

Traces of Brecht's Socio-Political Philosophy in Shahid Nadeem's Play *The Third Knock*

Dr. Taimur Kayani ¹ Farrukh Hameed ² Ishtiaq Ahmad³

Abstract

The research intends to study Shahid Nadeem's play The Third Knock from the perspective of Brecht's Socio-Political philosophy. It examines the rights of ownership in the context of the play and argues that the things should be given to those who can utilize them for the welfare of the society instead of those who own them through their social powers. At the same time, it also explores the abuse of power on the part of powerful who exploits the weak and poor for one's own benefits. Furthermore, the study endeavours to highlight the phenomena that the people are unable to implement their useful plans in the prevailing flawed system where they are oppressed and snubbed. Simultaneously, it provides encouragement to the handicapped of the society to keep on struggling to achieve their goals by contributing their potential for the development of the society. Additionally, it may also be beneficial in the academic curriculum because Brecht's works are a part of syllabus in Pakistan and across the world. In this regard, it may facilitate teachers as well as students to develop their understanding regarding the Socio-Political philosophy of Brecht.

Key Words: Brecht's Socio-Political, Commodity, Commodification, Landlord-Tenant relationship, Shahid Nadeem

Introduction

I came to the cities in a time of disorder
When hunger reigned there
I came among men in a time of revolt
And I rebelled with them. (Brecht, n.d.)

This study locates the traces of Brecht's Socio-Political philosophy in Shahid Nadeem's play *The Third Knock* (Teesri Dastak). It intends to uncover the relationship between tenant and landlord which converts tenants into commodities. In this regard, it debates on the rights of ownership. Broadly speaking, it stretches its borders on the phenomenon that to whom the things should be awarded; those who own them through their social

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of English, GIFT University, Pakistan

² M. Phil Scholar, Department of English, GIFT University, Pakistan

³ Ph. D Scholar, Department of Applied Linguistics GC University Faisalabad

powers or those who can take great care of them. This study also exposes the commodification in practical use through Brecht's Socio-Political philosophy in Shahid Nadeem's play *The Third Knock*.

Shahid Nadeem started Ajoka theatre which means 'aj-ka', 'today' or 'contemporary' and its purpose is to reconnect the people of Pakistan with its history of art in order to establish new identity. It favours several forms of art on theatre including actors, directors, producers, set designers, visual art and musicians (Majid, 2015, p. 25). Additionally, Ajoka considers conflict an integral part of theatre that provides fuel to theatre to convey its message in a clearer and direct way. According to Ajoka "if there is more conflict, there is more effective theatre" (Majid, 2015, p. 29)

He wrote *The Third Knock* in 1970 which highlights the struggle between tenants and landlord. The tenants are hand to mouth and spend poor lives. After too much suffering, they decide to rebel against the landlord and refuse to pay the rent of the building where they reside. They plan to kill the landlord and do it when he comes to demand the rent. But he appears again on the stage after some time. They kill him again and again but he comes back in the same sequence till the end of the play. The three knocks add suspense in the play through continuous revolt of tenants to control the power and resistance against the landlord.

Research Questions

- i. Why the tenants of the selected play are valued, in terms of their utility or by keeping in view their class and social condition?
- ii. How traces of Brecht's Socio-Political philosophy exist in *The Third Knock*?

Review of the Literature

Commodity and Commodification

Commodities are referred as the things which can be purchased, sold and replaced as a trade in the markets of several kinds (Mahajan & Singh, 2015). "Economic exchange creates value. Value is embodied in commodities that are exchanged" (Appadurai, 1988, p. 3). He further explains that commodity is basically meant to exchange with other products in capitalistic norms at different levels. Moreover, Rubin claims that in political and economic systems of sex/gender, an obscurity lies in the exchange of women where women are exchanged with each other like commodities (1975).

"Commodification is an attitude of valuing things not for their utility

(use value) but for their power to impress others (sign value) or for their resale possibilities (exchange value)” (Dobie, 2011, p. 88; Siegel, n.d.). Commodification means to make the people an object of economic paradigm. Furthermore, it can be generated that enslavement can also be regarded the part and parcel of the same paradigm. “Thus, in this regard, objectification, and commodification transform persons and their bodies from a human category into objects of economic desire” (Sharp, 2000, p. 293). The resultant effects of commodification lead towards self alienation and lose the spirit of individuals (Mubarak, 2015).

