

The Review of ‘The Doll’s House’ by Katherine Mansfield Through the Philosophy of Louis Pierre Althusser

Şahin KIZILTAŞ (*)

Abstract: The concept of ‘Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs)’ by French philosopher Louis Pierre Althusser has been derived from the ‘Repressive State Apparatuses (RSAs)’ of Karl Marx. Both concepts are based on this principle: The State profits by various institutions to give shape to society according to its ideology. The institutions such as the police, the army, prisons, and courts are accepted as the Repressive State Apparatuses; the institutions such as religion, family, school, political parties, associations are accepted as the Ideological State Apparatuses. In our study, first, information about ‘Ideological State Apparatuses’ and ‘Repressive State Apparatuses’ have been presented and they have also been compared. Then, the short story of Katherine Mansfield, ‘The Doll’s House’, has been analyzed in this context and the role of ideological state apparatuses, particularly of family and school, in raising children and forming society has been tried to be examined. The life-styles and possessions of the Burnell’s children who will represent the rich and dominant class in the future and the living conditions and deprivations of the Kelvey’s children who will symbolise the poor working class have been compared and the contributions of Ideological State Apparatuses, such as family and school on the personality development of these children have been tried to be analysed.

Keywords: The Ideological State Apparatuses, Louis Pierre Althusser, Katherine Mansfield, The Doll’s House

Katherine Mansfield’in ‘Bebek Evi’ Adlı Öyküsünün Louis Pierre Althusser Felsefesi Bağlamında İncelenmesi

Öz: ‘Devletin İdeolojik Aygıtları’ (DİA) kavramı Fransız felsefeci Louis Pierre Althusser tarafından Karl Marx’ın ‘Devletin Baskıcı Aygıtları’ (DBA) kavramından türetilmiştir. Her iki kavram da devletin toplumu kendi ideolojisi doğrultusunda şekillendirmek için değişik kurumlardan faydalandığı ilkesine dayanır. Polis, ordu, hapishaneler, mahkemeler gibi kurumlar Devletin Baskıcı Aygıtları; din, aile, okul, siyasi partiler, dernekler gibi kurumlar da Devletin İdeolojik Aygıtları olarak kabul edilir. Çalışmamızda ilk önce ‘Devletin İdeolojik Aygıtları’ ile ‘Devletin Baskıcı Aygıtları’ hakkında bilgi verilmiş ve bunların karşılaştırması yapılmıştır. Daha sonra Katherine Mansfield’in ‘Bebek Evi’ adlı kısa öyküsü bu bağlamda incelenmiş ve bu öyküde devletin ideolojik aygıtlarının, özellikle aile ve okulun, çocukları yetiştirme ve toplumu şekillendirmedeki rolü irdelenmeye çalışılmıştır. Gelecekte zengin ve egemen sınıfı temsil edecek olan Burnell ailesinin çocuklarının yaşam tarzları ve varlıkları ile yoksul işçi sınıfını sembolize edecek olan Kelvey ailesinin çocuklarının yaşam tarzları ve yoksunlukları karşılaştırılarak, Devletin İdeolojik Aygıtları olan aile ve okulun bu çocukların kişilik gelişimlerine katkıları değerlendirilmeye çalışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Devletin İdeolojik Aygıtları, Louis Pierre Althusser, Katherine Mansfield, Bebek Evi.

*) Öğretim Görevlisi, Bitlis Eren Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Meslek Yüksekokulu.
(e-posta: sahin.kiziltas@gmail.com)

An Althusserian Review of the ‘*The Doll’s House*’ by Katherine Mansfield

Introduction

Louis Pierre Althusser (1918 – 1990) was a French philosopher and critic whose contributions to both Marxist Ideology and Literary Criticism cannot be ignored, even today. One of his crucial contributions to philosophy is the concept of ‘Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs)’ which he derived from the ‘Repressive State Apparatuses (RSAs)’ of Karl Marx. In RSAs, according to Marxist tradition, the State is the machine of repression enabling the ruling classes to dominate and suppress the working classes. Those RSAs are the army, the police, prisons, courts, government and so on. However, in Althusserian ISAs, private institutions or formations undertake the roles of the State in a non-repressive way. Religion, family, schools, unions, associations, political parties, educational system etc. can be ranked among the ISAs. Goran Therborn alleges that Althusser’s theory of ideologies and Ideological State Apparatuses had lost Marxism’s basic recognition of their ultimate dependence on the materialist foundations of capitalist class society (Therborn, 129-130).

