adheres to the moral rules of conduct and morally wrong when he acts as trespasser. In both of the cases, the motives or the intentions are judged instead of the actions themselves.

The history of European ethics can be divided into various periods as the periods seem to influence the concept of the moral and immoral values. As every period has its own special characteristics and as the thoughts vary with the periods, the history of European ethics shows variations among thoughts, prescriptions, evaluations, and considerations.

The Greek period lasted from the beginning of the ethical study, which was not earlier than 500 B.C. to A.D.500. It was in the ancient Greek in the fifth century that European ethics really began. The Sophists were a group of teachers whose primary concern was to educate the young men. The Sophists raised the moral questions and the more revolutionary among them, Protagoras thought that all morality was a matter of human need. Gaarder presents his own phrase, "Man is the

measure of all things” (62). By that he meant that the evaluation of good or bad, right or wrong is based on its relation to a person’s need.

Socrates who was one of the first Greek philosophers emphasized the importance of knowledge. He realized that knowledge of human nature is important for the good life. To him, a person will naturally do what is good if he knows himself or if he wishes to attain self-knowledge. Moreover, any person who truly knows what is truly right will do it automatically, according to Socrates.

The two great followers of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle consider knowledge of ethical matters to be essential for virtue. For Plato this knowledge was metaphysical knowledge, understanding that the knowledge of this world which is perceived by our senses is not real knowledge. Real knowledge for him is located in the ‘world of ideas’. The most fundamental of these realities is the ‘idea of the good.’

Aristotle in contrast to Plato was more interested in the concrete details of moral life than in abstract principles. As Aristotle emphasized the character and nature of a person, thus when a person acts in accordance with his nature and realizes his full potential, he will do good and be content according to him. A person must act in accordance with their nature in order to be content and gain complete happiness. Thus, ethics is not a description of an ideal community as Plato imagined but an analysis of the moral life that is realized by the nature and character of an individual.

Despite the differences in their view, what they taught was the need and the importance of understanding the nature of goodness. To understand goodness meant to understand the nature of things, the nature of universe as a whole and particularly the nature of human beings.

The group contemporary to Plato and Aristotle like Cyrenaics and Cynics had major disputes. Cyrenaics held the thought that the good action is the one which gives

pleasure. This view is also known as hedonism and is prevalent as one of the great ethical theories at present. The Cynics on the other hand, held that the good life is to be devoid of human desires. The Cyrenaics were followed by the Epicureans and the Cynics by the Stoics in the later Greek thought. The Epicureans had a more developed theory of pleasure rejecting the extremism of the Cyrenaics. They found that some indulgences resulted in negative consequences. Stoicism found good life in the avoidance of feeling. Self-mastery over one's desires and emotions leads to spiritual peace for them.

The spread of Christianity in Medieval Europe meant that the emphasis shifted from the importance of the individual. The standard of right and wrong was derived from the principles and illustrations provided by the Bible and Church. God was considered to be the absolute foundations, source and substance of happiness. St. Augustine expresses his belief, "Man can attain happiness only by the means whereby he becomes good and he becomes good by loving the highest good and valuing God above everything for his own sake with no thought of reward" (108).

One of the greatest Christian philosophers of the Middle Ages, St. Thomas Aquinas held the concept that the moral law was both a law of nature and also a law of reason. He tried to resolve the controversies by merging them into one, by merging reason and faith as existing in individuals. Despite the fact that Aquinas, according to Doren, started considering "[t]he crucial importance of an individual's behavior (both physical and mental)" (121), he could not be free from the prejudices of the Reformers that were still strong and active during his time.

In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the Church lost its authority. One of the causes of the dwindling authority of Church was the outburst of individualism that emphasized the human freedom. This emphasis in individualism was because of the

revival of Greek learning. With the rise of individualism some thinkers started thinking that the difference between right and wrong was merely subjective, depending upon the attitude of the individual making the moral judgments. This became the view of all more skeptical among modern thinkers. The other thinkers maintained the view that this difference was known by direct insight or intuition.

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries “life, liberty, and property” was a subject of political debates in the English world. John Locke, one of the founders of modern liberal thought considered virtue or moral goodness as the intelligent achievement of our own happiness. According to Locke, by an inseparable connection, between virtue and public happiness together, the preservation of society was necessary.

Locke’s thought formed the basis for the utilitarianism. Utilitarianism is a moral philosophy in which social policy is uppermost as it is concerned with social action and happiness of the greatest number. The founder of the utilitarianism movement was a social theorist, Jeremy Bentham, who took over the principle of utility from the Scottish philosopher David Hume. He derived the concept of Hume and concluded that cause of people is the cause of virtue. Mothershead finds that for Bentham, “[t]he discovery of utility as a moral principle was the discovery that moral goodness is democratic” (225). This theory was later on developed fully by utilitarian John Stuart Mill.

The concepts held by Adam Smith and David Hume attempt to analyze conscience or the moral sense psychologically so as to discover the basis of morality. Smith considers that the moral judgements are made not on our conduct, but on the conduct of others and that our response depends on the extent to which we are able to sympathize with others in their conduct.

Like the humanists of antiquity most of the philosophers of the Enlightenment had faith in human reason. Thus, Enlightenment was also called the Age of Reason. With the development of natural sciences everything was subject to reason. Every philosopher tried to seek out foundations for morals, religion, and ethics in accordance with man's reason.

Kant always felt that it was a matter of reason to know the difference between right and wrong. He formulated the moral law as a "categorical imperative" that means it applies to every kind of situation. His deontological theories based on duty ethics find that the moral action must arise out of one's sense of duty. We act morally only when we purely do it out of duty. In other words, it is right only when it is done from the motive of doing what is reasonable. Kant stated, forms of categorical imperative or conditions that a valid moral law must fulfill, as "Treat every rational being including yourself always as an end, and never as a mere means" (46).

Locke's thought had already formed the basis of utilitarian that aimed happiness of the greatest number as a moral purpose. Following Locke, Jefferson extended his phrase "life, liberty, and property" to "pursuit of happiness" in The Declaration of Independence suggesting that happiness is not opposed to property but is an extension of it. Jefferson's declaration "all men are created equal and are endowed with unalienable rights" (13), led to the idea of happiness has a moral purpose and implies a social right to pursue happiness with consideration of our relationships with others in society. We don't pursue happiness in isolation but in and through our interaction with others.

The thoughts of social moral philosophy formed foundation for social theories like Marxism. The moral idea of Marxism is the greatest possible happiness and development of the individual human being, or stated in another way, the achievement



of human freedom. Marxists are materialists and do not believe in idealism. They are collectivists; they do not believe in individualism.

Modernity with all its modern developments in the economic insights, scientific developments, and the issues of equality led to the world wars. The world wars were the evident of the new thought and degradation of traditional moral values. This period of modernism is exemplified in the literary works of Virginia Woolf, James Joyce, T.S. Eliot who wrote *Waste Land*. The life of modern man has become meaningless and spiritually sterile. Moral crisis is the philosophical thought that the modern man lived amidst the disillusionment and meaningless existence.

The disillusionment and meaningless existence paved its ways for development of new philosophical thought known as existentialism. The movement led by Soren Kierkegaard had a period of rapid growth in Germany and France with their decline in World War first and second respectively. The philosophers like Karl Jaspers, Martin Heidegger, Jean Paul Sartre rebelled against the traditional thoughts that tried to discover, describe, and defend values, standards, or methods by means of rational guidance. The subject of ethics is the pure subjectivity of man's inner life. Duty is not already there to be done. As stated by Mothershead, "It should follow that existentialism does not offer a reasonable ethical theory ... Curiously enough, existentialists are quite prepared to admit that their views in ethics are not reasonable. This is simply because moral choices are absolutely free" (306).