Landlord-Tenant Relationship

In Europe the new domains in ownership of the land was introduced in 18th century. New paradigms were initiated to use the lands freely by their owners. They could give their land to “non-owners” for the exchange of things or any type of rent (Bregman, Bregman, Schwartz, Gilday, & Bethesda, n.d.). That was the start of the relationship of tenant and landlord where later those tenants suffered more who had low income (Dillahun, Mankoff, & Paulos, 2010). Keller claimed that “landlords hold the upper hand in the landlord/tenant relationship. Factors affecting the landlord/tenant relationship include the status of the housing market, socio-economic status, and existing laws” (as cited in Dillahun et al., 2010, p. 2). For example, the power of landlord may evict him at any time if they have any conflict among them. This risk remains all the time which make the landlord more dominant. It is also researched that the basic problem faces by the tenants who have low income. They suffer most of the time by spending their income on paying their rent to landlord which affects their own domestic lives (DiPasquale, 2011).

Research Gap

Kayani and Termizi (2017) have discussed *The Third Knock* from new historicist perspective in *Literary Representations of Capitalist Dictatorship in Transcultural Adaptations of Brecht's The Resistible Rise of Arturo Ui by Ajoka Theatre in Pakistan*. Shumaila Bari (2016) has pointed out exploitation embedded in knocks in *Subversive Resurrection-Perpetuation of Exploitation exposed by the Motif of Knock in Shahid Nadeem's The Third Knock*. The resurrection of the character represents the helplessness of the weak. Furthermore, the motif of knock haunts all the time. Majid (2015) has discussed *The Third Knock* in *The Symbiotic Embeddedness of Theatre and Conflict: A Metaphor-Inspired Quartet of Case Studies*.

The current study fills the gape by discussing the rights of ownership through tenant-landlord relationship in *The Third Knock*. This study also

explores the very existence of commodification and inequality in the selected text. The previous studies lack in exploring the particular lens of Brecht's Socio-Political philosophy in Shahid Nadeem's selected text.

Methodology

Theoretical Framework

"Brecht is a difficult phenomena" (Benjamin, 2003, p. 27). Furthermore, "Brecht as theorist and practitioner is neither outdated nor relevant, but waiting to be discovered" (Barnett, 2015, p. 6). This portion of the study explains the theoretical framework which set the ground to analyze the text. In order to achieve the purpose of the study, it seems essential to elaborate the chunks of Brecht's Socio-Political philosophy. His Socio-Political philosophy as far as this study is concerned, is based on his play *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* which was published in 1944.

The ending lines of the play *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* by Brecht have been taken as theoretical framework for this study where it is written that:

Things should belong to those who do well by them

Children to motherly women that they may thrive

Wagon to good drivers that they may be well driven

And the valley to those who water it, that it may bear fruit. (Brecht & Bentley, 1948, p. 94)

Brecht's Socio-Political philosophy reflects in these lines that the things should be awarded to those who can take great care of them. Children can only be flourished by the affectionate and motherly women. Vehicles must be given to trained drivers to reach destinations and valleys must also be kept in the hands of hard working professionals who don't let it make barren. In short, things should be valued in terms of their utility.

Furthermore, Brecht in his play *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* portrays several socio-political paradigms of society. He challenges established norms of society and transformed them by conveying his socio-political thoughts. He believes in the best use of things and relationships. In the play *FIRST LAWYER* maintains his arguments through the ties of mother-child relationship. He says that "High Court of Justice, of all ties the ties of blood is strongest. Mother and child-is there a more intimate relationship? Can one tear a child from its mother?" (1948, p. 104) but *GRUSHA*, who is not the

biological mother of the child, just replies that “He’s mine” (1948, p. 104). It is an established order of the society that a child only belongs to biological mother but Brecht argues against it. He turns the attention towards GRUSHA who says that “I brought him up like the priest says according to my best knowledge and conscience. I always found him something to eat. Most of the time, he had a roof over his head. And I went to such trouble for him” (1948, p. 105).