Anne Allison claims that in modern capitalist societies, the school conducts the primary role of ISAs since – compared to the past – students spend more hours and years in educational institutions than in any other places. And also, the education takes the functions of those apparatuses from the hands of other institutions, for instance religion from churches, and surrenders it to the schools. For her, knowledge and ideology have meshed in consequence of being influenced less by the threat of force in order to shape the society. Education, then, appears as the apparatus for pedagogical and ideological indoctrination (Allison, 198).

The schools are among the most crucial ideological apparatuses for the State where the roles of ISAs mostly mingle. Then what is taught in these schools or how are they used by the State to shape the individuals? The response of Althusser for this question lies under the concept of ‘know-how’. He states that at first children learn to read, to write, to add, a number of techniques, a number of other things including scientific and literary culture in these schools. Besides these techniques and knowledge, they learn the rules of good behaviour, of morality etc. But the most important point he draws attention to is: “In other words, the school (but also other State institutions like the Church or other apparatuses like the Army) teaches ‘know-how’, but in forms which ensure subjection to the ruling ideology or the mastery of its practice.” (Althusser, 133)

For Althusser, ‘... an ideology always exists in an apparatus and its practice or practices. This existence is material.’ (Althusser, 166) He believes in the fact that ideas or ideology are not mental and abstract occurrences, they are social events and they appear in language and behaviour. For Stuart Hall, “.. we have to analyse or deconstruct language and behaviour in order to decipher the patterns of ideological thinking which are inscribed in them”. (Hall, 99) So, we are going to undermine the behaviours of children and their

language in "The Doll's House" by Katherine Mansfield to reveal the hidden ideology of dominant class using the school as one of the most influential ideological apparatuses of the State.

Not only the behaviours and discourses of those children, but do the children themselves constitute a considerable part of ideology, so do our study. Because, according to Althusser, the ideology interpellates individuals as subjects. In other words, "... there is no ideology except for concrete subjects, and this destination for ideology is only made possible by the subject." (Althusser, 170) He calls this as *interpellation*: "...Ideology 'acts' or 'functions' in such a way that it 'recruits' subjects among the individuals (it recruits them all), or 'transforms' the individuals into subjects (it transforms them all) by that very precise operation which I have called interpellation or hailing, and which can be imagined along the lines of the most commonplace every day police (or other) hailing: 'Hey, you there!'" (Althusser, 174) He goes on and propounds that each individual is born in a society where he/she is always already a subject. The existence of ideology and the hailing or interpellation of individuals as subjects is one and the same thing (Althusser, 175). For Andrew Blake, interpellation is "... a social process of address, talking in the name of a social group to an individual, telling her or him what exists in the world (e.g. nature, society, people), thus creating for the individual a sense of place and identity." (Blake, 25)

The Children Brought Up through ISAs in 'The Doll's House'

The story studied in this article can be briefly summarized as: There are wealthy and poor families living in the same neighbourhood in 1910s in England. The rich is The Burnells and the poor is The Kelveys. They have children attending to the same school, but those children are not allowed to talk to each other by their parents, particularly by the parents belonging to the rich class. The Burnells buy a doll's house for their girls and the girls invite all of their friends to see the house. But they do not invite the Kelveys because they are in a lower social class. The story exhaustively tells the little and innocent world of the Kelveys in which the Doll's House is a non – attainable desire.

