

## International Journal of Arts and Humanities (IJAH)

### Ethiopia

Vol. 6(3), S/No 22, July, 2017: 106-117

ISSN: 2225-8590 (Print) ISSN 2227-5452 (Online)

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ijah.v6i3.9>

---

### **The Bourgeois Hawks in Market Arena: A Marxist Reading of *A Market of Betrayal***

**Adebanjo, Niyi**

Department of English

Olabisi Onabanjo University

P. M. B. 2002, Ago-Iwoye

Ogun State, Nigeria

E-mail: [dradeniyiadebanjo@yahoo.com](mailto:dradeniyiadebanjo@yahoo.com)

Telephone: +2348055231704; +2348034017520

.....  
**Sodiji, Seye**

Department of English

Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye

#### **Abstract**

Society, at its different stages of development, is said to evolve different modes of economic production- ranging from primitive mode, slavery mode, feudal mode, capitalist mode and sociological mode. Deploying Marxist literary theory, the paper focused on the effects and the implications of socio-economic evolution in *A Market of Betrayals* by examining the prevailing mode of production in the play, the type of social relations that exist among the people and govern their relation; those who determine these rules and the means of enforcing them as well as the implication for the opposing force and the society at large. Through textual analysis, it is established that the inherent contradictions in the world of *A Market of Betrayals* stem from the hidden selfish interest and hypocrisy of the dominant economic force which is in conflict with the interest of the working class. The hidden interests are presented as having universal values meant for the well-being of the people. The paper concluded that any socio-economic relations geared towards exploiting the people will eventually lead to a conflict because of its inherent contradictions. This conflict does not always resolve itself into a new position, essentially different from the original position.

**Key Words:** Bourgeois, Proletariat, Superstructure, Hawks, Dialectical materialism.

#### **Introduction**

Drama, like other literary forms, has presented an evolving bourgeois setting that treats off the inherent conflict that ensues between the working masses (proletariat) in the

market and the bourgeoisies who are aligned with the capitalists that hold the rein of socio-economic and political powers. The conflict presents a situation in which the bourgeois hawks impose their will on the proletariat, in the market, in a manner similar to what Karl Marx described as dialectical materialism.

The resultant effect of this opposition or conflict does not however resolve itself into a new (third) position in the form of the Hegelian proposition at the end of the play. This, thus, informed our beliefs that though any economic relation geared towards exploiting the people will eventually lead to a conflict because of its inherent contradictions. Ideology pervades the personalities of individuals to produce distorted reality but also because it presents itself as a cultural phenomenon firmly implanted in people's consciousness.

Beyond this, while the opposition between the working masses and the capitalists' results in a serious shake-up in the superstructures, the economic base (which constitutes the overriding ideology) is so powerful to regulate the cracks and control emerging deviants. The reason is that it is the ideological platform upon which all other superstructures - the institutional ideas and concepts - are based to form a holistic system. The other reason is that money is the driving force, propelled by greed. And by nature, every human is greedy regardless of his social position. According to Sexton (2008) in "Writing a Literary Term Paper Using Marxist Criticism: What You Need to Know":

Capitalism reproduces itself and keeps the exploited working class from rising up and overthrowing a system designed to exploit and alienate them not through the brutality of totalitarianism but rather by institutional naturalization of the process via religion, legal system, the educational system and government (Sexton, 2008, p. 2).

It can then be said that all these concrete institutional ideas merely serve to reinforce the economic base which masks an individual's greed. It can then be affirmed that what makes reproduction possible is greed on the part of both the capitalist and the proletariat.

### **Theoretical Framework**

In pursuing our argument in this paper, we explored the basic concepts of Marxist literary theory that serve as the analytical tools for the criticism of the text under our consideration. These concepts represent the major perspectives from which we approach the criticism of this text. The first of these theoretical concepts –dialectical materialism – in a way, traced Marxist literary theory back to its origin, which has its root in the philosophical tradition of German philosophers- Hegel, Feuerbach and Kaut. All of these philosophers were empiricists who believed in the primacy of the power of sensory perception over and above any idealistic constructs. They believed in what is objectively verifiable through the power of senses and were bothered with the question of what is real according to sensory perception, or what makes what is real actually real. Materialism has its root in empiricism of western philosophical thought from which science, as an empirical and objective observation of verifiable phenomena, particularly the material external reality developed. (Badcook, 1975; Elster, 1986; Bamidele, 2003; Utuama and Whawo, 2011) Materialism, therefore, eliminates every subjective and emotional explanation of phenomena. For this reason, materialist

philosophy is based on empirical reality and is more interested in knowing why things are as they are, or more precisely, why they are real. The descriptive epithet in the concept, 'dialectics' is of Greek origin which means 'dialogue'- to argue. Marx borrowed this term from Hegel whose dialectics was considered too idealistic and upside down. According to Bali (1999) in *Philosophy and Dialectics as Metaphysics*:

Marx 'mockingly' described Hegel's dialectics as walking on its head and that in order to make it intelligible and workable, it is necessary to set it on its feet. Marx meant that dialectics should not be seen at work only in consciousness but more importantly in nature and society. He was inspired by Feuerbach (1804-1872) whose doctrine – for being materialistic by definitions and aiming at freeing man from all forms of slavery, economic exploitation, or alienation- is a humanism transcending all previous humanistic theories and fundamentally anti-religious (Bali, 1999, p. 33).

Marx borrowed, therefore, the term from Hegel who 'thought that no ideas, social formations or practices were eternal or fixed but were always in motion of flux'. For Hegel, flux or change occurs as a result of conflict between two opposing forces which often result into another third entity. This is expressed in form of an argument which views a position called thesis, and another position- antithesis, resulting into another position called synthesis. This, again, becomes a thesis in conflict with another position (antithesis) which resolves itself into another position. Thus, the state of flux continues as a result of this kind of binary oppositions which often resolves itself in another position (Raymond, 1978; Eagleton, 1990; Jameson, 1992; Utoh-Ezeajugh and Ayakoroma, 2015). This is the reason for the continual change in the society. Thus, in this way, dialectical materialism is characterized by dialectical change, interrelatedness and the law of contradiction. This was what Marx applied to his observation of the economic relations between the proletariat and the bourgeoisies who are aligned with the capitalist. This was with the belief that the inherent contradictions in capitalism would eventually produce the conflict between opposing forces in the economic relations that would lead to a new position, socialism (Rossi-, 1990; Bamidele, 2003; Dobie, 2009).

The other concept examined links Marxist literary theory with history. This historical leaning is known as historical materialism. It emphasized the fact that historical, social or political change occurs because of human agents and not as a result of any unseen ultimate being, or some unknown forces or destiny. Historical materialism is materialistic in nature because it is interested in how human beings produce a material culture, that is, tools, objects and all other material things that we use in our quotidian endeavours. By implication, it explained how material culture has served as an agent of historical change. The view of history thus upholds that social organization and other concomitant changes are driven by people, the tools they have created and how they use the tools. It is these tools that are regarded as instrument of production or forces of production. The human labour which comprises the people and how they use their tools, often results into a particular social character (Raymond, 1978; Elster, 1986; Jameson, 1992; Dobie, 2009). The social character reflects how people relate with one another socially and how they organize themselves.

From historical materialism perspective, the organization's responsibilities for shaping how humans use their tools are called relations of production. The relations of

production and the forces of production form the mode of production. According to Marx, capitalism, as a mode of production, emerged from feudalism (a mode of production that showed how labour and life were organized in the medieval Europe. For Marx, capitalism involved the exploitation of workers much like the slave states exploited the slaves. This exploitation, borne out of inequality is at the core of capitalism and need be changed. This changed as it were, can only be achieved through a dialectical struggle (Badcook, 1975; Elster, 1986; Bamidele, 2003; Utuama and Whawo, 2011).

The third concept links Marxist literary theory to the economic system of capitalism. It is based on how the relations of production and the forces of production operate in a capitalist system. The labourers (known as proletariat) work in a factory where they add value to the raw materials through their human labour. This operation results in a surplus value which the capitalist sells in the market in excess of the cost of the raw materials. The relations of production then pay the labourers barely enough to keep them coming back. This is regarded as a reproduction. This economic relations result in alienation according to Marxism. First, this is in the sense that resultant commodity produced by the labourers is taken away from them, thus they are alienated from the commodity. The second view of alienation is considered from the humanist point of view that, the commodity, which is the labour of the labourer, is sold in the market. Thus, the labourers are viewed as commodities, that is, in terms of their exchange value. They are treated as economic units in a way that negates their humanity (Raymond, 1978; Eagleton, 1990; Jameson, 1992; Utoh-Ezeajugh and Ayakoroma, 2015).