In this context, GRUSHA’s words symbolize Brecht’s socio-political philosophy which deals with the hope of a ‘scientific audience’ to view the play with rational and active minds. It further intends to produce spectators like sociologists who view the critical aspects of the play (Squiers, 2012). Through theory, Brecht speculated his thoughts and ideas and set new goals to develop it more. He didn’t only theorize but also practiced it on theatre. However, he kept on presenting new draft to speculate and manifest reality which further made his theory concrete. In brief, Brecht didn’t create his theory as finished but provided several threads which float in his works. In addition, he explored running theatrical aspects and crafted “alternative vision” of viewing it (Barnett, 2015, p. 17).

Moreover, in the play Brecht builds his claim on the basis of humanism which GRUSHA holds and The GOVERNOR’S WIFE lacks even towards her own biological son. She wants him back only to get the estate which belongs to him. It comes to forefront when SECOND LAWYER says that “the revenue of her estates is blocked, and she is cold-bloodedly told that it’s tied to the heir. She can’t do a thing without that child” (1948, p. 105). Brecht makes his philosophical assumptions more clear at this point that the child is safer in the hands of GRUSHA as compare to biological mother who shows inhuman behaviour to her child. She pulls the child brutally to her side when AZDAK says ‘Pull’. But “GRUSHA (has let go and strands aghast). What’s the matter with you? You didn’t pull” (1948, p. 112). In this way, the right of ownership is challenged on the basis of humanist approach of GRUASHA. She is sympathetic and loving to the child because she has a soft heart. But GOVERNOR’S WIFE wants him back because the social norms support her.

Finally, Brecht highlights the humanistic nature of “GRUSHA (*in despair*): I brought him up! Shall I also tear him to bits? I can’t!” The court “determines the true mother” (1948, p. 113) and it is eventually finalized that the ‘child of love’ belongs to GRUSHA. In this way, Brecht’s social philosophy becomes evident that he supports love, affection, utility and truthfulness. Simultaneously, he is against the hypocrisy, inner ugliness, unequal socio-political aspects and inhuman behaviours of the people.

In this sense, it seems essential to examine that how does the “false consciousness” possibly alter? The answer can be explored through the realization of “material dialectical Weltanschauung” (Squiers, 2012, p. 56). It converts the people to live out of illusionary world. Brecht equates the efforts of labourer to changes the system with Sisyphean results. In a letter he says that “who wants to prevent the fishes in the sea from getting wet?” (as cited in Squiers, 2012, p. 57). The change is essential with new and fresh view. For this purpose, one needs to be critical who should take serious effort as Brecht claims in his another letter that “a mere echo of the world is not enough” (as cited in Squiers, 2012, p. 107).

According to Billington “Brecht is a Dramatist first and a Marxist second” (as cited in Barnett, 2015, p. 4) and through his plays, he encourages the audience to view the society critically in order to invent new paths to encounter with them. However, “Brecht as theorist can be a thinker. He does not generalize, but qualifies the art he is considering (‘of this sort’) and implicitly suggests that this is not the only way to represent the same story” (Barnett, 2015, pp. 11-12). In this context, the main assumptions of his theory, as far as this study is concerned, are given as under:

- a. Poor is treated like a commodity and becomes the victim of commodification. However, Brecht “addresses inequalities in society and proposes ways of overcoming them” (Barnett, 2015, p. 19).
- b. Powerful exploits the power hence the oppressed cannot implement their plans for the reformation and betterment of the society. In this context Brecht claims that “these ways are not based on reforming an already flawed system (capitalism), but fashioning a new and better one” (Barnett, 2015, p. 19).
- c. Change of weltanschauung (world view) through locating alternative options can be possible. In this regard he maintains that “the hope for change is based on the instability of any social system and is brought about by an unchanging methodology: dialectics” (Barnett, 2015, p. 19).

Textual Analysis

This section of the study analyzes the text of Shahid Nadeem’s play *The Third Knock* to explore the tenant-landlord relationship through which, the right of ownership is examined. Furthermore, it intends to explain the commodification of deprived where they can’t implement their effective plans for the betterment of the society. In this regard, the abuse of power is also discussed that landlord (powerful) snubs tenants (powerless) through fair and foul means. In addition, it also discusses the change of world view by

talking about the possibilities of change in the thoughts of the people. The shadow of these themes can be seen in author's note of the text where Nadeem expresses that "at the same time *Teesri Dastak* is also a story of the shattering of dreams and hopes of the generation of Pakistanis who were the victims of Partition riots and the unprecedented dislocation of population on religious grounds" (2008, p. 1). This textual evidence supports the arguments that 'shattering of dreams' is connected with the oppressed where they are unable to play a productive part in snubbed and grimed circumstances.