In the story, some of the children at school learn how to dominate, suppress and otherize; the others learn how to subject and obey. This is an inevitable output of capitalist society in 1910s England. The children of Burnell family (Isabel, Lottie, Kezia) represent the rich class and the bourgeoisie; however, the children of the Kelveys (Lil, Else) represent the poor and the proletariat. The lines drawn or the barricades built between two social classes are so sharp and high that every member of those classes is well aware of the fact that they must not transgress their borders. The lines are always drawn by ruling class, as Isabel does:

"For it had been arranged that while the doll's house stood in the courtyard they might ask the girls at school, two at a time, to come and look. Not to stay to tea, of course, or to

come traipsing through the house. But just to stand quietly in the courtyard while Isabel pointed out the beauties, and Lottie and Kezia looked pleased. . . ” (Mansfield, 385)

The ruling ideology casts roles to members of different classes, all members ought to act according to their roles and none is given the right to alter or go out of his/her role. The poor learn their borders better than the rich: “And the only two who stayed outside the ring were the two who were always outside, the little Kelveys. They knew better than to come anywhere near the Burnells.” (Mansfield, 385)

The State divides society into classes and tries to build barriers between those classes by means of ideological apparatuses. It also bends over backwards to leave the miserable class which can be named as ‘the other’ out of the barrier. Yet, Mansfield is nevertheless hopeful and she believes that the classes, in fact, feel intimacy to each other despite the discriminatory practices of the State. They do not care about the borders or barriers at all. If these classes are given an opportunity or they are left by themselves, presumably, class conflicts will not come to surface in the society.

In the story, there is a doll’s house belonging to the rich class. Other children are invited to see the house, except for the Kelveys. The youngest girl of the rich family, Kezia wants the Kelveys to see the house but she faces her mother’s resistance: “ ‘Mother,’ said Kezia, ‘can’t I ask the Kelveys just once?’ ‘Certainly not, Kezia.’ ‘But why not?’ ‘Run away, Kezia. You know quite well why not.’ ” (Mansfield, 387-388) The division is not only between the classes, but between the members of the same class. Kezia seems to be quite different from her elder sisters.

The children are not allowed to share anything or to speak with each other by their families, especially by dominant culture, the rich. There is sympathy between the children of different classes. They are not hostile to each other; they are actually hostile to discrimination of their families. Despite the black-balling of her family, Kezia insists on inviting the Kelveys to see their doll’s house: “ ‘Hullo,’ she said to the passing Kelveys. They were so astounded that they stopped. Lil gave her silly smile. Our Else stared. “You can come and see our doll’s house if you want to,” said Kezia, and she dragged one toe on the ground. But at that Lil turned red and shook her head quickly. ‘Why not?’ asked Kezia. Lil gasped, then she said, ‘Your ma told our ma you wasn’t to speak to us.’ ‘Oh, well,’ said Kezia. She didn’t know what to reply. ‘It doesn’t matter. You can come and see our doll’s house all the same. Come on. Nobody’s looking.’ ” (Mansfield, 389)

The discourse of Kezia, ‘Come on. Nobody’s looking.’, reflects the understanding of society in general under these circumstances. The ruling ideology feels uneasy about social cohesion between classes and does not allow to this integration: “ ‘Kezia!’ It was Aunt Beryl’s voice. They turned round. At the back door stood Aunt Beryl, staring as if she couldn’t believe what she saw. ‘How dare you ask the little Kelveys into the courtyard?’ said her cold, furious voice. ‘You know as well as I do, you’re not allowed to talk to them. Run away, children, run away at once. And don’t come back again,’ said Aunt Beryl. And

she stepped into the yard and shooed them out as if they were chickens.” (Mansfield, 390) The attitude of rich class against the poor is the attitude of a human against an animal, a chicken.