This mode of production, in all cultures, produced a social relation which pitched the proletariat against the capitalists in a dialectical struggle. Of course, there is the third force in these economic relations, the bourgeoisie who do not render their labour directly, but render services to both the proletariat and the capitalists. These people include lawyers, teachers, doctors, engineers and so on. They form the middle class and are often counted alongside the capitalist.

This economic relation, otherwise known as the base, provides the springboard upon which the institutional frameworks are built. These frameworks known as superstructures are there to protect and safeguard the capitalist culture and serve the interest of the capitalist themselves. They include politics, religion, philosophy morality, science, art and security agents. The implication of art being among the superstructures is that literature itself is a superstructure that reflects the ideology of the culture that produces it, whether capitalist or Marxism. This is because all these superstructures are shaped by the mode of production that exists in a particular society. It is instructive to note that these superstructures themselves are regarded as ideologies.

This manner of conceiving ideologies has the tendency of regarding ideology as first, an idealistic construct that makes the world looks like mere hotchpotch of ideas, thoughts, and principles that exist independently outside the material world. It also has the implication of reducing ideology to a mere thought process geared towards producing an ideal world. Lastly it is a way of regarding it as an alternative approach to reality that makes it possible to construct all kinds of speculative, indeed, an abstract and arbitrary scheme to short change reality- to create a false consciousness; that is, a way of using ideology to cover up its own failures. But, as said earlier, ideology is

greater than the totality of ideas. Of course, it is easy for the Marxist to consider ideologies as a set of ideas and concepts to produce false consciousness.

This, at least, is evident from the concepts of Marxism that have been treaded off at the offset of this paper. This way of viewing the superstructures made it possible for the Marxists to view capitalism as producing ideologies to create false consciousness aimed at exploiting and oppressing the working masses (proletariat). At least, some of such ideological superstructures are highlighted in *A Market of Betrayals*. They are politics, religion, and the state security apparatus which served as agents of repression.

### **Summary of *A Market of Betrayals***

The play begins with two elders who arrive at the market very early in the morning. They discuss the latest development in Ajegunle and the market in particular. Obviously, a new market has been built and a nocturnal installation of a new Yeye Oja has also taken place. They are there to witness the commissioning of this new building and the celebration of the installation of the new Yeye Oja. Their discussion is interrupted by rave of a madwoman, Salewa, the incumbent priestess of Aje, the goddess of prosperity and sales. Elder I says she is convinced that Salewa is moved to desecrate the market ground before the event of the day. Elder II is of the opinion that a terrible curse is on the land since a madwoman has never taken her abode in the market, in the history of the land.

The mad woman eventually comes into full view, raving about the loss of her husband and children whom she accuses of neglecting her among several other offences. While Elder II believes that her madness has nothing to do with her actions (Adebanjo, 2008, p. 12).

Situation II witnesses the meeting of the leaders of the market, Babalaje, Iyalaje, Alhaji Isa, Chief Ude and Salewa. With the exception of Salewa, others constitute the bourgeois hawks in the market arena. While other sellers are busy displaying their wares, Babalaje addresses those present at the meeting. He intimates them about the current decision of the government. From the response of others, particularly Chief Ude and Salewa, it is certain that they are not all privy to the government's decision. Salewa asks for other members of the association of Ajegunle Trade Union. Babalaje replies that they are not important. He informs them that the government wants to open the market to people from the cities and across the seas because they can no longer maintain and manage it. He makes it clear to others that there is profit opportunity for all of them in the meeting. He tells them about the government's intention to rebuild the market. This, he regards as another dividend of democracy. However, Salewa sees this as a ploy to get rid of the people, impoverish them. Iyalaja's violent response shows that she is privy to the meeting with the excellency and this sparks off an argument between her and Salewa who is regarded as an ingrate.

