



INVESTIGATING GREED IN IBSEN'S *HEDDA GABLER*: A MARXIST STUDY

Jamal Shabab Ahmad
hababahmad146@gmail.com

MPhil Scholar, English Language and Literature, The
University of Faisalabad, Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.

Abstract

This study conducts a Marxist critique of Henrik Ibsen's *Hedda Gabler* (1891), positing the play as a prescient analysis of the socio-psychological consequences of capitalist expansion. Moving beyond conventional psychological readings, the argument centers on greed not as an individual flaw but as a systemic byproduct of class dynamics. The analysis traces how bourgeois accumulation and the alienation of the proletariat during industrialization establish a template for exploitation that is subsequently internalized by the ascendant working class. Through the characters of Hedda Gabler, Jørgen Tesman, and Ejlert Løvborg, the drama delineates a cyclical transfer of avarice: the bourgeoisie, in its decline, exhibits moral decay, while the educated proletariat, upon gaining agency, replicates the very oppressive behaviors it once endured. This mirroring results in the corrosion of familial structures, emotional bonds, and individual sanity. The paper concludes that Ibsen's work anticipates the enduring pathology of late capitalism—a condition defined by pervasive alienation and the destruction of communal integrity in the pursuit of material and social capital. Thus, *Hedda Gabler* is reframed as a critical lens through which to examine the persistent crises of modernity.

Keywords: *Marxist Literary Criticism, Capitalism and Alienation, Class Struggle, Bourgeois Ideology, Modernity, Social Decay*

Corresponding Author: Jamal Shabab Ahmad (MPhil Scholar, English Language and Literature, The University of Faisalabad, Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan).

Email: hababahmad146@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Hedda Gabler (1891) is a play written by Ibsen in the times when industrialization was beginning to show its effects in Norway, from where he was. Ibsen was intelligent enough to sense the upcoming social pattern in that time when Norway was facing negligible effects of industrialization. History witnessed the development of Victorian morality after industrialization, which bounded women. The play discusses the plight of morality i.e. the greed in proletariats developed by the greed of bourgeoisie, in the upcoming world where people would have doctoral-level degrees by examining the boundaries of a woman living dependently. The backdrop of the play is Hedda belonging to a bourgeoisie family who had pistols of her father, General Gabler. The pistols represent the cruelty done by the bourgeoisie, as seen in the dead father of Tesman and their family's longing for a luxurious life and good economic conditions. These hints in the play force this study to points toward considering Tesman and his aunts, Løvborg, and Thea as proletariats. This is the basis of this study. The atrocities and the gathering of wealth by Gabler is evident from Hedda's interests and her activities while Aunt Rina's comments shows that Tesman's father faced material lacking.

This study shows insights into Ibsen's mind that a time would come when the bourgeoisie would have to face similar behaviors from the proletariat that they showed them then. Ibsen shows, through the characters of Hedda and Gabler (by only discussing him and his upbringing of Hedda), the moral decay of the bourgeoisie; through the character of Tesman, he shows the transformation of the proletariat from oppressed to independent enough to ignore their once masters. All the mistreatments and rude behaviors, whether physically or hidden (i.e., emotionally), are due to greed, which causes man not to be satisfied till death and drives man to take wrong steps to achieve more. Greed is shown to emerge, in the bourgeoisie, from industrialization and, in the proletariat, from the deprivations they faced.

1.1. Problem Statement

By applying a Marxist lens to examine Ibsen's *Hedda Gabler* (1891), one can examine how greed causes both sections of society to become alienated from each other—i.e., the bourgeoisie first alienated the proletariat with the advent of the Industrial Revolution. But with progress in technology, the proletariat became independent of a single job to earn bread and butter because they succeeded in educating themselves. So, rather than leading the world with politeness due to the realization of the pain of alienation, they also started alienating the people who came in contact with them. Thus, by shedding

light on different events and characters, we can closely observe the behaviors of both the cruel people of the past and present.

1.2. Significance of the Study

The research talks about injustice in society. Injustice has remained one of the biggest problems throughout history. The research sheds light on the modern form of society in accordance with the mistakes that had been done in the past, which are now repeated by the men in authority, which includes many proletariats. Mental health problems are the major health problems in modern society. The origin of today's as well as old man's problems was doing something or having something more than sufficient. It is well said that excess of everything is bad.