With the freedom of choice for the existence of human beings there came a sudden rise in individualism and irrationality. The pleasure-oriented theories and ethical egoism suggest that even though man is not free because he has been condemned to live here in the earth and that was not his own choice nevertheless he is free because he exists and is responsible for every action he chooses.

These meaninglessness and moral crisis were the modern strains. Then the anti-humanists such as Louis Althusser, Michel Foucault, Roland Barthes developed the philosophical thought paving foundations for postmodernism and post-structuralism. The critical theory developed in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century, poststructuralism questioned the traditional Western metaphysics. It showed that all the older moral thoughts prescribed rules based on some set of moral values. But the very existence of reality, truth, and meaning was questioned by philosophers like Jacques Derrida. Derrida placed reality in the linguistic realm stating there is nothing outside the text. Emmanuel Levinas' writings on 'other' and Derrida's thoughts on the 'death of ethics' are signs of the ethical turn in continental philosophy that occurred in 1980s and 1990s. Central to Levinas' theory according to Manderson is an idea of ethics which "[i]mplies a personal responsibility to another that is both involuntary and singular. Ethics therefore speaks about interpersonal relationships and not about abstract principles" (3).

From a philosophic point of view, it is not merely happiness but the means by which a person achieves happiness that has moral significance. The question is, is man's happiness the only purpose? But happiness means something different for each and every person. In fact, in a free society, it probably should. Nevertheless, even if a man is free and there are plural views regarding the attainment of happiness, the moral standards within certain moral restraints, and the basis of those restraints forms the true definition of moral purpose. An indispensable part of the moral purpose of an individual, then, is his relationship to others in the society in which he lives.

In this postmodern era the post-critique ethics like that of Foucault show that the moral choices are freedom of choice. Foucault was firmly opposed to the notion of universal categories and essences, 'things' that remained unchanged in all times and

places such as the State, madness, sexuality, criminality and so on. These things exist as the result of specific historical activities and reflection. According to him, the essential condition for the practice of ethics is freedom, the ability to choose one action, over another. Ethics concerns the kind of relation one has to oneself. As there is no such moral value that exists for all and for always.

Bertrand Russell, twentieth century philosopher according to Bonevac, argues for a liberalization of sexual morality. “He adopts the perspective of a rule-utilitarian,” by “stressing that the pursuit of pleasure is good, though it must of course be constrained by other moral concerns” (58).

The theoretical strands that follow a fragmented, anti-authoritarian course have given the support to the politico-cultural theories like feminism. Feminism, that begs for equal rights and that mediates upon the differences between male thoughts and female thoughts in essences, has also shown differences between male and female morality. The moral psychology focus on whether there is a distinctly female psychology. According to many feminist thinkers the traditional morality is male-centered since it is modeled after the practices that have been traditionally male-dominated, such as acquiring property, engaging in business contracts, and governing societies. The feminists also think that there is a unique female perspective, women in contrast to men have traditionally nurturing role so they develop a different perspective than that of men.

Gilligan also thinks that women develop their ethics and morals that focus on connections among people rather than separation and with an ethic of care for those people rather than an ethic of justice. Kohlberg’s moral development theory did not take into account gender; however, from Kohlberg’s theory Gilligan found that women do in-fact develop moral orientations differently than males. Gilligan and

Attanucci in their study express “Concerns about justice and care are represented in people’s thinking about real-life moral dilemmas, but that people tend to focus on one or the other depending on gender” (230).

But there are some feminist ethicists who support the western ethical theory as they think it is adequate to address feminist ethical concerns. Some of them propose that one or another existing theory is entirely adequate to address feminist ethical concerns. Margaret Walker also reports that some philosophers remain convinced that well-established traditions of moral thought and their allied epistemologies, in particular those of Kant and Aristotle, can be effectively recruited to feminist criticism.

Someone like Walker remains convinced that some ‘traditional’ ethical theory is ‘good enough’ to do the job needed to meet feminist practical and philosophical goals. However, feminists like Samantha Brennan, according to Nobis,

... suspect that an ethical theory like utilitarianism does justify pro-female moral judgments since only rarely would disrespecting women, treating them unfairly, and harming them in other ways maximizes overall utility. She suspects, however, that since utilitarianism could require the subordination of women in some possible (however unlikely) circumstances, it is probably not a theory that a feminist would want to accept. (215)

Post-critique thought presents the obligations themselves to be fulfilled but are not forced on one principle. The traditional western thought on ethics was based on absolute and objective rules as it viewed that the moral codes are universal and absolute that applies to all men of all the ages. But post-critique thought values pluralistic views thus it holds the view that ethics and moral principles can never be

same to all as they change with change in circumstances. It considers that the moral codes are subjective and relativistic and vary with the mental status of a particular person and particular culture.

Nevertheless, no one can disagree what Peter Singer thinks. Humanly rational morality is one that can help people live well together, given that neither we nor the people around us are going to consider everything. Conformity to such a morality is something we can and do reasonably expect from anyone with some real degree of moral motivation. Conforming to such a morality also enables people to live well together, to prosper individually, and to develop a significant capacity to make their society a better place for other people as well as for themselves.

Ethical theories can also be divided thematically into three general subject areas as normative ethics, metaethics, and descriptive ethics. Normative ethics tries to formulate moral standards or values that regulate right and wrong. It is the systematic attempt to analyze whether any action is right or wrong. In other words, it gives the criteria to judge and guide moral choice and conduct. It formulates the criteria on the basis of those acts that inspire good habits that we should acquire, the duties that we should follow or the consequences of our behavior. Thus, virtue theories that of Greek civilization, Plato, Aristotle, and Christian philosophies; duty theories like that of Locke, Jefferson and Kant; or consequential theories like utilitarianism and social theories fall under this ethics.

In the twentieth century, moral theories have become more complex and are not only concerned with rightness or wrongness. Thus, there was development of metaethics which is also known as analytic ethics. "The aim of analytic ethics", is according to Taylor "to obtain a clear and complete understanding of the semantical, logical, and epistemological structure of moral discourse" (7).

With the rise of linguistic theories in the twentieth century, ethics also tended to derive theories by basing on linguistic phenomena as it started semantical studies referring to the meaning of words and statements. It also tried to seek out logical inferences and epistemological basis. Thus, metaethics deals with metaphysical issues, psychological issues, egoism and altruism, emotion and reason, theories related to male and female morality to analyze the moral issues.

Applied ethics tries to resolve the controversial issue in the real life by use of conceptual tools developed by metaethics and normative ethics. This can also be seen as descriptive ethics that examines the ethics on the basis of observations of the actual practices and can be seen as the starting point to the philosophers for their critical reflection to investigate the nature of moral judgements. In other words, it may be basis for developing ideal moral standards and rules. However, these distinctions between normative ethics, metaethics, and applied ethics are often blurry as every issue can be analyzed on the basis of all of these divisions rather than by a single division. Moreover, these divisions are interrelated and interdependent upon themselves.