One of the highlighting points of the study is the ownership rights of the people. The question arises that who owns the ownership and who *should* own? Whether the people deserve to claim the right who have productive plan for the things or those who occupy them through any other mode of transfer or social power? In the context of Brecht's Socio-Political philosophy, those people are the true heirs who have plans for the betterment of the land and things (as discussed in the theoretical framework in detail). Same is the case in *The Third Knock* where EJAZ, a tenant, outlines planning to utilize the building for the best use of it. He draws a plan that "EJAZ (to himself): A water pump in this corner, lamp post here, and garbage bin in this corner... and the complaints and suggestions box here, the *katri* will be transformed in a few days. (To Baba) Don't you think so?" (Nadeem, 2008, p. 7). Ejaz thinks about the welfare of the people in terms of utility and dreams to change the condition of the Katri.

Another prominent factor which is raised in the play by Nadeem is that landlords and their agents know the technique of exploitation through the use of law. But on the other hand tenants are ignorant and consider the legal notices "just another notice" (2008, p. 15). At the same time landlord is more concerned with his business and less concerned with the people living on rent. The agent, Munshi brings the interest of landlord on the front when Old Man asks him that "but what will the Haji do with this building after evicting us?" and he replies with a *wink* that "he is building a hotel here. There is no hotel in this vicinity, you see. And the hotel business is very profitable". Simultaneously, he says that "he can build a mansion or a brothel. Who can object?" (2008, pp. 15-16). In this regard, it can be claimed that the powerful can do anything right or wrong according to his will and for his benefit.

In addition, another type of abuse of power can also be traced in the play which is connected with the lecherous nature of Munshi. He threatens all the characters with the name of jail but he changes his tone and mood when Jamila enters. "*He stares at her lecherously and then laughs*" and says that "There could be exceptions" (2008, p. 17). The lecherous staring at the females of tenants is one of the common practices is presented in these

dialogues by Nadeem. Through it he highlights the sensitive issue of staring and gazing at the females of in the society.

Nadeem also talks about the possibilities of change by challenging the norms and values of society in the play. He keeps on mentioning the struggle to change social norms through his characters. Ejaz is one of those characters who try to provide solutions even in worse conditions. He calls it “a revolutionary plan”. He says that “this slum would have been transformed with the help of that plan” (2008, p. 18). In the meanwhile, some characters like Jamila remain passive and just talk about the looming danger of eviction. She says that “this slum cannot be reformed, it is impossible” (19).

Additionally, Nadeem highlights the hope through Ejaz when he says that “why be so pessimistic” and “change is possible”. These are the hall marks of his abilities to make plans for the development of the society. He becomes the positive thinker in time of adversity. In this context, it can be claimed that impossibility can be converted into possibility by changing the mind set.

One of the important aspects of the study is to discuss the rights of ownership. In this regard Nadeem has mentioned the villainy of the suppressor through the possession of the building. Tenants are on the edge of eviction because they don’t have legal rights over the land. On the other hand, Landlord holds the power over land because of the allotment of the building which he got after partition. It is not his ancestral property. He got right of ownership through this process which became legal with the passage of time. Bi hints about the matter that “BI: This building is not his ancestral property. He also got it allotted after Partition”. In this context, law protects him as Zulfi talks that “but he is the owner now and we are tenants. He has a legal right to evict us” and there can be “misadventure” if they struggle against the law. So they are nothing but “helpless” (2008, p. 21).

Commodification is another factor exists in the play. Tenants pay their rent to landlord for a long time but they cannot claim the land legally as their ownership. Similar point has risen by Nadeem through Mansoor in the play by pointing out that “you can make several such buildings with the amount of rent we have paid him, over these thirty years. This is our home. How can we vacate our home?” (2008, p. 23). Moreover, in the light of the description of his facial expression, it can be argued that Nadeem has depicted another way of possibility to change the social set up. “*Mansoor suddenly gets up. His eyes are full of hatred and anger*” (2008, p. 23). This expression shows the aggression of the commodified. Additionally, the aggression speaks out that “violence cannot be eliminated without violence” (2008, p. 24).