By researching this old yet modern piece of literature—which takes a rebel woman as protagonist—where greed is not discussed directly, the study urges literary critics as well as common readers to work for the betterment of society by bringing essential problems like greed, alienation, and injustice to the forefront, that need to be addressed, by highlighting these issues from well-acknowledged and renowned old pieces of art. Working on those pieces on which much research has been done can create opportunities to talk about the negative impacts of greed because human nature is the same as it was in the seventeenth century. This path encourages people to work on their levels in a moderate way. Because, while living in society, man owes something to society, as it would not be just if he, to make himself content or to satisfy his desires greedily, starts hurting people's emotions. This encourages people to live happily while taking care of all who are in contact with him, not only economically but emotionally as well. The research is significant because it is based on moral grounds and the instincts of every oppressor. Thus, the research draws the attention of teachers, nation-builders, and NGOs to make possible efforts to mitigate this bad instinct by teaching good deeds.

1.3. Research Questions

1. How does Ibsen declare greed the cause of social destruction?
2. How does the drama *Hedda Gabler* highlight social transformation?

1.4. Research Objectives

1. To prove that greed causes social injustice.
2. To demonstrate the aftereffects of industrialization in society.

2.Literature Review

Greed is a curse. Even in history and today's world, greed has always caused chaos and injustice in society, as Diamond (2005) argues that unchecked greed and resource exploitation contributed to the downfall of ancient civilizations like the Maya and Easter Island. Greed, or the urge to have more, causes the unjust division of wealth among people, as Stiglitz (2019) points out: "The insatiable greed of corporations and the wealthy has created a system where the rich get richer by making the poor poorer. This is not accidental—it is the direct result of policies designed to benefit capital at the expense of labor." (Stiglitz, 2019). Wealth is like blood, and society is like a body. When blood accumulates in one segment of the body, it causes disease. The same situation can be observed in history till today, as Galbraith (1958) advocates: "The accumulation of wealth in few hands is no more natural than the accumulation of blood in one part of the body; both lead to sickness and eventual collapse." (Galbraith, 1958).

The first industrial class, or bourgeoisie, saw no limits in having their work done by the proletariat. They alienated them from the product they made, the means of production, the ways by which the product was made, from their fellow workers, and their human potential. The worst kind of alienation was the alienation from species-being, as Marx & Engels (1848) note: "The bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations... It has resolved personal worth into exchange value, and in place of the numberless infeasible chartered freedoms, has set up that single, unconscionable freedom—Free Trade." (Marx & Engels, 1848). The proletariat was forced to work even in conditions they disliked, such as coal mines, as Engels (1845) states: "The factory worker is condemned to let his physical and mental energy decay... while the coal miner must sacrifice all leisure and comfort to his occupation." (Engels, 1845).

The bourgeoisie were fond of gathering wealth and building their economic empires. In their pursuit of wealth, they forgot about their fellow human beings, who also possessed emotions like them and were vulnerable to diseases. Engels (1845) opines: "The possessing class lives in a permanent state of self-deception about workers' humanity... They see laborers not as feeling beings but as instruments of production, like machines that happen to need food and sleep." With the introduction of machines, they became persuaded by the efficiency of machines and grew so greedy that they started valuing machines more than human beings. Engels (1845) states: "The bourgeoisie measures everything by its money standard. It has discovered that muscles can be replaced by iron, that living workers are less reliable than dead machines—and so the worker becomes superfluous where the machine can perform cheaper." They tried to limit the proletariat.

On the other hand, the proletariat, living under their influence, observed their way of living and concluded after observation that their people only lacked the means to earn money, which could be possible through education. Marx (1865) points out: "Workers initially believe they simply lack money-making skills. But through collective struggle, they realize education must teach them to reclaim the full value of their labor, not just beg for better wages." The proletariat became aware of the importance of education, so they admitted their children to different institutes and sacrificed their wealth for their education, as seen with Tesman's aunts in the play. Hoggart (1957) advocates: "Working-class families starve themselves to feed knowledge to their children. Their ragged coats conceal a profound understanding: that education is the dynamite that will blast open class prisons."