### 3. Betrayals of Males in *View* and *Salesman*

Both *A View from the Bridge* and *Death of a Salesman* present the moral problems in the part of the protagonists, Eddie Carbone and Willy Loman. Eddie seems to be not only teaching moral values to his niece, Catherine and Rodolpho, whom he has given asylum but also following it as he helps Marco and Rodolpho by providing asylum to them. However, as he has been uncontrollably attracted to Catherine he commits the act of betrayal informing to the immigration bureau. With his act of betrayal towards Rodolpho and Marco he commits the moral violation of the values that are held in society in the expectations from neighbors and friends. Being obsessed to Catherine, he betrays his wife, and his niece as well as his own moral values.

Willy Loman, the central character in *Death of Salesman* shows his moral concerns by comparing himself with others and judging himself based on being liked or accepted by others. He idealizes success as being 'well-liked'. Willy also ingrains his ideals even to his sons by his moral teachings thus his sons genuinely inherit his ethical problems. When he finds his act of betrayal to Linda and the family as a whole as being revealed and others have started to question him about his failure he is unable to live committing the act of suicide. His sons inherit his moral problems thus presenting false images and being unable to become morally upright people.

In the past, people were more often motivated by strong ethical precepts but in the modern period, people care more about others thoughts towards them and calculate their behavior accordingly. However, every man chooses his own moral ideals whether by following the social norms or by his own thoughts to judge any action as moral or immoral. The mass culture and modern American society that Miller presented in *Death of Salesman* show devastation of traditional ideal moral

values based on individualism and thus idealizing the goal of fitting in with other people. Similarly, *A View from the Bridge* play reveals the need of law. The mouthpiece of the play, Alfieri is the lawyer. He tries to form the basis to show the important concern of the play by stating “in this neighborhood to meet a lawyer or a priest on the street is unlucky”, because they are “thought of in connection with disasters” (379). He also explains “A lawyer means the law” and “the law has never been friendly idea” (379) in punishing the violator or trespasser of the law.

He gives the background about the place where the story takes place. He tells that he came there only when he was twenty-five. He remembers, “There were many here who were justly shot by unjust men. Justice is very important here” (379). He also gives hints about the occupations of the people that the only people he dealt with were “longshoremen and their wives, and fathers and grandfathers” (379).

The stage directions already suggest that there is something different in Eddie’s perspective to Catherine. As soon as he enters his home, when Catherine welcomes him he is “pleased and therefore shy about” it (380). He tries to control Catherine’s behavior. He comments about her dress, her attitudes. He feels she is wearing “too short” skirt. He also tells “you been givin’ me the willies the way walk down the street,” (381). Furthermore, he adds: “Now don’t aggravate me, Katie, you are walkin’ wavy! I don’t like the looks they’re givin’ you in the candy store. And with them new high heels on the sidewalk- clack, clack, clack. There heads are turnin’ like windmills” (381).

Eddie’s problem can be seen with the depth of his obsession in observing his niece. He does not like other people being attracted towards her. Moreover, he tries to protect her from everyone else. So, he acts strict, suggesting her to do right things and prohibiting her against doing some other actions.



Eddie is trying to stop the natural acts. Boys get attracted to the girls and vice-versa. Moreover, there is nothing to be commented upon. We see later Catherine's aunt Beatrice, wife of Eddie, trying to make a fine girl out of Catherine as she realizes that Catherine is growing up. The natural and the obvious behavior as seen by every other people except Eddie can be felt.

His strictness is perceptible with his imperatives and prohibitions trying to limit the happiness and pleasures that she achieves through compliments and friendship. He says, "You can't be so friendly" (381). These imperatives, his concerns and his firmness show that he must be a strict follower of the moral laws himself who is really focused upon bringing moral uprightness in character.

From the very beginning, Miller presents the familial problem in *Death of a Salesman* that has started to arise in the Loman family. The tension between father and his favorite son is evident. Biff has already started to dislike and disrupt the ideals his father has thought about him and has tried to impose on him. The income means less to the son than to the father which can be seen in contrast to the classical values. By the conversation between Willy and Linda we can already figure out that Willy Loman values personal attractiveness and idealizes his son to become successful by his attractiveness. Willy is surprised that "in the greatest country in the world a young man with such personal attractiveness, gets lost" (773), as he has always tried to make his son value his personality to be successful.

Both Eddie and Willy seem to be making moral principles of their own. Sometimes they follow the traditional conventional values, sometimes the prevailing rational grounds that judge the actions while at other times making their own grounds on the basis of self-reflection to form the basis to judge the actions as good and bad.

Willy retraces his memories which he does repetitively in the play. He remembers how people used to follow his son Biff in high school. "When he smiled at one of them their faces lit up. When he walked down the street ..." (773). Willy is full of disappointment and exhaustion as his time is running out and he has failed to reach his goal to become highly successful businessperson. He now wants his son to fulfill his dreams. He loves his son and tries to make him into something he's not.

Hearing their parent's voices, Biff and Happy are awakened. Both are worried because lately they have seen noticing Willy's strange behavior. Happy says that Willy has "the finest eye for color in the business" (773) when Biff says may be Willy is color-blind. Willy has trained his sons relating everything to business. Thus, even personal characteristics are valued in terms of their usefulness.

With their conversation it is clear that even the two brothers have contradictory views. Biff cares about saving his soul and Happy is more concerned about making money. Happy follows footsteps of his father but ironically, Biff is Willy's favorite son. Biff admits that he himself is worried about his inability to settle down with a good job as he has tried various jobs. We also see in contrast to his father's teaching he hates the competition- the having to "get ahead of the next fella" (774).

The morality in the consumer society is what Willy teaches his sons to get ahead of the next fellow. People see their status and their happiness in comparison to their competitors. Biff doesn't fulfill the expectations that he's inherited from his father. Biff is confused; he does not like his father's teachings and ideals. Nevertheless, he has inherited his father's expectations. Thus, he also feels guilty over wasting his life. Biff's dilemma stems from the refusal to compromise his ideals. In

order to grow up one needs to have a role model, but Biff doesn't want to become like his father.

By the same teachings of Willy to Happy, he idealizes himself to be successful thus, he is unhappy as he has to take orders from others. We find him say:

HAPPY. That's what I dream about, Biff. Sometimes I want to just rip my clothes off in the middle of the store and outbox that goddam merchandise manager. I mean I can outbox, outrun and outlift anybody in that store, and I have to take orders from those common petty sons-of-bitches till I can't stand it anymore.

BIFF. I'm telling you, kid, if you were with me I'd be happy out there.

HAPPY. See, Biff, everybody around me is so false that I'm constantly lowering my ideals .... (775)

Happy feels being cheated because he cannot achieve his goal of being successful businessperson. Instead, he has to take orders. With the failure in his dreams he feels guilty and being cheated. Consequently, he begins to cheat himself. This can be seen as the betrayal of the ideals – the moral ideals of the consumer society and the ideals his father has imposed on him.

Eddie gives information to Beatrice that her cousins are coming there. It seems that Eddie is a helpful person. Though Beatrice's cousin would be illegal immigrants, he is going to provide them shelter under his roof against the law. Here, we find differences between law and morality. Although law is made being based upon moral values, standards and judgments it can be cruel in providing the ideal lives to the people who wish to join hands and mouth together. Eddie here seems to be going against the law; however, he seems to be following moral values that respect communal feelings, friendship, and helpfulness.

However, Eddie is worried due to the kindhearted attitude of his wife as in his words, “All I’m worried about you is you got such a heart that I’ll end up on the floor with you, and they’ll be in our bed” (383). He also remembers the time they helped Beatrice’s relatives when their house burned down. His words and his helpfulness makes Beatrice think that he is “an angel” (383).