Furthermore, Nadeem has created the possibility of change towards the right of ownership. The revolt takes place when Mansoor says that “we can only live if Haji dies”. After living in the building for so many years he asserts that “we have a right to take over the property”. There would be no oppression in the absence of oppressor. “No papers, no notices” conveys the clear message of revolt on the part of tenants (2008, p. 24). But the question remains there whether violence can be eliminated through violence because as Zulfi says “Haji has a long family. They will replace him” (2008, p. 25). In this way, another exploiter of power will replace the previous and the cycle of exploitation will remain the same.

Additionally, the landlord’s name is symbolic which shows the apparent piousness but in fact a suppressor and a materialist. His first meeting with the tenants highlights the several facets of his personality. He talks about the eviction, “signatures”, “formalities” and hints the “bureaucrats” and laughs in “an embarrassed manner”. Furthermore, he offers them to “written off the rent” (Nadeem, 2008, pp. 11-12). In this way, he could get rid of the tenants. He is totally a materialist. He replies in an “embarrass” manner to Old Man when he appeals him and touches his “feet”. Haji replies that “why appeal to religious sentiments? This is purely a business matter” (Nadeem, 2008, p. 26).

Another aspect of Haji’s personality is that he never cares about any relationship. Ejaz says that “Mr. Haji sir, we have been your tenants for such a long time. My father was your tenant too” (Nadeem, 2008, p. 26) but he replies that:

HAJI: What nonsense! This is business. Relationships don’t count here. If I cared for relationships and niceties, I might have been here with you, getting evicted. My old man, senior Haji Sahib, used to insist to go for Haj pilgrimage every year, and that too by air. First he used to do some business while on Haj, but then he became so godly, only performing Haj. I remained patient for one year, two years, three years. Then I told the doctor to tell the old man that if he flies, he will have a heart attack. That was the end of the pilgrimages. The moral of the story is: Don’t spare even your own father in business matters. Get it? (2008, p. 26)

He used to commodify his own father so how can he take care of his tenants? The words like ‘niceties’, ‘relationship’, and ‘godly’ have no place in his life.

Furthermore, Nadeem (2008) exposes the mentality of landlord that he is not used to hear the high tone of tenants. Mansoor raises his voice which surprises landlord. He surprisingly says “keep your voice down”.

Mansoor's revolt against the landlord highlights the possibility of change that provides a hope to oppressed one. His strong reaction conveys the message of struggle against the cruelty of landlord. He says "No, I will not keep my voice down any more. We have been silent for too long. We will shout now. So loudly that your eardrums will burst" (p. 30). In this way, it can be claimed that Mansoor is the embodiment of resistance against the capitalist values.

In this context, it seems that Nadeem has attempted to change the world view of the society through this play. He talks about the ownership right to take the possession of the assets by arguing to use them for the best public interest. The tenants in the play attempt to kill Haji which signifies their concern to change the society. However, a lot of efforts are needed to reform the society but they start the journey through the murder of Haji. Simultaneously, they are little bit confused after killing the landlord:

EJAZ (*with a fearful laughter*): Yes, it is ours now. We own it.

ZULFI (*with mixed emotions of happiness and concern*): Haji is gone but that doesn't mean this property is ours now.

EJAZ (*laughingly*): One who lives in it, has the ownership right. (2008, p. 35)

The first murder of Haji after the first knock gives them a happy moment to celebrate. In this way, they own the right of ownership. They start to celebrate it in their own way by raising slogans.

All the residents of the building take part in electing their administrator that is a sign of freedom and equality. All are agreed to give responsibility to one person. Mansoor is elected who started the struggle for the change through the proposal of Haji's murder.