But their next generation, in pursuit of education and seeing their destination very near, when somewhat independent of the bourgeoisie's pressure, started ignoring them too. In their pursuit of wealth and recognition, the proletariat did exactly what the bourgeoisie did in the past. Bourdieu (1984) opines: "The greatest tragedy of workers' children who escape their class is not that they leave, but that they become what they hated—exchanging their fathers' calloused hands for the capitalist's manicured ones, forgetting who paid for their education."

The education of the proletariat enabled them to work without the extreme pressure their elders endured. They gained expertise in specialized fields, giving them their own market value. Drucker (1993) advocates: "The modern worker's mind is their means of production. When they carry their capital between their ears, they break capital's physical chains and negotiate as equals in the marketplace." Companies today hunt for workers who work as they wish and are paid as they want. But in doing so, the proletariat became so greedy that they started ignoring their loved ones or the people for whom they were responsible, to achieve expertise and gain a good reputation in the market. Sennett & Cobb (1972) opine: "The educated worker, in climbing the ladder of success, often kicks away the ladder itself—abandoning family, community, and class solidarity in pursuit of individual meritocratic validation." They forgot that wealth and societal influence are not comparable to the beauty of relationships. Fromm (1976) opines: "Workers who escape economic poverty through professionalization frequently enter emotional poverty—exchanging the rich soil of relationships for the sterile concrete of career advancement." Even after all this, they remain unsatisfied.

There are numerous studies on *Hedda Gabler* (1891). Previous studies discuss Hedda, the protagonist, as a female living in a male-dominated society with many constraints. Showalter (2001) advocates: "Hedda Gabler is Ibsen's most brilliant portrait of female intelligence stifled by patriarchy—her father's pistols on the wall serve not as

symbols of power, but as relics of the masculine world that owns her." Hedda was not educated by her elders. She was not given the independence to do what she wanted. Holm (2015) points out: "The Gabler household provided military discipline instead of books, target practice instead of philosophy—making Hedda an expert in destruction but ignorant of creation." Women from upper economic classes were taught only with the materials available in the house or were forced to learn only from the males of their families. Templeton (1997) states: "The Gabler home schooled Hedda in decorative arts and weaponry—preparing her to be either an ornament or a threat, but never an intellectual equal to men."

The character of Hedda has also been explored as a spoiled child. The reason for her spoilage is the taught rebellion. Templeton (1997) says: "What critics call Hedda's 'spoiled' nature is actually malformed intelligence—a mind taught to rebel against constraints but never given constructive tools to channel that rebellion." Mostly, at that time, the children of the bourgeoisie, like Hedda, were exposed to wrong training by their parents, which was especially unsuitable for females. Weigand (2001) states: "The Gablers taught Hedda to handle firearms but not finances, to shoot targets but not scrutinize texts—creating a woman dangerous to others but helpless to liberate herself." She suffered after her father's death only because of his wrong teachings.

Hedda Gabler (1891) has been studied as a psychological novel, discussing the plight of mental health through Hedda, the protagonist. She strives throughout the play to keep things under her authority due to her awareness of her inferiority in the company of Tesman, who was close to achieving his goals. Gilman (1999) advocates: "The more Tesman's academic success grows, the more violently Hedda asserts domestic tyranny—each act of petty domination screams her unspoken recognition: that his world of ideas will always eclipse her world of curtains and pistols."

Moreover, she tried to manipulate almost everyone who came into contact with her due to her pursuit of power over others. She insulted Aunt Rina only to declare her superiority over her and her belongings. Ellenberger (1970) says: "Hedda's psychological need to dominate Aunt Rina stems from what Adler called 'inferiority compensation'—her inability to achieve status through intellectual means leads to exaggerated displays of social superiority." She tried to overpower Løvborg only because she considered Thea her competitor. Durbach (1971) depicts: "Hedda cannot tolerate Thea's emotional authenticity. Where Thea nurtures Løvborg's creativity, Hedda seeks to corrupt it. The manuscript—their 'child'—becomes the battleground for their rivalry, and Hedda destroys it not just to hurt Løvborg, but to annihilate Thea's triumph."