Eddie seems to be following ideals making others to follow morality of friendliness, helpfulness, and kindness to such an extent that he is going against the laws and risking his own life. But his problem in allowing women in providing equal opportunities for earning and acquiring property and engaging in business contracts shows him to be strict follower of traditional male parochial. The views that differentiate women and men trying to limit women in the four walls of house are legally unjust but practically real.

So here, it is discovered that Eddie is nearly a passive creation of his environment, its prejudices, and family-created psychological drives. The traditional views privilege the males putting them in moral responsibility to be the wage earner and making them reluctant in providing equal opportunities to females of their family. This problem is seen in his dialogue when he is informed about the job opportunity that Catherine has come up with. She has been selected as the best student and been provided with the job of stenographer. Eddie already knows that the economic freedom also would bring other freedoms-freedom of thought and freedom from his authority. He is also afraid that he might lose her as he explains:

EDDIE. That ain’t what I wanted, though.

CATHERINE. Why! It’s a great big company—

EDDIE. I don’t like that neighborhood over there.

CATHERINE. It’s a block and half from the subway, he says.

EDDIE. Near the Navy Yard plenty can happen in a block and a half.

And a plumbin' company! That's one step over the water front.

They're practically longshoremen.

BEATRICE. Yeah, but she'll be in the office, Eddie.

EDDIE. I know she'll be in the office, but that ain't what I had in mind.

(385)

Eddie shows his hatred towards the neighborhood where he belongs himself and towards the people in the neighborhood who are longshoremen like him. Then we also witness Beatrice's fear as she has already started to suspect Eddie's obsession. She suggests him to allow freedom to Catherine as she tells Eddie as she says, "I don't understand when it ends", and adds, "first it was gonna be when she graduated high school," then "it was gonna be when she learned stenographer" (386). Yet it seems Eddie is not ready until now when she has already learned stenographer.

He then becomes emotional with Catherine expressing his suppositions: "And then you'll move away" and "you'll come visit on Sundays" then "once a month then Christmas and New Year's finally" (386).

To minimize the chances of his suppositions, Eddie again seems to be teaching Catherine not to trust anyone. This hints us about another prohibition that males prejudiced by traditional concepts think of. By suggesting her not to trust, he is trying to limit her socialization process. This is the greatest problem of Eddie that he wants Catherine to trust him only. He even tells that Catherine has "learned bad from" Beatrice as "she's got too big a heart" (387).

Eddie also presents his resent to Beatrice when she tries to suggest Catherine and tries to show that Beatrice does not know anything as she has spent all her life inside the house. This again shows the differences between male and female morality.

Eddie emphasizes feminine incapacabilities, which are only due to the strictness, and prohibitions that Eddie imposes upon them. He says resentfully:

EDDIE. You lived in a house all your life, what do you know about it?

You never worked in your life.

BEATRICE. She likes people. What's wrong with that?

EDDIE. Because most people ain't people. She's goin' to work;

plumbers; they'll chew her to pieces if she don't watch out. *To*

*Catherine:* Believe me, Katie, the less you trust, the less you be sorry. (387)

After this discussion and Eddie's suggestions, we again find him giving another advice to follow but this time about hiding the secret of keeping illegal immigrants with others and police even if they are asked. This is the lie but this act of lie can be taken less harshly since the moral judgments are based not solely upon the act but the intention behind the action. The lie he has been suggesting to follow thus shows his moral concern in saving innocent lives as he has been playing against "the United States government" and the immigration Bureau. Though he seems to be going against the law here he can be seen a kind-hearted person but later towards the end when Eddie himself informs about it, though he might be acting according to the law his intentions make him a moral violator.

He talks about Vinny who was harshly behaved because he snitched to the immigration on his own uncle. Even though for the government he was acting lawfully, nevertheless for the neighborhood that believes in communal feelings and self-sacrifice this was unjust act. Thus, as Beatrice remembers we find out, "And they grabbed him in the kitchen and pulled him down the stairs- three flights his head was

bouncin' like a coconut. And they spit on him in the street, his own father and brothers" (389).

The Carbone family then comes back to their activities. Eddie asks Beatrice why she has been mad at her lately. Beatrice has already slightly come to know Eddie's obsession on Catherine. So she replies, "I'm not mad" instead she blames "you're the one is mad" (390).

The spokesperson of the play, Alfieri also considers Eddie to be a "good man as he had to be in a life that was hard and even. He worked on piers when there was work he brought home his pay, and he lived" (370). Even the lawyer considered him a good man insofar as he was doing his duty of looking after his family, by his pay and his work. This has been considered the duty of males. They go out for work; they earn and are the bread-earner, wage earner, and sole-provider of the family that puts them on a privileged position to enjoy other rights. They can make boundaries to their wives and daughters teaching them the moral law while it may not be sure that they are themselves follower of it.

The cousins, Marco and Rodolpho arrive in their house, and are prepared to live there. Catherine soon starts observing the brothers and takes interest on them. As Beatrice had earlier said that she loved people, we find her interest upon them. She finds that "Rodolpho is practically blond" (394). As soon as Catherine says this Eddie tries to send her to kitchen to prepare coffee. Eddie's obsession is discernible here too. He has also found Rodolpho's appearance to be fine that seems to be impressing Catherine so he tries to create a distance between them.

Then the men are found to be discussing about their economic conditions, their works, their pasts, and their plans for future. The morality of men and women and the differences between them is also seen here. Men feel it is their duty to earn

enough money to their family and women feed the children from their own mouth. That is why Marco has come to Eddie to earn more money so that he could provide his family with the money and food.

The stage direction tells that Eddie tries to hush Rodolpho's voice and has started to address Marco only. While Catherine really feels attracted to Rodolpho she asks: "You married too?" (394). Catherine now and then talks about blondness of Rodolpho. And Beatrice hopes and indicates about good that is likely to happen, we can suppose must be about her niece and good for their family as he will free Catherine from Eddie's inspection and authority.

Catherine shows her interest to Rodolpho asking if he could sing jazz as they are talking about the works and their knowledge in things. Rodolpho sings "Paper Doll" that is quite equivalent to the real situation of the play. He sings, "It's tough to love a doll that's not your own" (396). It suits both Eddie and Rodolpho. Eddie owes some right on Catherine as he has brought her up. However, Catherine has already grown up and has developed interest in Rodolpho and she is not of Eddie too.

Eddie feeling insecure about Catherine's interest in his song tells Rodolpho to stop singing saying that the neighborhood would find out that there is a new man in their house. Catherine is trying to impress the guests so she is wearing the high heels. Again Eddie is found interfering in her interest. He has concealed suspicion to Rodolpho also. The growing nearness between Catherine and Rodolpho troubles Eddie.

When he again knows that Rodolpho and Catherine have gone to see the picture he complains against it but Beatrice says even if Rodolpho gets picked up it is none of the concerns of Eddie. He puts it as if he is showing considerations to the brothers but in reality, he has been troubling himself due to his obsession and his wish



to keep Catherine always with him only. The contrast can be seen between the wishes of Eddie and Beatrice as Beatrice has developed her likings to Rodolpho. In fact, Rodolpho is fantastic; he owes looks, and every other quality that the women like. Nevertheless, for the males like Eddie, Rodolpho might give ‘heeby-jeebies’ to use his own terms, for he has started to be jealous of Rodolpho.

As Beatrice and Eddie converse, Eddie never talks about Beatrice. However, he is always concerned about Catherine’s character and his expectations from her. It is then Beatrice starts to talk about “other worries” about their relationship. We find through their conversation about the trouble in relationship:

EDDIE, *in retreat*. Why? What worries you got?