The real change in attitudes and behaviours is shown by Nadeem through freedom and equal rights of living. Characters are using their potential and intellect to make new plan. After freedom, their abilities are sharpened. They can think according to their own minds. Jamila who remains sick all the time in the play is ready to contribute in the effort of reformation of the society. She says that "I want to start a school in the courtyard, where children from our buildings and others in the neighbourhood can come and study". Furthermore, she shares her plan of converting the building into garden, "a flower garden". She dreams of "blue, pink, red flowers, flowers of all colours" (2008, p. 38) to make the building a beautiful and soothing place for living.

Notably, the second knock of the landlord signifies the chain of suppression which continues the tyranny of the landlord. The second arrival of Haji horrifies them again that “*a fearful silence. Another knock*” (Nadeem, 2008, p. 38). Through the phrase “*Haji enters, smiling as before*” (2008, p. 38) it seems that Nadeem maintains the argument to struggle more. Haji replaces with Haji that is not other than Haji himself. In this regard, it can be said that the process of tyranny and commodification can never be ended easily. The tenants need to encounter with the difficulties.

Firstly, they call him a “ghost” but later realize “Haji in the flesh” (Nadeem, 2008, p. 38). They check the dead body which is disappeared from the place. The situation makes them confuse whether he is Haji or his brother? They consider that murder a dream. Ejaz’s comment on the situation is pertinent to mention that “May be we killed him in our dream. May be it was all a dream, a collective dream! A dream made up of our wishes....” (2008, p. 39). In this background, it can be outlined that the efforts of poor are useless in the capitalist society. The social set up support the landlord who uses it to commodify the tenants.

However, Nadeem (2008) connects the events through Baba’s story of Partition. Ejaz by “*pointing towards Baba*” says that “His whole family was cut down in the Partition riots” (40). At this time, Nadeem discloses the matter that the background of Haji and Baba is same. Both came in Pakistan after Partition and both started their new life. Additionally, the difference between Haji and Baba can be seen transparently that one is the owner of many building and the other is living in the buildings as a tenant. In this way, it can be examined that the author hints towards the self centred nature of Haji who is a worldly man. In this context, it can also be argued that Baba had been at the same place if he would have been exploited people. The phrase “He is all alone now” (2008, p. 40) could have been the destiny of Haji.

After this, Mansoor once again announces loudly that “This building will not be vacated”. Haji reacts surprisingly once again and Mansoor “shouts” at him. They again do the same job what they did first time but this time, Bangali, the weaker one also joins them.

They all join hands in murdering Haji, just like the first time. Bengali also joins them. Haji is killed. They leave his body, which drops on the floor. They are panting. Silence for a few moments. They are less shocked this time”. (Nadeem, 2008, p. 41)

It is notable that Nadeem presented the second possibility in the chapter the second knock to get rid of the Haji. Moreover, it can be claimed

that he believes in the struggle where all join hands to eradicate the issue. In addition, the struggle should also be firm to achieve goals. It is presented through Mansoor when he says that “I strangled him very hard this time, to make sure that he stopped breathing” (2008, p. 42). So the conscious effort is needed every time to reform the society towards a better direction.

Notably, Old Man and Jamila talk about the possession of the building which they have after the death of the landlord. They are optimistic that no one evicts them after Haji. In the meanwhile, the door is knocked again, the third knock. “*After a pause, Haji enters again. He is smiling like before. He looks around*”. Haji’s entrance makes the efforts of the tenants futile. He is still alive but the residents are arrested in the offence of Haji’s murder. Jamila “*looks at Haji in a mesmerized manner*” and “*gets up*”. Additionally, it can be mentioned that she is the last hope of change that can stand against landlord. “*There is a new strength in her and hatred like that of her brother. She moves towards Haji*”. The play ends in a way that “*Jamila’s hands move towards Haji’s neck. Action is frozen. Bi shuts the window. Lights go off. Haji’s loud scream in the dark*” (2008, p. 48).

At the end, it can be claimed that suppressors will keep on coming to exploit the poor like Haji but a united and proactive struggle is required to cope with them. Jamila shows strength at the end after realizing the fact that she has to create another possibility to carry on the struggle of oppressed. Furthermore, it can also be argued that her “hands move towards Haji’s neck” (Nadeem, 2008, p. 48) is the symbolic representation of the people against the commodification of the powerful.