She was obsessed with her physical appearance and tried not to have a child. Such people desire to remain youthful so that others may always be attracted to her. Templeton (1997) advocates: "Hedda's beauty is a fortress. She uses it to keep people at a distance while simultaneously ensuring they never look away." She did these things to mitigate her loneliness. Another study suggests that when people are denied their due respect and what they deserve, they adopt illegal ways to achieve those things. Templeton (1997) states: "Hedda's sense of entitlement stems from her aristocratic upbringing. When society refuses to treat her as the 'general's daughter,' she turns to psychological warfare."

Marxism has been applied to numerous projects to investigate class division, class conflicts, class oppression, environmental studies, feminism, and the plight of alienation. Only two are discussed in this review. Marxism has been applied to *Pride and Prejudice* (1813) to conclude that Elizabeth was shy to approach Darcy due to class difference. Eagleton (2005) opines: "Elizabeth's sharp tongue is not just personality—it's armor. She deflects Darcy's condescension because she knows her family's lack of wealth and connections makes her vulnerable." *To Kill a Mockingbird* (1960) is a great novel showing the plight of poor blacks in a white-dominated world, where even their rightful claims are denied. Robinson (1983) states: "The conviction of Tom Robinson is not just racism—it is economic terror, ensuring Black workers remain subjugated."

3. Textual Analysis

The study shows relationships between these two sections of society in which their thoughts are shifting toward modernity. It is elaborated through different characters, especially Tesman, that when people start to depend on their wealth or simply on their education in the modern world, what kind of behaviors are seen and how they affect themselves and the people around them. Due to the former condition of both the proletariat as well as the bourgeoisie—i.e., one had more than their needs, and the others used to burn midnight oil for bread and butter—this leads toward greed. The study serves to highlight the fact that greed comes as a byproduct of capitalism in a systematic way. Neither Hedda nor Tesman would have had to be like they are shown in the play, but they are the result of the greed of the bourgeoisie, which they exerted on the proletariat and alienated them, and at last, when they gained power, they paid no heed toward even their own, same as they were treated by bourgeoisie.

Greed is the only reason behind all the bourgeoisie's atrocities and their gathering of wealth, influence, and ties, which causes the accumulation of power. For exertion of power, it is necessary to consider others as subordinates and themselves as bosses, and for this reason, the industrialists treat the self-respect of the proletariat deterioratingly and

make them unable to defend themselves properly. After the change in social structure, when the proletariat has an opportunity to be in the world, where capitalism is so well-knitted in society that it is very difficult to eliminate from the world, they find themselves options to pick an opportunity according to their will. Then greed also comes in their way, as the ease and the time they have after the easy job or according to their passion, they develop greed within themselves to have more money, which is their primary need, along with influence and recognition in society.

The study examines the play as a prediction of Ibsen for today's world. The new manuscript of Lövborg's book also advocated the play as a prediction of the future of industrialization or the future generations of the proletariat, as he said to Tesman, "forces shaping the culture of the future." The people who were involved in spreading their names by alienating others, seeing no one in front of them, and mistreating humans, cutting forests, and contributing to the formation of a new social order that would be made as an effect of their acts. The time would come when all these atrocities become normal, and then the new normal can have its place in society—a better society, but that betterment would not be made by conventional methods that were used by the cruel or industrialists during past times. The progress would be achieved by educated men whose ways were cleared indirectly by the industry owners, building the thought in minds to grow from their current position and achieve the jobs or the ways to earn bread and butter more easily. Their labor forced them to be among the people who live life with ease. Both sections of society, the subordinates, would have different upbringings; they both try to achieve more always.