The Kelveys, the lower class is not the only ones who have their share from the rage of the upper class. The innocent and affectionate members of upper class, for instance Kezia, who has not been kneaded by the ruling ideology yet, is called down by the ruthless member of the same class, Aunt Beryl: “ ‘Wicked, disobedient little girl!’ said Aunt Beryl bitterly to Kezia, and she slammed the doll’s house to.” (Mansfield, 390)

Trying to reveal the dissimilarities between RSAs and ISAs, Althusser claims that the RSAs function or act by repression, generally use violence and impose the objectives of ruling class to target groups; on the other hand, the ISAs function by ideology, people act and obey voluntarily and they are formed through the goals of those ISAs unconsciously. The ISAs can sometimes use the means of RSAs and function by violence. The punishment, expulsion or disciplinary methods in either schools or families may require violence (Althusser, 143-150). Here, Aunt Beryl uses the language of violence through ‘rebuking Kezia’ and ‘slamming the doll’s house’. This is to say, she, as a member of the family (family is an ISA), uses the means of RSAs to shape the children.

The bourgeoisie in England in 19th century and in the beginning of 20th century was divided into two: high bourgeoisie and low bourgeoisie. The low one was closer to working class because they were workers in the past and the high was closer to upper class because their ultimate goal was to obtain the same concessions someday. In the story, behaviours of Kezia (for instance, feeling intimacy to the poor) seem to represent low bourgeoisie; of her parents and aunt (for instance, having strict rules against the poor or excluding them) seem to represent high bourgeoisie. Her elder sisters also have same inclination. Isabel, the eldest of them, behaves so dominantly and authoritatively as if her younger sisters had to bow the knee in front of her power:

“‘I’m to tell,’ said Isabel, ‘because I’m the eldest. And you two can join in after. But I’m to tell first.’ There was nothing to answer. Isabel was bossy, but she was always right, and Lottie and Kezia knew too well the powers that went with being eldest. They brushed through the thick buttercups at the road edge and said nothing. ‘And I’m to choose who’s to come and see it first. Mother said I might.’” (Mansfield, 384-385)

The ruling State ideology, through school and family apparatuses, tries to raise children like Isabel and adults like Aunt Beryl. However, Kezia seems to be a fault of ruling class, but she is under training at school and she needs time to ripen as Isabel. When she becomes an adult, she will probably be ‘the expected product’ of this process consciously applied to her by the ruling ideology.

Engels and Marx allege that the present-day capitalist mechanism assumes two social classes; one is the capitalists who hold the means of production and subsistence in their hands and the other is the proletarians, who have nothing in their hands as commodity

except for their labour power. (Engels, 71) In the same years, Benjamin Disraeli writes a novel, *Sybil or the Two Nations* and divides the country into two nations, the rich and the poor:

“‘Which nation?’ asked the younger stranger, ‘for she¹ reigns over two?’ The stranger paused; Egremont was silent, but looked inquiringly. ‘Yes,’ resumed the younger stranger after a moment’s interval. ‘Two nations; between whom there is no intercourse and no sympathy; who are ignorant of each other’s habits, thoughts and feelings, as if they were dwellers in different zones, or inhabitants of different planets; who are formed by a different breeding, are fed by a different food, are ordered by different manners, and are not governed by the same laws.’ ‘You speak of ___’ said Egremont, hesitatingly. ‘THE RICH AND THE POOR.’”(Disraeli, 65-66)

The heroines of the story are the children of the Burnells (Isabel, Lottie, Kezia) and of the Kelveys (Lil and Else). The Burnells represent the rich, the potent, and the wealthy while the Kelveys represent the poor, the devoid and the weak. The problems of being the members of different social classes, in other words, of class conflict is the most striking and major theme in the story. Class conflict is also a central concept for Althusser. For him, ideologies always express class positions. These social classes can be classified as two nations: the rich and the poor. The borders and lines of these classes are so sharp that parents of different classes do not send their children to the school where the children of lower class can attend. If they have to send, then they caution their children not to play or talk to the other children. The Burnells inevitably send their children to a public school since the school for the privileged is so far and they do not allow their daughters to speak with the Kelveys. Because, it is said that father Kelvey is in prison and mother is a washerwoman; that is to say, they are the members of a lower class:

“For the fact was, the school the Burnell children went to was not at all the kind of place their parents would have chosen if there had been any choice. But there was none. It was the only school for miles. And the consequence was all the children in the neighbourhood, the judge’s little girls, the doctor’s daughters, the store-keeper’s children, the milkman’s, were forced to mix together. Not to speak of there being an equal number of rude, rough little boys as well. But the line had to be drawn somewhere. It was drawn at the Kelveys. Many of the children, including the Burnells, were not allowed even to speak to them. They walked past the Kelveys with their heads in the air, and as they set the fashion in all matters of behaviour, the Kelveys were shunned by everybody.” (Mansfield, 385)

Mansfield portrays the living conditions of these two nations very professionally. The rich have a great, flawless and colourful life. The Burnells buy a doll’s house to their children and even it is just a toy, all the details are thought:

1) She refers to the Queen Elizabeth. Ş.K.

“There stood the doll’s house, a dark, oily, spinach green, picked out with bright yellow. Its two solid little chimneys, glued on to the roof, were painted red and white, and the door, gleaming with yellow varnish, was like a little slab of toffee. Four windows, real windows, were divided into panes by a broad streak of green...” (Mansfield, 383)

While the rich have everything even in their toys with its details for their comfort, the poor do not have clothes to put on. The Kelveys wear the dresses given to them by their neighbours; old, large and inharmonious clothes:

“... Why Mrs. Kelvey made them so conspicuous was hard to understand. The truth was they were dressed in ‘bits’ given to her by the people for whom she worked. Lil, for instance, who was a stout, plain child, with big freckles, came to school in a dress made from a green art-serge table cloth of the Burnells’, with red plush sleeves from the Logans’ curtains....” (Mansfield, 386)

The distinction between Mansfield and other authors focusing on the same issue is her reflecting of the problem from the innocent perspective of children. The feelings of the poor children, to be the other and the miserable, are depicted so disconsolately. Their personality has developed in this way; so depressive and lonely. This is a proper output which ruling ideology aims: to bring up the members of lower class in a passive and isolated mood. Then, it will be easier for this class to feel themselves as ‘the other’.

In an ideological apparatus of the State, in the school, the teacher is the agent of the State aiming to shape the individuals. The teacher carries out the responsibilities of the burden laid on his/her shoulders by the ruling ideology in order to split the society into two poles: “Even the teacher had a special voice for them, and a special smile for the other children when Lil Kelvey came up to her desk with a bunch of dreadfully common-looking flowers.” (Mansfield, 386)

In order to contribute this otherness and to concretize it in the eyes of readers, the author gives allegorical names to the representatives of the poor, the other class: Lil and Else. While the dominant children have noble names such as Isabel, Lottie, the passive children deprived of this nobility. Their names are in accordance with their social status; Lil (little) represents ‘poverty’ and Else represents ‘otherness’. Poverty and otherness are very agreeable couple, they act in harmony. Wherever poverty goes, otherness follows as if it were his destiny:

“She went through life holding on to Lil, with a piece of Lil’s skirt screwed up in her hand. Where Lil went our Else followed. In the playground, on the road going to and from school, there was Lil marching in front and our Else holding on behind. Only when she wanted anything, or when she was out of breath, our Else gave Lil a tug, a twitch, and Lil stopped and turned round. The Kelveys never failed to understand each other.” (Mansfield, 386)

The ultimate boundary of marginalization is this: something that exists for everybody is always absent for somebody. All of the children at school have the honour of seeing

the doll's house, but the Kelveys do not. "At last everybody had seen it except them." (Mansfield, 388)

The Burnells have everything, they have tasted all pleasures and they are not aware of the Kelveys' deprivation. They do not know the feeling of indigence while the Kelveys do not know the feeling of abundance. They live in the same neighbourhood but their conditions are quite different that as if they lived in different countries or planets. The Burnells like showing-off what they own, they are proud of their belongings: "The Burnell children could hardly walk to school fast enough the next morning. They burned to tell everybody, to describe, to – well – to boast about their doll's house before the school-bell rang." (Mansfield, 384) But, the children of Kelveys are unaware of that feeling. Their only desire is to be able to see what other children own.