Conclusion

The study has traced several assumption of Brecht’s social philosophy in *The Third Knock* by Shahid Nadeem. Firstly, it has examined that tenants are commodified by landlord because the landlord holds the power and possession over sources. Moreover, the productive plans of poor have not been utilized because of the flawed system where they are considered a mere commodity. In addition, it highlighted the factor involving the wastage of potential which is not being utilized in the presence of capitalistic mind set.

Secondly, the research has also explored the possibility of change which gives an encouragement to the handicapped and suppressed people of the society and addresses them to keep on struggling to contribute for the development of the society. In this context, it has also been pointed out that the change is not a one night battle but a continuous effort to achieve goals.

In this regard, it has also been determined that the things should be given to those who can take great care of them instead of those who hold them through their social power.

Thirdly, the current project has predicted an alarming perspective for the exploiters of the society that the people should be treated with humanistic approach otherwise they can revolt against the unequal treatment and tyranny of the exploiter. Furthermore, it has mentioned the solution of the problems related to maintain a peaceful atmosphere of the society. In this way, a guideline has been provided for those who hold the upper hand in the society and simultaneously, they can play an integral part for the betterment of the society by giving the deserving rights to the oppressed of the society.

Along with the assumptions of Brecht's socio-political philosophy, the study has provided the guideline for further researches. It presented the idea of taking the concluding line of a work and to apply them on other works as a theoretical framework. In this way, new paradigms can be explored from other texts. At the same time, Brecht's philosophy can also be applied on other works of writers. Besides, the study can be useful in the academic curriculum because Brecht's works have been taught in Pakistan and across the world.

Works Cited

- Appadurai, A. (1988). *The social life of things: Commodities in cultural perspective*: Cambridge University Press.
- Bari, S. (2016). Subversive Resurrection-Perpetuation of Exploitation exposed by the Motif of Knock in Shahid Nadeem's The Third Knock.
- Barnett, D. (2015). *Brecht in practice: Theatre, theory and performance*: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Benjamin, W. (2003). *Understanding Brecht (New Edition)*: Verso.
- Brecht, B. (n.d.). To Posterity. Retrieved from <http://www.poemhunter.com/poem/to-posterity>
- Brecht, B., & Bentley, E. (1948). *The Caucasian Chalk Circle*: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bregman, D., Bregman, B., Schwartz, Gilday, & Bethesda, M. (n.d.). Historic Perspective of the Modern Landlord and Tenant Relationship. Retrieved from <http://www.bregmanlaw.com/siteFiles/7559/Historic%20Perspective%20of%20the%20Modern%20Landlord%20and%20Tenant%20Relationship.pdf>
- Dillahunt, T., Mankoff, J., & Paulos, E. (2010). *Understanding conflict between landlords and tenants: implications for energy sensing and feedback*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 12th ACM international conference on Ubiquitous computing.
- DiPasquale, D. (2011). Rental housing: Current market conditions and the role of federal policy. *Cityscape*, 57-70.
- Dobie, A. B. (2011). *Theory into practice: an introduction to literary criticism*: Cengage learning.
- Kayani, T., & Termizi, A. A. (2017). Literary Representations of Capitalist Dictatorship in Transcultural Adaptations of Brecht's The Resistible Rise of Arturo Ui by Ajoka Theatre in Pakistan. *International Journal of Comparative Literature and Translation Studies*, 5(1), 16-26.

- Mahajan, N., & Singh, K. (2015). A beginner's guide to Indian commodity futures markets. In: Madhyam.
- Majid, A. (2015). The Symbiotic Embeddedness of Theatre and Conflict: A Metaphor-Inspired Quartet of Case Studies.
- Mubarak, S. (2015). Dramatizing Power and Resistance: Images of Women in Pakistani and Indian Alternative Theater.
- Nadeem, S. (2008). Selected Plays. *New York: Oxford University Press.*
- Rubin, G. (1975). The Traffic in Women: Notes on the "Political Economy" of Sex. Teoksessa Rayna R. Reiter (toim.), toward an anthropology of Women. In: New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Sharp, L. A. (2000). The commodification of the body and its parts. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 29(1), 287-328.
- Siegel, K. (n.d.). Introduction to Modern Literary Theory. Retrieved from <http://www.kristisiegel.com/theory.htm#marx>
- Squiers, A. (2012). *The social and political philosophy of Bertolt Brecht*: Western Michigan University.