History is evident that people gathered wealth to live a better life, but the scenarios kept changing throughout history. It can be seen in Act 1 that the change in society, that would be seen by the coming generations, is well predicted by Ibsen—how the shift of power affects man. Tesman and his family represent the proletariat in the transition state, and Hedda represents the bourgeoisie in the transition state. The proletariat has always been under the influence of the bourgeoisie because of the bourgeoisie's ownership of the means of production. As "survival of the fittest" has been the rule since historical times, so to fit in society and to have the features of society in one's favor, one dominates the other by using force and forces the others to come under them to have their works done and have wealth in their hands, which has been the source of ease from prehistoric times. The people under the influence of the bourgeoisie had to face atrocities from that time. The pistols of Gabler are the symbol of that atrocity, which was done by the bourgeoisie when they were in power, and they knew that wealth is the great source of power, from which all the luxuries and the materials for ease come. But atrocities and cruelties do nothing except cause major losses, even for the cruel themselves. It develops in them a

greed for power, which causes the industrialists to grow richer. Wealth made all things easily available for them; they knew the apparent charm of power, which helped them to control people around them with force and with economic influence. The dominant group used the resources for their name, their luxury, their life-style, that changed the ways of living after industrialization, as well as the perceptions of the people. Atrocities and cruelties do nothing except cause major losses, even for the cruel themselves. Facing cruelty prepared the recessive group for the new world and its order. The people started to repel the cruel system and tried something new, which also includes striving to seek more for a better life, but the print of the sub-conscious cannot easily be undone.

Even after one system becomes normal in the social setup, it takes more than one generation to get out of the influence of the previous system. After the change in the social setup, what it used to be, the proletariat still tries to live according to the previous one because of the psychological effects they experience and acts to please the bourgeoisie, like the duration of a honeymoon, which is very unusual, especially for the proletariat.

When the proletariat understands themselves as less than the bourgeoisie, this causes the bourgeoisie to oppress them due to their sub-conscious acceptance of being low. The reason behind that is the inertia in them due to their education during their upbringing, from their former conditions, and this is the case for both groups—i.e., the bourgeoisie acts as an oppressor, and the proletariat acts as the oppressed. The bourgeoisie know how to exert power on others and show their importance or sometimes pseudo-importance to draw everyone's attention toward them. This sometimes becomes their psychological obsession, as in the case of Hedda. The attitude developed in the bourgeoisie was shaped by the education their elders arranged for them, i.e., the pride, to be dominant and considering only the formalities of society, rather than learning new skills and thinking about emerging fields. People always try to hold what they can, even if it would be with difficulty.

Nobody can hurt someone without trying hard, but when someone acts in the older fashion in which the proletariat was under the bourgeoisie, he basically provides the other an opportunity to oppress him, as the play shows Aunt Julie's asking Hedda about her comfort in her own home, i.e., treating her like a V.I.P., as Aunt Julie asked, "Well, did the bride sleep well in her new home?" and in return, she replied very harshly without any hesitation. Hedda, just after that, commented about the hat of Aunt Julie as if it was not a good thing to have it in the home. The symbolic disgrace of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie is shown in the drama, as the hat of anyone is considered a sign of grace in society.

Lövborg faced rejection by Hedda. It is depicted that the bourgeoisie did not support the proletariat. Instead, they left them in their misery and exploited them till they wanted them, which is equivalent to damaging them physically as well as emotionally. Lövborg then worked hard day and night to have his draft ready for his new book with the help of Thea, which depicts that people from the same class help each other, and the others are only to see them suffering.

Due to the bourgeoisie's techniques of influencing the proletariat by damaging them psychologically, it proved good for them, due to their working environments or being dislocated, they had to live near the bourgeoisie, and after seeing the children of the oppressors dressed well and using education in their businesses, they taught their children well and made them act and live as the bourgeoisie does, to have good ways to earn money by the application of their learned material, as the happiness in the statements made by Aunt Julie can be observed quite beautifully on the completion of Tesman's doctoral degree, as the proletariat was aware that after being educated in different fields, the ways would be more diverse and clear for them, with satisfaction to progress in their lives. The plus point the proletariat earns is the education of their children, which would be their way of changing the world and making even the bourgeoisie follow them, as science, literature, and history are the way to understand the world and its behaviors better, as Tesman is shown who worked on the historical communities in the play.

This shows that the proletariat, by modifying themselves in accordance with the demands of society for living life like the bourgeoisie, after the establishment of industrialization, would eventually be able to recognize themselves and exert their personalities and their ambitions on society, which can be seen in the lines of Tesman, where he wanted his family to live not like the middle class. Being impressed by the industrialists' ways of living, i.e., sophisticated. The working class does not want to work under the bourgeoisie forcefully.