In situation 3, Salewa is seen at the office of Assistant Police Commissioner. She wants to know the whereabouts of her children. Obviously from the discussion, she has been in the police custody for some days. The APC tells her that the police are investigating the matter. Salewa asks him: 'how much have these messiahs of pain paid for your conscience? How much did it cost them to make you a beast? Tell me, Oga Suberu'. The APC is annoyed at being called 'Suberu' and insists he is Olawale Badmus. He reminds her that the police are merely performing their duty. The APC tells her that her

own case is a serious offence – ‘an attempt to subvert a constitutionally elected government, arson, treasonable felony, if you like, its civil unrest and an attempt to murder. But your boys.... we can’t still see the connection’. Salewa is pained by the loss of her boys and pleads that her boys be left out of the whole matter. It is obvious that the bourgeois hawks have framed her up. A sergeant comes in and drops a newspaper which contains a caption ‘Our Moremi Incarcerated’, obviously referring to Salewa as Moremi, a Yoruba legendary figure who delivered her people from the threat and captivity of the Igbo warriors. The APC’s response shows that the writer of the article and the Editor of the newspaper are already in police custody. Salewa asks him if the police are afraid of the press. The APC, ignoring her question, asks her about her planned nude protest. Salewa tells him that taking the people’s source of livelihood, destroying the women’s sources of income is more than exposing their nudity in the market. She says: ‘which nation on earth does not know.... Nudity means nothing to the insane’ (Adebanjo, 2008, p. 26). The APC, however, betrays himself when he replies that Salewa should not allow her foolishness to destroy her children. He confesses that the children are in police custody and they have only been slightly tortured. Salewa accuses the APC and the police of cowardice because they can’t own up to the world that they have her children in their custody. The APC tells her the police merely obey orders. To this Salewa asks if they take order from traitors or from the excellency. The APC replies that Babalaje and Iyaloja have even come to beg for her release and have even written an appeal letter to his excellency. When Salewa says Orisa Ajegunle will expose and disgrace them, the APC says Orisas are powerless before money. ‘Money answereth all things, the Messiah Himself said so’ (27). Salewa replies that ‘truth is God’ and it cannot be bought. APC replies her that money gives life and money kills it. Everyone is powerless before it. Salewa replies,

But the hunger! The pain! The sickness! The incarceration!  
The Homelessness! They only empower money. Without  
Poverty and fear, money will be dethroned. It will mean  
nothing (Adebanjo, 2008, p. 27).

The APC makes it clear to her that money is not a slave. It has absolute power and cannot be dethroned. He says its power is shown through poverty and fear. But still Salewa believes that absolute power is with the people and that when they rise, all messiahs of pain will be wiped and money will flee. The APC thinks Salewa is merely a blind dreamer. The sergeant enters again to give the APC a note which indicates that Iyaloja and Babalaje have paid the medical bill for the treatment of her children and fed them throughout. Salewa curses them and believes that they will pay for their sin someday. She asks the APC when she will be released but it appears that the APC is not even sure of this. When the APC tells her that she should worry about herself and not her children, she replies that she is not worried if her earthly tabernacle is destroyed after all, her soul can’t be destroyed. But the APC tells her that where money is involved, it kills body, soul and spirit.

In situation 4, the scene takes place in the market square. There is celebration and dancing. A new Yeye oja has been installed. Elder II calls the celebration, a mourning. Risika, after learning that a new Yeye Oja has been installed says: ‘Impossible that’s an abomination...’ (Adebanjo, 2008, p. 31). Elder I believes that, this is only possible

because Oke-Aje has gone to sleep. Elder II corrects her by saying, ‘the goddess is not just asleep but dead’.

Adeoti, Iyaloja’s daughter, has been installed as the new priestess of Oke Aje. When Risika asks about the reaction of the people to this development Elder II tells her that the people left in Ajegunle are worse than animals. The newly installed priestess of Oke – Aje enters the market square in a royal robe. Babalaje addresses the people briefly and asserts that Oke-Aje has demanded for seven cow heads and the bodies are waiting to be devoured by the people. He tells them the whole of Ajegunle is celebrating and it is all part of the dividends of democracy. Besides, Oke-Aje, the goddess of sales and prosperity has demanded for a new Yeye Oja. He adds: ‘times are changing... and the goddess must change. Still, as part of the celebration, the market is wearing a new look’ Babalaje adds.