The children of Burnells are happy, social and alive and they have self-confidence which is the feature of a dominant culture. They have many friends around themselves: "Playtime came and Isabel was surrounded. The girls of her class nearly fought to put their arms round her, to walk away with her, to beam flattering, to be her special friend. ..." (Mansfield, 385) But the Kelveys are not social, they do not have any friends and they are always shy and timid; the characteristics of a passive or secondary culture: "The children stood together under the pine trees, and suddenly, as they looked at the Kelveys eating out of their paper, always by themselves, always listening," (Mansfield, 388)

The Kelveys are always excluded by the upper class. When the children keep together in the school yard and play entertainingly, the Kelveys are always left out of the circle deliberately: "Only the Kelveys moved away forgotten; there was nothing more for them to hear." (Mansfield, 387) This is one of the strategies of the ruling class: to provide the lower class not to participate in activities with the upper class. When all the children play in the school yard, only two girls, the Kelveys are outside the play: "... Nudging, giggling together, the little girls pressed up close. And the only two who stayed outside the ring were the two who were always outside, the little Kelveys. They knew better than to come anywhere near the Burnells." (Mansfield, 385)

Another point that the writer wants to draw attention to is the difference in the feeding of two classes: "The little girls sat under the pines eating their thick mutton sandwiches and big slabs of johnny cake spread with butter. While always, as near as they could get, sat the Kelveys, our Else holding on to Lil, listening too, while they chewed their jam sandwiches out of a newspaper soaked with large red blobs." (Mansfield, 387) The Burnells eat mutton sandwiches, but the Kelveys eat jam sandwiches. The rich and the poor are fed by different food and this shows the different living conditions of the two nations.

The children of upper class usually gibe at the Kelveys due to their passiveness and deficiency: "Is it true you are going to be a servant when you grow up, Lil Kelvey?" shrilled Lena. Dead silence. But instead of answering, Lil only gave her silly, shamefaced

smile. She didn't seem to mind the question at all. What a sell for Lena! The girls began to titter." (Mansfield, 388) The poor are usually silent and do not give reaction while they are mocked. In this scene, we can deeply feel despair and pitifulness of the poor.

Dominic Strinati expresses that the educational system or schools at first bring individuals into the position of 'student', then, after growing-up, their positions change and they become the members of different social classes or groups (Strinati, 137). In fact, the positions of children who are the representatives of different social classes are evident and they will take the place of their parents in the future. That is the role provided by ruling ideology for them. To change the social status is not welcome in society then and this is a part of know-how concept taught in the schools: "Emmie Cole started the whisper. 'Lil Kelvey's going to be a servant when she grows up.' 'O-oh, how awful!' said Isabel Burnell, and she made eyes at Emmie. Emmie swallowed in a very meaning way and nodded to Isabel as she'd seen her mother do on those occasions. 'It's true-it's true-it's true,' she said." (Mansfield, 388)

The inevitable fate of poor children and their parents is indigence. The ruling class is against to move up a social ladder; if he/she is a member of a lower class, he/she ought to stay there. To jump onto a higher social class is not welcome.

However, Mansfield is not so desperate at all. In the story, the favourite of the youngest girl of the Burnells, Kezia, among the accessories of the doll's house is the lamp. As the youngest girl of dominant class who has not been shaped by State Apparatuses yet, Kezia shows interest to the lamp while it does not mean anything for her elder sisters. And also, it is something very important for Else, the youngest of the Kelveys. At the end of the story, she is able to see the lamp. Although scolded and shooed with her elder sister by ruling class, Else, perhaps at first time, smiles and says: "I seen the little lamp." (Mansfield, 391) The lamp is concretization of the hopes. One day it will light and illuminate the darkness in the heads and thoughts of people. Mansfield believes this and provides the Kelveys to see the doll's house, particularly the lamp that was symbolizing unattainable desires of the suppressed and marginalized class at the beginning of the story.