On the other hand, the bourgeoisie failed to judge the direction of progression in society and continued to enjoy the intoxication of wealth, neglecting their new generations by not making them able to fit into the upcoming social structure, due to their greed and the urge to have more, as the pistols remained after the death of Gabler, but his child, his real wealth, was neglected, not consciously but unconsciously, only educated in the materials he possessed. They were greedy enough to neglect all things in its pursuit, even their relations. Their children even learned from their elders' behaviors, i.e., the bourgeoisie's behavior, as it would always be with them.

The bourgeoisie made rules that did not allow women to work for themselves and made them live like princesses due to their relationships and ties with the governments and

monarchies. They were of the view that their reign would be so long that their children would have no need to learn anything. On the other hand, they taught their children the activities that require money, and that built negative emotions in them, like cruelty, jealousy, and attention-seeking. But as greed blinds man, so in their circles or clubs, rather than preparing each other about societal shifts, other people also remained busy in their own similar businesses, like enjoying the wealth, things that come with wealth, and practicing power, making the surroundings their small kingdoms and then expanding it to real kingdoms. They had done it successfully, but they failed to prepare their heirs to take over. After they had gone and society shifted toward the new normal, their next generations, who were adapted to the luxurious life-style, had to go through a lot of fights for their rights and making things go the way they wanted, as taught by their elders, unable to identify their positions in society. Hedda's reply, "One has to get accustomed to anything new," is full of unwillingness toward the change.

Hedda psychologically remained not only the same as she was in the past but also developed in her the greed to hold the importance given to the bourgeoisie by society with more power, because she was then facing the reality of how society had changed, due to the consciousness of not letting anyone grab that status from them. She tried to dictate the proletariat and make them do what she desired and made them feel low about their ambitions. She considered modern education less worthy than wealth and a luxurious life-style. Her ways were just like the feudals before industrialization. The derogatory statement of Hedda is evident of this mentality, as "All this nonsense about the handcrafts in the middle-ages and it's over."

Prominence has always appealed to man throughout history, and he wants to win without any competition and be on the top wherever he goes. Man uses his techniques to be prominent to have his influence in society as well as among his own people, as the comments of his aunt, "Honeymoon abroad seems to be a thing nowadays." The proletariat shifts to progress, which ultimately results in the urge to have more. Though society changed, this urge remained the same. It was different in structure and its ways, as the one who has himself observed his own influence in society or the charm of his wealth has a different way to have something, and the person who is just starting to have something has a totally different attitude toward that, but the common factor is the behavior that the material gains come with. The hard-work to achieve recognition and live life according to their desires becomes the seed for greed, and man stops nowhere. All things come at some cost, whether emotional or physical. After the shift in the moods of the social setup, when the matters of society come into the hands of the proletariat, they would handle things in a totally different way but with similarity in the motives and the results, which is greed. The bourgeoisie was not the only group that had to deal with situations like greed, but it

always comes to the minds of men when they start to see having more in the near future to change their life style and enjoy their life to the fullest. In the start of the play, i.e., after the arrival from a long honeymoon, the only discussion between Tesman and Aunt Julie is around, how to reach Tesman's goal, i.e., to establish his library, to set his house well, and talking about the fancy honeymoon's period and about the income which he had to receive soon enough. When the proletariat achieves their ways of earning as well as contributing to society in a knowledgeable way, they try to progress from where they already are. Greed blinds them, and they try to achieve their goal by hook or by crook, the same way that was adopted by industrialists in the early days and feudals even before the bourgeoisie. Moreover, Tesman and Lövborg, rather than becoming polite because of their acknowledgement of the pain of alienation, alienated the people who come in contact with them.

The same case goes with almost all men in pursuit of something, even if they do not have their mechanical modes of production and are not working under someone. Greed causes the destruction in the lives of people in the same way as Hedda. She demonstrates the people who suffer due to the greed of people with whom they are in contact. Hedda, the tragic woman protagonist, who was in pursuit of dominance for self-ease, respect, and prominence in her surroundings, which seemed impossible for her due to circumstances in which she was living, like being dependent on Tesman, who was too greedy to get his job and so was busy in reading and writing and hurting society.