BEATRICE. When am I gonna be a wife again, Eddie?

EDDIE. I ain’t been feelin’ good. They bother me since they came.

BEATRICE. It’s almost three months you don’t feel good; they’re only here a couple of weeks. It’s three months, Eddie.

EDDIE. I don’t know, B. I don’t want to talk about it. (399)

Eddie is having troubles with Beatrice for a long time that of course, is because of his obsession to Catherine. Even though the men are there only from few days he keeps his blames upon them. Catherine also asks Eddie why he shows resent towards Rodolpho. However, Eddie tells Catherine that he does not find her to be the same instead of answering her. He says Catherine is “runnin’ around someplace” and not “listening anymore” (402) to him.

Eddie also tries to create dissuasion in Catherine to Rodolpho. He says that Rodolpho is just trying to use Catherine to get his wish of being American fulfilled, “That’s a hit-and-run guy, baby; he’s got bright lights in his head, Broadway. Them guys don’t think of nobody but theirselves!” (403). When Beatrice finds that Eddie is

trying to influence Catherine, she says Eddie to leave her alone. With her fury, Eddie trying to retain his dignity walks off guiltily. Then Beatrice tries to show the reality that Catherine has already grown up and is able to take her decisions herself. Then she also says that Eddie had never liked anyone for Catherine. She also suggests her that she needs to show Eddie that he cannot give any orders to her.

The difference between the teachings of Beatrice and Eddie to Catherine is clearly perceptible. While Beatrice teaches to maintain distance with Eddie and to make decision to choose Rodolpho as her love, Eddie teaches her to be close to him as she used to be and maintain distance with Rodolpho. Beatrice's teaching has the potential to make Catherine independent, mature, and free. Therefore, her suggestions are moral teachings to Catherine:

BEATRICE. I'm telling you, I'm not makin' a joke. I tried to tell you a couple of times in the last year or so. That's why I was so happy you were going to go out and get work, you wouldn't be here so much, you'd be a little more independent. I mean it. It's wonderful for a whole family to love each other, but you're a grown woman and you're in the same house with a grown man. So you'll act different now. Heh? (405)

The next truth is revealed when Biff wonders if Oliver thinks that that Biff had stolen the carton of basketballs. Biff also discloses that he had quitted because he felt Oliver would fire him. This is another revealing example, how Biff and Happy are failing to do the duty honestly and how they have started working against morality. They lie, exaggerate, cheat, and steal. These immoral acts are all the effects of the ideals that their father has taught them.

We again find Willy teaching his sons to be careful with girls. He tells them not to make any promises of any kind. This is father who was actually supposed to teach good things to his sons to value the love of girls and to respect their feelings. This conversation reveals Willy's flaw. He is the one who thinks that girls follow and pay for the boys if they are well-liked and famous. Thus, Willy values the career and money only. The moral values don't really matter to him. That is why, we see him teaching his sons to make fun of a true friend like Bernard.

Bernard was the real friend of Biff trying to make him study and do well in his exams. We hear Willy say:

WILLY. Bernard is not well liked, is he?

BIFF. He's liked but he's not well-liked.

HAPPY. That's right, pop.

WILLY. That's just what I mean. Bernard can get the best marks in school, y'understand, but when he gets out in the business world, y'understand, you are going to be five times ahead of him. That's why I thank Almighty God you're both built like Adonises. Because the man who makes an appearance in the business world, the man who creates personal interest, is the man who gets ahead. Be liked and you will never want. You take me, for instance. I never have to wait in line to see a buyer. "Willy Loman is here!" That's all they have to know, and I go right through. (778)

Bernard does not have the appearance- the qualities of manliness according to Willy. He valorizes personal appearance and he presents himself as well-liked time

and again. He fills the mind of his sons with all false pretenses and lies about his popularity.

Willy then tells Linda one reality after his several lies about his popularity. He feels he is losing his aura and personal appearance that is why people seem to laugh at him or not notice him, that he is fat and very “foolish to look at” (779). Here we find Willy gradually beginning to criticize and doubt himself. This is all because of his values of competition in which he has immersed himself so much that his physical traits are analyzed from the perspectives of business. Linda, being a wife and a woman loves him and tells him that he is the handsomest man in the world” (779).

Willy seems to be thinking too much and putting an unbearable stress upon him by the competition and his failure in it makes him feel guilty of betraying his own ideals. Thus, he expresses “Cause I get so lonely [...]. I get the feeling that I’ll never sell anything again, that I won’t make a living for you, or a business, a business for the boys” (779).

Willy has started realizing his moral problems. He is also probably feeling guilty of having an extramarital affair. That is why he remembers his affair with the woman of Boston. The woman picks up the words and changes the meaning. “Me? You didn’t make me, Willy. I picked you” (780). This reveals the next truth the violation of moral law by Willy. We can suppose he has the affair because he wants to be well-liked and famous.

We can also see the comparison where Linda is darning the silk stockings or Willy is giving the silk stockings to the woman. Linda neither complains nor demands any even when she has its need. So, she mends it. Being maddened by his guilt about the other woman and his affair with her, Willy angrily orders Linda to throw out the stockings.

Willy again goes back to his past where Willy and Linda are discussing about their son's character. Linda says, "He's too rough with the girls, Willy. All the mothers are afraid of him!" Few lines later we hear Willy say:

WILLY (*exploding at her*). There's nothing the matter with him! You want him to be a worm like Bernard? He's got spirit, personality ... Loaded with it. Loaded! What is he stealing? He's giving it back, isn't he? Why is he stealing? What did I tell him? I never in my life told him anything but decent things.  
(780)

When Linda is suggesting Willy to teach Biff to value his study, Willy compares his son to Bernard and takes Bernard to be like a 'worm' without personality, without popularity and just concerned about studies. About his training, Willy still thinks that he has trained his sons very well to value good things in life. However, he seems to be unaware of the characters and ideals that his sons have merely inherited from him.

We also come across the dialogues between Charley and Willy. Willy takes Charley's presence as an insult. In an offer of a job by Charley Willy tells he has it already and feels insulted. This reveals the fact that Willy sees himself in comparison to his neighbor Charley. He compares himself to Charley time and again and tries to make his false image with false pretenses as 'well-liked' and being successful. He seems to be ethical egoist who values everything that is favorable to him only in comparison to others.

With the past memories related to Ben, Willy's brother we come upon the revelation, self-doubt, and self-recognition. Willy has started to know that he has not given right kind of education and training to his sons. We find him saying, "Because

sometimes I'm afraid that I'm not teaching them the right kind of – Ben, how should I teach them?" (783).

Both of the women figures in both of the plays try to resolve the abyss of their familial condition. They both view the world and relationship in contrary to the male figures. Linda in *Death of a Salesman* and Beatrice in *A View from the Bridge* try to mend the mistakes of their husbands. They develop care perspective rather than principle oriented and justice oriented morals. They follow the traditional nurturing role of the women. They sometimes are shown to be questioning their husbands but they follow their husbands' words as their duty.

As Linda discusses about the on-going relationship and problem of Biff and Willy and she says that Willy is "more shaky" when Biff is closer to Willy. We can also find that they are hateful to each other. With Biff's words, "He's got no character" (784). We can suppose that Biff hates his father. The ideal figure that Willy tried to present has not been imposed on Biff as Willy imagined. Biff does not find his father to be ideal that he can imitate and follow.