After this the new Yeye Oja goes into trance and prays for the people while carrying the pot of prosperity (Ikoko Aje). Suddenly, the pot falls down from her hands and breaks. The people shout: Aje O! Abomination Oke-Aje is finished. What is this! The new Yeye Oja translates this into another blessing by saying the pot of sorrow has been broken. The people shout ‘Amen’. Elder II is worried about the response of the people to this abomination that they are still celebrating and jubilating after the breaking of the ancient pot. Her conclusion is that either money or religion has bought the people. The discussion between Elder I and Risika also shows that each of the people has been given a tuber of yam and a milk-tin of salt. Salewa arrives in the middle of this celebration shouting again, ‘Ta lo ba mi ri Ide O?’ Risika regards her as a madwoman and wonders how long she will continue in her madness. Elder I believes that anybody who goes through Salewa’s experience will definitely go mad. Risika is of the opinion that losing her children is not enough for her to go insane and lose all that she has laboured for. Elder II quickly corrects her that losing a single child in such a situation as hers is enough to agonize anybody. The discussion shows that Salewa has lost her two children to a supposed drunk-driver while they are going to welcome her after her incarceration in room 16. Elder II says it’s a room of insanity and death and a poison has been put in her blood that robs her of her mind. Elder II says that her children are actually snatched away from her by the supposed drunk-driver. This, according to her, is a way of dealing with oppositions. In addition, her husband is also killed by the drunk driver in the same manner. All these are attributed to due process. Elder II says sarcastically;

Why are we here without any source of livelihood?

Due process! Thanks to due process. Due process took  
away our shops, jobs, peace, freedom, rights and us,  
our husbands and children on the street, without cover.

Is that not what privatization means? (Adebanjo, 2008, p. 36)

Amidst the celebration, Babalaje hands over the opa Aje (the wand of office) to the new Yeye Oja and almost simultaneously, the new market building collapses.

### **Textual Analysis**

The way humans conceive of their environment shapes the organization of their society and individual conducts within the society. The goddess of Ajegunle is the goddess of sales and prosperity. This has a significant impact on the way the people view their

world, their society, and conduct themselves within it. Aje, herself, as the goddess of sales and prosperity favours the mercantile interest of individuals within the society and of course, only rewards hard work. She distributes wealth on the bases of this. She is the force behind creation and whoever makes profit on his sales, attributes this to the goddess. It is in this way that we understand in the play that ideology, more than an ordinary system, unites nature, society and individual. And this, again, showed that literature itself can reinforce the prevailing ideology of the society in which it is produced, thus becoming an ideological construct itself – this might happen consciously or unconsciously.

That Iyaloja and others (the bourgeois' hawks) are able to short-change the priestess of Aje simply means that only those that are favoured by the goddess – those whose mercantile interest has brought about huge fortune – has the power to determine who serves as the spokesperson or the mouthpiece of the goodness who merely represents a concrete idea of a greater ideological base. Thus, they also possess the power to determine the doctrine of that goddess, how she should be worshipped and the means of punishing deviants from norms of the society since the organization of the society and the conduct of individuals are inextricably woven with the way the people conceive their environment. Wellek (1955) recognized this fact in *Theory of Literature* when he eventually admitted that:

We can establish some connection between the modes of production and literature, since an economic system usually implies some system of power and must control the forms of life. And the family plays an important role in education, in the concept of sexuality and love, in the whole convention and tradition of human sentiment (Wellek, 1955, p. 94).

We can reasonably assert that people construct their religion, their education, political system and other social institutions according to the way they conceive their world and this conception of the society in 'Ajegunle, the setting of *A Market betrayals*, as in any other society, is inseparable from the narrow interest of a few individuals who occupy privileged positions within the society and thus serve as the custodians of the societal values. Iyalode's statement that she is the goddess of the market rings true. The only logical conclusion, we can draw is that if we accept the statement of Iyaloja as the goddess of the market, it then means when money speaks, everybody keeps silent. And if the people have chosen money as their goddess, they have unwittingly chosen Iyaloja. Neither can they reject her mouth-piece.

That the play begins and ends in the market means that the world is, in literal and metaphoric term, regarded as a market. This reveals something about the nature of man. He is a greedy being who is always driven by mercantile interests and this greed is often hidden in the freedom to own means of production and right to own property. This is why we posit that greed makes reproduction possible in capitalism. Once the impression is given that everybody has something to benefit from the economic relations, the greedy instinct is satisfied and the feeling of exploitation is assuaged. Yet, someone may say that this satisfaction is not always in equal measure. Yes, but it is always enough to reshuffle the people in a manner that produces new bourgeois out of the proletariats and even, new capitalists, out of the bourgeoisie and the greedy cycle of mercantile interests continues to whirl round, principally because it is subsumed under the freedom of ownership and fuelled by the imagination to create products that

satisfy the needs of others. This, basically, is related to consumerism which, according to Marxism, produces a sign exchange value that is based on the insecurity created by the capitalists.