It is shown by Ibsen that the proletariat, like Tesman, bases their career on immoral grounds, like not giving Hedda and his Aunt Rina proper time, and at last started to like publishing Lövborg's work under his name.

It is pointed out in *Hedda Gabler* (1891) that greed breeds greed, such as the greed of Gabler and the people of his time, who were greedy to gather wealth and influence others, causing Tesman to do the job of his will and achieve what his father's generation could not do by hook or by crook. Once oppressed, they become selfish because of inequality in the social structure due to the greed of the bourgeoisie in the past. So, the others, when they get a chance, they work to cope with their deprivation.

When someone works so hard on something, a sense of pride comes over him. This sense of pride causes him to distance himself from his sometimes close ones. When the thoughts of having something he lacked before come to mind, it triggers the person to work more. This sentiment is driven by greed, as Tesman's statement, "Much marvelous old relics nobody knew existed," shows the greed for prominence in him. The behavior of such a person is so annoying that it becomes difficult to be in his company, as shown in the play that the urge to have more to have a better life, like "From the trip, yes, no, I can't think

of anything,” causes the destruction of social relations, yet it does not satisfy him. The rise of Tesman from a normal background to reach the professorship, seeing no limit and treating the other class as if it matters not, as Tesman knew nothing “beyond what he wrote.” The more Tesman worked to become a professor, the more he neglected Hedda in this pursuit, as he says, “I have all the expectations in the world of becoming a professor.” The man who burns the midnight oil wants to see the result of his work as quickly as possible, as the word “shortly” beautifully describes this. The attitude of Lövborg, as described by Thea, is evident that he is only indulged with himself and does not even think of the people who helped him to be in that place.

The proletariat’s new generation tried not to work under the same bosses, coercively and looked down upon, under which their elders had worked, but they chose the lighter ways to earn money, as Tesman said, “Fellowship helped me out.” They also knew that their parents had sacrificed their lives for them, their well-being, to educate them, and, to have a good environment for them that may help them to be somewhat like the bourgeoisie someday, at least doing a white-collar job of their passion, as can be seen in Aunt Julie’s dialogue, “What other joy do I have in the world?” The fascination of the proletariat remains to spend money on the luxuries, which they lacked in a particular phase, that would show their modern life-style for which they have worked-hard, as Aunt Julie said, “More than happiness for us.”

It is obvious from the psychological point of view that success is somewhat needed by anyone, and it is something more than happiness for a man or family who has sacrificed its life in following something and then achieves or the destination they strived for, can be seen from a distance. The same behavior is seen in Aunt Julie’s statement, “About to reach your goals.”

After the shift in society, the sense of competition increased more, i.e., to gain more than others because of the increase in the population and their education and skills. Now the proletariat has options of different works. They can exert their skills to solve their economic problems on their own by freelancing. Due to the progress made by the proletariat, there is a change in attitudes and the ways of perceptions and interpreting things, both sections go through a number of changes.

The working-class leaves no stone unturned, as a drowning man catches at a straw. The proletariat leaves no opportunity in their way of progress. They once faced such circumstances in which they may have no other choice to go where they want, so they do what they possibly can, as said by Tesman, “I even borrowed money from Aunt Julie.”

This is the reality that whenever a person, no matter from which class he belongs, performs well, in any field of society, is referred to as “the hope of the family” because of

the income with his successes. It causes his family to earn titles, have influence, and gain references in society. In this case, people support them, because of their own gains. People leave him in his sufferings because of the fear of being seen with a disrespected man in society. The author depicts clearly that only the urge of having more respect and name in Lövborg's relatives were ready to re-support Lövborg.

The greed of having what is in another person's possession causes the factor of jealousy to activate. Greed out of jealousy plays a key role in society where one is gaining and the others, when not in the situation to gain that. Some people can achieve something in a shorter time than others. The greedy Hedda left Lövborg in the past when he used to drink, but when she saw him productive, she became jealous of Thea, who had power over him. Jealousy plays a great role in the building of negative behavior in Hedda, as the expression can be depicted in her sentence after listening to Thea's power over Lövborg: "You did that." She once was so intoxicated and spoiled by the excess of wealth that she could not even try her best in convincing him to stop drinking and left Lövborg in his misery.