But Linda reveals feminine morality that most of the women possess as they have the nurturing role to perform. So, she shows care perspective being duty oriented to care. She accepts that Willy is "[n]ot the finest character that ever lived. But he's a human being, and a terrible thing is happening to him" (785). Linda seems to be accepting frailty as a normal thing and she feels that a person should be taken care of properly. Here we can also the difference between the concept of morality between that of male and female. Biff is unable to forgive Willy and says he has got no character duty oriented principally but Linda being a woman seems to be taking and accepting Willy as he is.

When Linda asks Biff “What happened to the love you had for him?” (785). She cannot understand why Willy threw Biff out of the house. Then we come up with the most revealing fact when Biff says, “Because I know he’s a fake and he doesn’t like anybody around who knows!” (785). Linda does not like to discuss anything about his attempts of suicide with him, as it would be to discuss his failure to live upto his expectations. Linda also hates Willy’s failure as she has also been betrayed by Willy’s false pretensions, lies, and exaggerations. She has also built fantasy of his success and indirectly becomes passive accomplice in Willy’s betrayal and his guilt.

The same kind of abyss can be seen when Eddie discusses with Alfieri that he has not been able to settle himself from the turmoil of thought that has been swirling over his mind. It is also discernible that Eddie has started to do something against this to get rid of the men. At the very first sight of Eddie, Alfieri saw his eyes were “like tunnels” Alfieri’s first thought was “that he had committed a crime” (406). Alfieri explains that he cannot do anything to help Eddie as he does not see any question of law, because “there’s nothing illegal about a girl falling in love with an immigrant” (406).

Eddie speaks out to express that whenever he thinks of Rodolpho laying his hands on Catherine he feels as if he has been eaten out as he had struggled for her. But Alfieri explains to him that even the law allows the wrong people to work and marry the girl he likes, and the law does not interfere in such issue. The only legal question that could be raised was the way they entered the country illegally. However, Alfieri believes that Eddie would not do anything about this case for he is himself involved in keeping them there in his own house.

Keeping in his mind Eddie’s psychological turmoil, he suggests:

ALFIERI. Yes, but these things have to end, Eddie, that's all. The child has to grow up and go away, and the man has to learn to forget. Because after all, Eddie - what other way can it end? *Pause*. Let her go. That's my advice. You did your job, now it's her life; wish her luck, and let her go. *Pause*. Will you do that? Because there's no law, Eddie; make up your mind to it; the law is not interested ...

EDDIE. He's stealing from me!

ALFIERI. She wants to get married, Eddie. She can't marry you, can she?

EDDIE, *furiously*. What're you talking about, marry me! I don't know what the hell you're talking about. (409-10)

Alfieri already could see what was the end, what Eddie would do now for he has already figured it out what was inside Eddie's head, thus he asked him could Catherine marry him. He says, "Being an intelligent man" (410), he was powerless. Alfieri also went to a wise old lady to find out some solutions as he could foresee the future action of Eddie- his act of betrayal to all.

Eddie back in his house again tries to stop the pace of closeness growing everyday between Catherine and Rodolpho, "It ain't so free here either, Rodolpho" he explains, "just because a girl does not go around with a shawl over her head that she ain't strict" (412). Beatrice repeatedly interrupts him and criticizes him for his interference in Catherine's life as she plainly sees that Rodolpho "didn't exactly drag her off" she suggests Eddie "to be an uncle" (413) and do the duty of uncle.

Eddie does not like Beatrice interrupting him and suggesting him. He acts as a male parochial and thinks his wife should follow him in every step even if that leads to destruction. But Beatrice has already started to suspect him and he realizes how he



acts that's why to put it the other way, he even tells the things in different way as if he is concerned only about them. He tries to scare them saying they are illegally there without papers and identities thus any thing could happen to Rodolpho and it would be very difficult.

In the next act, Rodolpho and Catherine are alone in the house and Catherine has asked Rodolpho if he had loved her just to be American. Rodolpho maintains that he wants to be American but not by using Catherine. However, it is also true that he has loved Catherine dearly so he would like to make her his wife. But, only to be American, he would have never married the women whom he didn't love.

The conversation again depicts the dilemma of Catherine how she would like to be wife to Rodolpho and make Eddie happy at the same time. For her, to go against the teachings of Eddie is not moral violation as they were not actually moral values at all. We know Catherine has no such intentions of hurting Eddie's emotions.

This clearly shows what Eddie is doing is totally wrong and against moral values. So from new light Catherine tries to leave the house as they pack. When Eddie comes back to the house, she boldly declares that she cannot stay there anymore. In this discussion and argument, Eddie tries to owe Catherine so he draws her to him and kisses her as she struggles to free herself. This can be seen as the act of the betrayal towards Catherine, Rodolpho and Beatrice. Catherine thinks of Eddie as her protector, her guardian, her uncle, and her father but he betrays her ideals. Similarly, trying to make Rodolpho leave Catherine, Eddie betrays his expectations that he would give the permission to marry Catherine. It is betrayal to Beatrice as she is expecting love and continuity of their relationship.

Eddie again tries to take help from Alfieri as he discusses about the matter presenting the truth, that he could not prove anything about Rodolpho. However, Alfieri again suggests him:

ALFIERI. This is my last word, Eddie, take it or not, that's your business. Morally or legally you have no rights, you cannot stop it; she is a free agent.

EDDIE, *angering*. Didn't you hear what I told you?

ALFIERI. I heard what you told me, and I'm telling you what the answer is. I'm not only telling you now, I'm warning you- the law is nature. The law is only a word for what has a right to happen. When the law is wrong it's because it's unnatural, but in this case it is natural and a river will drown you if you buck it now. Let her go. And bless her .... You won't have a friend in the world, Eddie! Even those who understand will turn against you, even the ones who feel the same will despise you! (424)

It is the forecast of what will happen next. Alfieri could see Eddie's downfall as he was going against the natural law. Eddie but is unalarmed. He moves egoistically and commits what Alfieri has feared all this time. Eddie reports to the Immigration Bureau. He is not only taking revenge from Rodolpho for what he tells 'stealing' Catherine from him but also violating his own ideals that were based on helpfulness to the people, lying to save the lives, going against the law to provide wages to the family. He is also betraying expectations and trust of Marco who was in belief that he would provide enough food to his family.

Eddie now and then discusses with Beatrice telling her to return his respect. He reprimands her for her way of talking to him. However, after all this too, Baetrice

tries to close the topic. "I'm finished with it. That's all. Nothin' to have out with me, It's all settled. Now we gonna be like it never happened, that's all" (426).

This is what women do in most of the families; they shut their eyes and settle the matter, as they do not have any options of leaving the husbands. They are easily able to forgive them for their betrayals rather than leaving them. However, she has been criticizing and trying to make Eddie guilty about his act. Eddie still exercises his many demands, "Don't tell me okay, okay, I'm telling you the truth. A wife is supposed to believe the husband. If I tell you the guy ain't right don't tell me he is right" (427).

Eddie seems to be teaching his wife, the duty of being wife that she ought to believe in what her husband tells her, no matter how wrong he is. However, Beatrice tries to persuade and convince him to accept their relationship.

When the immigration bureau searches the house and finds the illegal immigrants, Eddie is blamed by everyone. According to Marco, Eddie degraded Rodolpho, Marco's blood and robbed his children as he cut off the sources of income to them by informing about them.

In both of the plays, the protagonists see themselves as failures and morally degraded when everyone around questions them. As Eddie has been blamed by Marco being scrutinized with staring eyes on him by everyone. Similarly, Biff starts questioning Willy showing what he did wrong and how his family always cheated with lies never even speaking the truth for a single second.