Naturally, we will regard Aje as the goddess behind the market forces and profit. She regulates the activities of the market, imposes peace and order on it and distributes profit to its participants impartially according to the law of market forces. That Salewa, the goddess' mouthpiece is bereaved, incarcerated, tortured and poisoned to madness is part of the ploy to preserve the economic relations by the 'invisible' hands of the capitalists in conjunction with the bourgeois hawks in order to corner all the benefits and profits of the market. The climax of this is seen in the nocturnal arrangement to short-change, the priestess, and by implication, the people themselves. Though the installation of a new priestess is a gross violation of the tradition and an abomination, what constitutes a taboo and a deviation from the norms is often determined by those who serve as the custodians of the traditional values in the society.

In any case, if we accept the proposition that Iyaloja is the goddess personified, then she alone is in the position to establish the norms determine and interpret actions that conform or deviate from the standard. Thus, the breaking of the pot is interpreted as a blessing instead of a curse when the new priestess of Oke Aje, the puerile Iyalode's daughter, is installed while the incumbent is still alive. This is an example of the way ideology functions to produce false consciousness. The point being made here is that religion is malleable in the hands of those whose interests it is meant to serve. Here, 'Oke Aje' serves the mercantile interests of the bourgeois hawks – Iyaloja, Babalaje, Alhaji Isa and Chief Ude. So, they decide how she should be worshipped and who should serve as her mouthpiece. It is instructive to note here that what the people contend with is not the goddess, herself, but the short-changing of her mouth-piece, even though, the acceptance of the goodness, herself is an indirect acceptance of their own exploitation. This is because every ideology, including religion, is presented as a natural phenomenon.

The foregoing explanation can only serve as the reason for the people's docility in the face of exploitation and inability to understand that Salewa, the mad priestess of Oke-Aje, is fighting for their well-being, that her persecution is their own persecution. The chicanery that there is something in it for everybody, as earlier mentioned, shows that Ajegunle is a capitalist society where everything is driven by money.

Indeed, money has become another god in Ajegunle, the APC says,

I see you are a blind dreamer, why waste my time to save the lost.

Listen, nothing breaks the power of money; not even God.

The people have chosen their leader, their God. That god is money (Adebanjo, 2008, p. 28).

Yet, that choice, as natural as it seems, is the choice imposed on the people by the bourgeois hawks. So, once each of them receives a tuber of yam and a milk tin of salt, with a prospect of consuming seven bodies of cows, the feeling of poverty and exploitation is assuaged. Besides, there is also the grandiose possibility of owning shops in the newly constructed market building. All these give the impression that the people are benefiting from the dividends of democracy.

Although the relationship between Democracy and capitalism is not directly stated in the play, the bourgeois hawks in the play, it is instructive to note, are pseudo-capitalists who parade the corridors of power to curry the favour of the political elites and conspire with them to wrench power, both political and economic, out of the hands of people. Thus, in a way, democracy becomes a game in the hands of the capitalists to pull the wool over the eyes of the people through the promise of the dividends of democracy. It is precisely in this form of hypocrisy that the contradiction in capitalism is contained since it is exactly through these dividends that the people are exploited. This is how the conflict is created between Salewa, Oke Aje priestess, who represents the muffled voices of the oppressed and the bourgeois hawks. So, in a way, the bourgeois hawks have access to the basic super-structures – religion, politics and security apparatus-built on the economic base. The security super-structure is not as benign as the other ones mentioned in quelling the fire of opposition. It is a repressive apparatus that is used to deal with opposition and its impact can be gruelling and agonizing as we have seen in the case of Salewa. The security apparatus of the state is used to incarcerate, torture, and kill her children and husband. And as if all these are not enough, she is poisoned to madness. That the masses, for which she fights for, do not see this shows the extent to which they have been ideologically conditioned to see events, including socio-political incidents, as natural phenomena. This is supported by the statement of Elder II about Salewa's uncompromising attitude.