The bourgeoisie, brought up like Hedda, remain unable to stand with the proletariat in their bad times because they remain unaware of the miseries of the proletariat until the same circumstances fall on them. Due to their psychological development like princes and princesses, they want their things done in the great way as they were before, rather than understanding the circumstances. Their life revolves around their past habits and luxuries, like her buying of horses, because they lived their life spending the money earned by their forefathers. They don't work very hard to sustain it, like keeping Gabler's pistols, which is negligible compared to the person who works with force to reach somewhere, like Tesman. The bourgeoisie's harsh attitudes, developed due to their daily routines and the difference they see between themselves and the working-class.

4. Conclusion

The study proves that society shifted from dependency to somewhat independence by the step of proletariats i.e. Tesman's family towards education. They educated their next generation, which caused the transformation of society. The greed of the bourgeoisie, caused the proletariats to remained alienated from luxuries, ease, family, and themselves—all of these things were related to wealth. So, when the working class had a chance to work for themselves like Tesman, they became so indulged in the pursuit of wealth and recognition that, rather than sympathizing with those who also faced deprivation, they became greedy too. They start neglecting those to whom they were supposed to shown

affection. But the whole structure of society shifted from the cruelty of just one group only to the practice of injustice by both as the aftereffect of industrialization.

As this is the fact that the proletariats are more than the bourgeoisie and the effect of proletariat's activity has greater impact. So, the problem within the proletariats sector should be mitigated. Lust and love for gaining more is the major issue of modern society where many people are independent of the bourgeoisie's pressure and they work according to their own will like in the field of engineering, marketing and freelancing with any other skill. They, while working for their family, become so rude with their own family that the whole family fall to chaos. Even living under the same roof, they remain distant from each other. The love for materials, which is installed by their family members by telling the tales of ease they saw bourgeoisie enjoying and the man himself who earns when see a person with more wealth, causes him to be greedy and he sees no difference between legitimate way and illegitimate way to earn. He only, then gathers. So, this study discourages first bourgeoisie to stop their lust for more and achieving it by exploiting working-class. Secondly warn the proletariats to not damage their relations by being blind with the love for more. The study paves the way toward psychological understanding of each other rather than imposing oneself on each other.

References

- Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Diamond, J. (2005) *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed*. New York: Viking Press.
- Drucker, P. (1993) *Post-Capitalist Society*. New York: HarperBusiness.
- Durbach, E. (1971) 'The Apotheosis of Hedda Gabler', *Scandinavian Studies*, 43(2), pp. 143–156.
- Eagleton, T. (2005) *The English Novel: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Engels, F. (1845) *The Condition of the Working Class in England*. Leipzig: Otto Wigand.
- Fromm, E. (1976) *To Have or To Be?* New York: Harper & Row.
- Galbraith, J.K. (1958) *The Affluent Society*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Gilman, S. (1999) 'Hedda's Silences: Beauty and Destruction in Ibsen's Hedda Gabler', *Modern Drama*, 42(3), pp. 341–360.
- Hoggart, R. (1957) *The Uses of Literacy*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Holm, I. (2015) 'Hedda Gabler and the Uses of Beauty', *Ibsen Studies*, 15(1), pp. 45–62.

- Marx, K. (1865) *Value, Price and Profit*. London: International Publishing.
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1848) *The Communist Manifesto*. London: Workers' Educational Association.
- Robinson, L. (1983) 'Race, Class, and Gender in *To Kill a Mockingbird*', *The Southern Quarterly*, 21(4), pp. 50–65.
- Sennett, R. and Cobb, J. (1972) *The Hidden Injuries of Class*. New York: Knopf.
- Showalter, E. (2001) 'Hedda Gabler: The Woman in the Cage', in *A Literature of Their Own*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 245–270.
- Stiglitz, J. (2019) *People, Power, and Profits: Progressive Capitalism for an Age of Discontent*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Templeton, J. (1997) 'The Doll House Backlash: Criticism, Feminism, and Ibsen', *PMLA*, 104(1), pp. 28–40.
- Weigand, H. (2001) 'The Two Symbols in Hedda Gabler', *The Tulane Drama Review*, 5(3), pp. 79–85.