Even at the stage when Willy has already been 63 years old and soon is retiring, he boasts with his false pretenses, "They laugh at me, heh? Go to Filene's, go to the Hub, go to Slatery's Boston. Call out the name Willy Loman see what happens! Big shot!" (786).

Biff again hints about what he cannot accept about Willy “Since when did he get so clean?” (786). Biff is indicating some kind of truth that he has been keeping to himself. We find that Biff is unable to respect Willy and Willy is quite right when he says that Biff is insulting him.

As they are planning to start a future since Biff has been ready to see Oliver to start the job, Linda tries to lighten up with renewed hope. But we find Willy interrupting her time and again and tries to talk himself. Biff then bursts out “Stop yelling at her” as it’s not been hard to shout at Willy due to his lack of respect to him. He feels Willy always takes advantage of his mother as he knows that Willy is having an affair.

Willy, a little later, tells Biff that he has got all kinds of greatness in him probably he is appreciating Biff’s effort in hiding his secret affair. When Linda tries to ask Willy to clear her confusion that has been on her mind since her talk with Biff “Willy dear, what has he got against you?” But he brushes her aside saying “I am so tired. Don’t talk any more” (788).

It is in the conversation between Howard and Willy that he has now realized that he is losing his grounds. He says, “Today its all cut and dried, and there’s no chance for bringing friendship to bear- or personality” and accepts the fact, “they don’t know me any more” (791). In the same scene, we find Willy saying to Howard, “you can’t eat the orange and throw the peel away- a man is not a piece of fruit!” (791).

But we know the truth that this happens in consumer’s society everything has its value until and unless it works. As soon as it is useless it is thrown. Same has happened in case of Willy. He cannot work properly, he is unable to give average commissions. Even a person has to sell himself when he is unable he is fired from his

job. When Willy feels defeated in his trials to convince Howard, his only aim is to maintain his dignity and get out of the room. Willy tells Howard about his plan that he will keep traveling, he concedes, he will go to Boston. But Howard shows Willy his ground as “I don’t want you to represent us. I’ve been meaning to tell you for a long time now” (791). Howard again suggests Willy, “This is no time for a false pride” (792).

This is the tragic flaw of Willy, and the tragedy of common man. Though he has nothing, no stature to show but he has a false pride in him. This can be again seen when Willy encounters Bernard. In Bernard’s question about Biff, Willy answers saying Biff is “working on a very big deal” (794). This has been the character of Willy and his reality. He tells lies to present flashiness and not the reality.

Similar kind of tragic flaw is found in Eddie as well. He is also the common man who pretends to have a grand stature as a tragic hero. Miller by presenting common men as tragic heroes has gone against the conventional concept of tragic hero having royal heritage and position with all sorts of grandness. He himself defended that in the modern period the tragic hero conceived by Aristotle can hardly be seen as acceptable. The fate and condition of these protagonists with flaws make them suitable to be heroic figures in such period.

Eddie demands that his family, friends, and everyone else need to return his name as he feels that his name has been condemned and he has been offended for false blames. He stills wants his respect no matter even if it is a forced one.

It is the wedding day, and Catherine is getting ready, she asks Beatrice to go along with her. However, Eddie does not allow her to go blackmailing her, “You walk out that door to that wedding you ain’t coming back here” (435). Beatrice in either respect or obedience to Eddie replies to Catherine that she can’t go. She even takes his

side saying, “then we all belong to garbage. You, and me too. Don’t say that. Whatever happened we all done it, and don’t you ever forget it” (436) when she defends Eddie in the blames of Catherine.

Though it is clear that Eddie is sad because he has not been successful in his effort to stop Catherine to marry Rodolpho, Eddie puts it the other way that he wants his name back. In this case, it is clear that when a person has to live in neighborhood he needs his respect otherwise he cannot be happy. For man is a social being and he searches his happiness in communal feelings. When Beatrice reveals the truth that it is not only forgiveness from Marco and Rodolpho that matters to Eddie but he wants “somethin’ else”, and says “you can never have her!” (437), Eddie is horrified. And he gives up his life because he is horrified to face Beatrice for the betrayal he has committed and Beatrice lessons it all.

We also come upon another truth from the conversation between Bernard and Willy. Willy asks why Biff’s life ended after Ebbets field game. Then Bernard tells that Biff was flunked by the math teacher. Here we again find Willy’s self-doubts, “[m]ay be I did something to him. I got nothing to give him” and he adds, “It keeps going around my mind, maybe I did something wrong to him” (794).

Though Willy repetitively thinks that he has given his boys the right teachings but he wonders if he has brought them upright. With his wonders he tries to understand the real problem behind Biff’s act of giving up his hopes and dreams of his career. It is then Bernard who talks of the event that when Biff returned back from New England where he had gone to talk with Willy, he took his favorite sneakers down in the cellar and burned them up in the furnace. When Bernard asks back to Willy what had happened in Boston, Willy acts weird as if someone is intruding upon his secret.

This hints that there might have been a great problem between Biff and Willy as they both also have problems, contradictions and Biff has started to call him a fake. Later it is revealed that Biff had caught Willy red handed with the woman, thus what he had been idealizing in his life was all fake. The role model he had been idealizing was that of his father but due to Willy's act of betrayal, Biff gives up his dreams and all his prospects.

When Charley comes there to see off Bernard, he talks to Willy. Then we also come to know that Bernard had become a lawyer and was going to argue a case.

WILLY. And you never told him what to do, did you? You never took any interest in him.

CHARLEY. My salvation is that I never took any interest in anything.

(795)

Charley's answers reveal his moral ideals. Charley lacks personality that Willy boasts of possessing, but is content even with small business. He never runs after the dreams that seem to be impossible. And finally, he has become successful and owns everything that Willy wishes to have. Even here we find him offering job to Willy but Willy feels insulted. However, he feels that Charley is the only one with whom he can share his things so he regrets that Howard fired him.

Through Charley's words we understand the morals of consumer society. The human sentiments do not mean anything, as they are unable to be sold. However, Willy realizes that he had thought otherwise throughout his life, valuing the preferences and impressiveness. Again, in Charley's offer we see Willy's problem. Willy has been jealous of Charley all his life. He always used to care and take interest in everything just to set himself off against Charley. It was all competition for him.

But Charley always was the true friend of Willy. Willy had completely immersed himself in the competition that he tried to idealize and create his false images.

The new scene in restaurant as a preparation to take back to the past shows Happy lying and trying to impress the woman flirting with her. This shows Happy's moral problems that he has inherited from his father. Like his father Happy idealizes the golden years of promise. Biff was unable to settle his meeting instead of ending up stealing Oliver's pen. With all the lies and exaggerations, Biff has been tired thus he has made up his mind to tell all the truth to his father. "What a ridiculous lie my whole life has been!" he adds, "We've been talking in a dream for fifteen years" (797).

Biff has been feeling an unbearable pressure that his father has put on him. However, Biff has been unable to fulfill it that is why he feels worthless. Willy is taken back to his past because of the parallel scene involving Biff and probably because of his conversation with Bernard had taken him to past in Boston. He remembers the time when Biff wanted to talk to him about his credits and points in Mathematics, he was with the woman of Boston with whom he had been having the affair. Though Willy tried to conceal it, Biff came to know about the affair and his father's act of betrayal towards his whole family and his ideals.