She was blind to wisdom. The main ingredients of stardom,  
of success, of leadership (Adebanjo, 2008, p. 12)

And when Elder I says it is all about the people, Elder II says again,

The people! The people! She was leading animals, pure incubuses.

I think she is idle (Adebanjo, 2008, p. 12).

### **Conclusion**

The bourgeois hawks take contracts to construct a new market building which is supposed to be in the interest of the working masses in the market. This has serious effects on the existing status quo, on the working masses and particularly, on Salewa, the priestess of Oke Aje, who is driven mad by the repressive superstructure of the capitalist system of production. However, the chicanery and the inherent contradictions in the game of the bourgeois hawks lead to the collapse of the building suggesting the Marxist's vision that capitalism will eventually collapse under its own inherent contradictions, giving way to a more utopian vision of the world-socialism. The conflict in the text is not resolved in the form of Hegelian argument of thesis versus antithesis producing synthesis. This obviously is because the conflict in the play- between the working-class force and the bourgeois force- does not resolve itself into a new position- a new economic mode that could be identified as socialism.

In conclusion, when the ideal functions to mask its failure, so much so that people cannot recognize or even agree on it, it is a false ideal, or false consciousness that merely serve the interest and aspiration of those in power. Though symbolic, the collapse of the building does not suggest, in any way, the end of the capitalist regime.

### References

- Aaron, D. (1977). *Writers on the left*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Adebanjo, N. (2008). *Market of betrayals*. Ibadan: Kraftbook.
- Badcock, C. (1975). *Levi-Strauss: Structuralism and sociological theory*: London: Hutchinson & Co.
- Bah, T. (1999). *Philosophy and metaphysics: A critical introduction*. London: Garland Publishing.
- Baldick, C. (1996). *Criticism and literary theory 1890 to the present*. London: Longman.
- Bamidele, L. (2003). *Literature and sociology*. Ibadan: Stirling Horden.
- Brenner, C. (1974). *Writing about literature and critical theory*. New York: Mufin Books.
- Buci-Gluksmann, C. (1980). *Gramsci and the state* (transl. by David Fernbach) London: Lawrence and Wishart Ltd.
- Dobie, A. (2009). *Theory into practice: An introduction to literary criticism*. Boston: Longman.
- Eagleton, T. (1983). *Literary theory: An introduction*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Eagleton, T. (1976). *Criticism and ideology: A study in Marxist literary theory*. London: Verso.
- Eagleton, T. (1990). *Literary theory: An introduction*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Goncharenko, N. (1980). Innovation in the process of artistic creation. In *Marxist-Leninist Aesthetics and the arts*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Jameson, F. (1992). *Postmodernism or the cultural logic of late capitalism*. London: Verso.
- Jon, E. (1986). *An introduction to Karl Marx*. England: Cambridge.
- Lois, T. (1999). *Critical theory today*. London: Garland Publishing Inc.
- Mayer, M. (1999). *The Bedford introduction to literature*. (3rd ed.). New York: Bedford.
- Michael, D. (1984). *Introduction to literature*. London: Westport Greenwood.
- Olakunbi, O. (2013). *Black Dionysos: Conversation with Femi Osofisan*. Ibadan: Kraftbook.
- Obafemi, O. & Barclays, A. (Eds.) (2013). *Culture, leadership and accountability in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Kraftbook.
- Rossi-Landi, F. (1990). *Marxism and ideology*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Sexton, T. (2008, October 7). How to write a Marxist critique: Jaws. Retrieved from [http://www.associatedcontent.com/pop\\_printshtml?content\\_type-article](http://www.associatedcontent.com/pop_printshtml?content_type-article)

- Trilling, L. (1950). *The liberal imagination*. New York: Viking Press.
- Tyson, L. (1999). *Critical theory today*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Utmama, A. & Whawo, D. (eds.) (2011). *Philosophy logic & human existence*. Ibadan: Kraftbook.
- Utoh-Ezeajugh, T., & Ayakoroma, B. (Eds.) (2015). *Gender discourse in African theatre literature*. A festschrift in honour of Professor Mabel Evwierhoma. Ibadan: Kraftbook.
- Wellek, R., & Warren, A. (1955). *Theory of literature*. (2nd ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace and Company.
- Williams, R. (1978). *Marxism and literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.