Conclusion

Mansfield's short story, *The Doll's House*, mentions of how those children become the concrete output of ruling class ideology and how the ones in disadvantaged position are marginalized by dominant culture. The course of this proceeding, according to Althusser, lies under the concept of 'know-how'. Through the deconstruction and interpretation of the children's attitudes and discourses at school, we will be able to realize better how the ideology of dominant class and the secondary class appear and become concrete.

For domineering ideology, there are two classes in the society: *the bourgeoisie* who has all means of production and *the proletariat* who are devoid of these means. These classes are brought up first in their families and then at schools according to the requirements

of modern capitalist society. Some are designed to be the members of upper class in the society owning those means in the future and they are treated according to this goal. The other ones are supposed to be the members of a lower class, in other words the working class, carrying out the duties as a machine given to them by the bourgeoisie. They both are trained and treated in ISAs according to this understanding. And Mansfield reveals this practice in her story.

She divides the children of the same society into two; the Burnells as the representatives of dominant class and the Kelveys as of the working class. The distinction between those social classes is so explicit. While the Burnells have everything to comfort their lives, the Kelveys do not have even anything to put on. They wear the clothes of other people for whom their mother works and which do not fit them and are inharmonious. Those clothes look strange on them as if they came from a different planet. The Burnells eat mutton sandwiches but the Kelveys eat jam sandwiches. The Burnells have many friends around them but the Kelveys are always alone, they do not have any friends and they are excluded from the friendly environment of the children at school. The Burnells are happy but the Kelveys are shy and timid, always in a passive mood. The teacher behaves the Burnells and the Kelveys quite differently as if he wanted to prove that they came from different worlds.

In this study, it has been concluded that the ruling ideology shapes the society, both the poor and the rich, through the ISAs of Althusser such as family and school. The family members of the rich and the poor behave and act according to the expectations and tasking of the ruling ideology. For instance, the aunt of rich children, Beryl, does not permit her nieces to have intercourse with poor children and she tries to build a barricade between them. This is a method of upper class using for marginalization. On the other hand, the mother of poor children does not want her daughters to interrelate with rich children either; because she has been taught by ruling class to know her limits very well. As a result of this training, the children have acquired a passive, timid and antisocial personality.

Accordingly, the school also contributes to the social formation according to Althusserian principles. The teachers and the students in the school treat to these rich and poor children differently. Their attitudes to the Burnells, the rich class, are inclusive; yet, the attitudes towards the Kelveys, the poor class, are exclusive. As a result of such type of behavioural differences, the poor children have been brought up in a passive, unsocial, cowed and weak mood; the rich children have been brought up in a social, active and influential mood. That is to say, the people act according to the ideology of ruling class and the society takes shape through the goals of this class. And Althusser tries to explain this type of government and life style in his well-known article, 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses'.

References

- Allison, A. (1991). "Japanese Mothers and Obent#s: The Lunch-Box as Ideological State Apparatus". *Anthropological Quarterly*, Vol. 64, No. 4, p.195-208
- Althusser, L. (1971). *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press
- Blake, A. (1989). *Reading Victorian Fiction: The Cultural Context and Ideological Content of the Nineteenth-Century Novel*. Houndmills: Macmillan
- Disraeli, B. (1981). *Sybil or the Two Nations*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Engels, F. (2003). "Karl Marx". Robert J. Antonio (Ed.). *Marx and Modernity: Key Readings and Commentary* (p. 69-71). Malden: Blackwell Publishing
- Hall, S. (1985). "Signification, Representation, Ideology: Althusser and the Post – Structuralist Debates". *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, Volume 2, Number 2, p. 91-115
- Mansfield, K. (1981). *The Collected Stories of Katherine Mansfield*. London: Penguin Books
- Strinati, D. (2004). *An Introduction to Theories of Popular Culture*. New York: Routledge
- Therborn, G. (1980). *The Ideology of Power and Power of Ideology*. London: Verso.