Back to the present, when they all are in their home, Biff comes down straight to the facts and starts the truth: "No, you're going to hear the truth-what you are and what I am!" (805). He has decided to reveal as he says that he is not the "leader of men" and is incapable because he lacks morality that a leader owes. Saying "We never told the truth for ten minutes in this house!" he tells:

BIFF. You big blow, are you the assistant buyer? You're one of the two assistants to assistant, ...



BIFF. You know why I had no address for three months? I stole a suit in Kansas City and I was in jail. (805)

Even though Biff reveals these facts he does not tell about Willy's infidelity. Thus, Willy says to Linda and Happy that Biff likes him. With the suicide of Willy, the family is free of debts, free of exaggerations, lies, and false ideals. But Linda can't understand Willy has died due to his infidelity and betrayal because he has gone against his own moral standards he had set for himself and his family.

Both of the plays reveal the fact that the individual chooses the moral codes for himself, which need not be the conventional moral codes. The individual is free either to follow the conventional moral codes or to create his own standards of norms that may go against the traditional values. But no matter whether a person has unthinkingly absorbed a set of rules and standards from his social environment or has chosen them himself on the basis of his self-reflection, he will implicitly or explicitly use them as grounds to judge right and wrong conduct. Insofar as a person tries to live up to the rules and standards he sincerely accepts, they become part of his philosophy of life. This philosophy determines his ultimate ends and ideals in life, providing him with reasons for considering some goals as more important than others.

For a particular person his moral consciousness consists of his beliefs about what is right and wrong his feelings of remorse and guilt when he fails to live up to his own moral norms and his sense of self-respect when he does fulfill them. Both Eddie and Willy have feelings of guilt and remorse for their acts for they go against what they have idealized as their principles of life.

#### 4. Conclusion

Miller in his dramas *A View from the Bridge* and *Death of a Salesman* shows the protagonists Eddie Carbone and Willy Loman having moral problems in fitting to the moral ideals that they have made for themselves; they are always seen to be teaching others to follow their trail to become ethically upright in the society. They always compare themselves to others to seek out happiness in their lives. Eddie hates his filthy neighborhood. Due to his obsession to his own niece he does not want her to go to this neighborhood and work. He is found to be teaching his niece about morality, strictness, and adherence to the traditional thoughts. However, he has moral problem in himself that he is unable to see Catherine, his niece as his daughter-figure and let her live happily with her love. He instead has grown obsession towards her even ruining his relationship with Beatrice, his wife.

Due to the same problem he goes to the extent of betraying his friends Marco and Rodolpho whom he has himself provided asylum in his own house. Eddie who values helpfulness and friendliness dismantles the same ideals he has made. He teaches others not to reveal the fact about Marco and Rodolpho in providing them chance to earn more money to support their family however, he himself informs about them to immigration office.

Selfishness, material progress, competition, and obsession make men immoral leading them to dismantle their own moral ideals that they deeply develop to follow. Selfishness and obsession in Eddie's part makes him immoral in ruining his niece's love life. Willy Loman similarly teaches his sons to be successful. His teachings always involve competition with their friends in Willy's case with Charley and in his sons' case with Bernard. He valorizes himself and his sons to be "well-liked" having personal attractiveness and all of those things that are required to be successful. He

always emphasizes his sons' personal outlooks rather than their academic career. However, due to the harsh reality of consumer society Willy becomes failure to be role model of his sons.

Both Eddie and Willy fail to become role model of others. They also have moral problems in that they cannot keep their promises to their wives with their fidelity. Eddie has sexual obsession to his own niece and Willy valorizing the well-likeness goes to the extent of betraying his ideals and his wife and having affairs with his customers. This suggests that he might have been involved with similar affairs with various women though we are told of only one.

There are differences in how males react to the acts of betrayal. While Biff cannot forgive his father and both Eddie and Willy feel guilty in betraying and lowering their ideals, Catherine, Beatrice and Linda easily forgive Eddie and Willy. The evaluations someone uses in his moral judgments need not be conventionally accepted norms of a society's established moral codes. However, no matter whether one has chosen the moral norms himself or followed the conventional morality of his society, he chooses some values to judge right and wrong. Both Eddie and Willy, though make their own judgments to judge their acts they cannot follow the rules and standards they develop. When they lower their ideals betraying themselves and others they become failures and unable to live with self-respect.

### Works Cited

- Augustine, St. "On Christian Doctrine." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Harcourt, 1992. 107-13.
- Beauvoir, Simone de. "The Married Woman." *The Second Sex*. Trans. H. M. Parshley. New York: Vintage, 1972. 476-96.
- Bonevac, Daniel. "First Principles: Sexual Behavior." *Today's Moral Issues: Classic and Contemporary Perspectives*. 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. Toronto: The McGraw Hill Companies, 2002. 56-76.
- Boss, Judith A. *Ethics for Life*. Toronto: Mayfield, 2001. 200-30.
- Dewey, John. "Right, Duty, and Loyalty." *Theory of the Moral Life*. New York: Irvington, 1980. 64-88.
- Doren, Charles Van. "The Middle Ages: The Great Experiment." *A History of Knowledge: Past, Present and Future*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1992. 119-22.
- Duprat, G. L. "The Family, Friendship, and the Collective Sentiments." *Morals: The Psycho-Sociological Bases of Ethics*. Trans. W. J. Greenstreet. Ed. Havelock Ellis. London: Walter Scott, 1930. 314-30.
- Gaarder, Jostein. "Socrates." *Sophie's World: A Novel About the History of Philosophy*. Trans. Paulette Moller. New York: Berkeley Books, 1996. 56-71.
- Gilligan, C. and J. Attanucci. "Two Moral Orientations: Gender Differences and Similarities." *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 34 (1988): 223-37.
- Jefferson, Thomas. "The Declaration of Independence." *Essays on the Creation of Knowledge*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Eds. Shreedhar Pd. Lohani, Rameshwor Pd. Adhikary, Abhi N. Subedi. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar, 1996. 12-16.

- Kant, Immanuel. *Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysic of Morals*. Trans. Thomas Kingsmill Abbott. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1949. 40-50.
- Lantz, Herman R., and Eloise C. Synder. "Externalizations and Marital Incompatibility." *Marriage: The Study of Man Woman Relationship*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1969. 284-87.
- Lillie, William. "The Development of Ethical Theory." *An Introduction to Ethics*. London: Barnes and Noble, 1964. 84-103.
- Manderson, Desmond. "Emmanuel Levinas and the Philosophy of Negligence." *Tortlaw Review* 14 (2006): 1-18.
- Margalit, Avishai. *The Ethics of Memory*. London: Harvard UP, 2002. 193-200.
- Miller, Arthur. "Death of a Salesman." *The Bedford Introduction to Drama*. Ed. Lee A. Jacobus. New York: Bedford, 2001. 767-808.
- . "A View from the Bridge." *The Collected Plays*. New York: Viking Press, 1957. 377-439.
- Miller, Saul L. and Jon K. Maner. "Coping with Romantic Betrayal: Sex Differences in Responses to Partner Infidelity." *Evolutionary Psychology* 6 (2008): 413-26. <<http://www.epjournal.net/>>.
- Mothershead, John L. *Ethics: Modern Conceptions of the Principles of Right*. New York: Henry Holt Company, 1955. 225-310.
- Noam, Nathan. "Feminist Ethics without Feminist Ethical Theory." *Ethical Issues for the 21st Century*. Ed. Frederick Adams. Spec. issue of *The Journal of Philosophical Research* 8 (2005): 213-225.
- Taylor, Paul W. "What is Ethics." *Principles of Ethics: An Introduction*. California: Dickenson Publishing Company Inc., 1975. 1-15.