CONCLUSION
In the introduction to her work *The Second Sex*, Simone de Beauvoir starts with the question 'What is a woman?'. She then goes on exploring the physical and social aspects that differentiate a woman from a man. Now, in the postmodern period, we might have moved far away from de Beauvoir's fundamental assertions in inquiring into 'What is a woman?'. There is no need anymore to establish a woman's gender identity, and argue that she is equally capable like men in the areas of creative writing as well as challenging men in the so-called areas meant 'only for man'. What is crucial in literary and critical discourse is how far we have been able to understand 'women's writing' as different from other writings. The question that needs to be explored is how the difference is articulated? Does that difference speak of fundamental differences in thinking, feeling and articulation? If so, how does it work? All these questions and others concerning body, motherhood, woman-child relationship, man-woman relationship, and spiritualism are discussed in the foregoing chapters in the context of Kamala Das and Judith Wright as feminist poets.

It is widely held that while one's sex is determined by anatomy, the prevailing concepts of gender - of the traits that constitute what is masculine and what is feminine - are largely, if not entirely, cultural constructs that were generated by the omnipresent patriarchal biases of our civilization. In this way the masculine in our culture has come to be identified as active,
dominating, adventurous, rational, creative, the feminine, by systematic opposition to such traits, has come to be identified as passive, acquiescent, timid, emotional and conventional. Further, it is often held that the traditional aesthetics categories and criteria for analyzing and appraising literary works, although represented in standard critical theory as objective, disinterested, and universal are in fact infused with masculine assumptions, interests, and ways of reasoning, so that the standard rankings, and also the critical treatments, of literary works in fact been tacitly but thoroughly gender-biased. The feminists of all hues challenge this bias. They call attention to deconstructing our critical approaches and dealing with literature so as to do justice to female points of view, concerns and values. In the eighties, feminists have moved from the social to the linguistic challenges of gender discrimination. The sweeping radical claim of French theorists has declared that language is not gender-neutral. Therefore, the need of the hour is not only that women should create a tradition of their own writing but should also create a language of their own. The basic problem of the French theorists is to establish the very possibility of a woman's language that will not, when a woman writes, automatically be appropriated into the phallocentric language, for such appropriation forces her into complicity with the linguistic features that impose on females a condition of marginality and subservience, or even of linguistic nonentity.
To get rid of this dilemma, Helen Cixous points the existence of an incipient 'feminine writing' which has its source in the mother, in that stage of the mother-child relation before the child acquires the father's language. Therefore, in her view, this prelinguistic potentiality in the unconscious manifests itself in those written texts which, abolishing all repressions undermine and subvert the fixed signification, the 'logic' and 'closure' of phallocentric language, and open into a joyous freplay of meanings. Alternately Luce Irigaray posits "woman's writing" which evades the male monopoly and the risk of appropriation into the existing systems by establishing as its generative principle, in place of the monolithic phallus, the diversity, fluidity, and multiple possibilities inherent in the structure and erotic functioning of the female sexual organs and in the distinctive nature of female sexual experience.

In our study of Kamala Das and Judith Wright, in spite of arguments and counter-arguments by critics, what has emerged clearly is their unique sensibility. Central to that unique sensibility are female experience and imagination. Although Kamala Das has shown a different language use, rhetorical employment, Judith Wright seems to be traditional. However, their feelings and experiences as women illuminate through their creativity. Hence, it will not be improper to say that both belong to the tradition of women writing with the attendant features that the feminists consider unique to 'women's
writing'. In their poems one witnesses a strong disapproval of men's point of view prioritizing only the female way of seeing and understanding things around them or through their lived experiences. If we don't accept aesthetic value as universal and axiomatic, we find in the works of both poets superb poetic qualities that resonate through a unique use of symbols and metaphors that inform the aesthetic quality of their works.

Female identity apart from being based on a difference or lack is mostly socially constructed. Kamala Das's self-definition subsumed in the poetic persona 'I' talks of her individuality and gender difference. She starts with knowing her, 'who is she' and then articulates her feelings in poetry from that position. She is often rebellious and vehement in articulating her subject position. Like Sylvia Plath, she does not want to shy away even from violence. Heterosexuality is not only a man's prerogative. However, Kamala Das visualizes it as a quest for wish-fulfillment. In her various sexual escapades, she is looking for the man of her ideal mate/man. She is unfortunate, in the sense that all her extramarital involvements only results in disgust and not in glorification. While in the social context she tries not to elude herself with the image of the ideals of Sita or Savitri, nonetheless she does not hesitate to play the role of Radha, the consort of Krishna. One may argue that Kamala Das has given a new direction to female spirituality in idealising Radha- Krishna love. To her physical love is a kind of sickness. However, the only escape from this
sickness is there in the ideal love of Radha and Krishna. The theme of Radha-Krishna love is stripped of all traditional trapping. Kamala Das understands this relationship as coming together of two like-minded people. However, this pursuit does not bear fruit in the context of social control.

Her anger and frustrations in her multiple relationships are obvious. This does not lead her to hate men in general. She as a mother is overgratified and loved the experience of motherhood. The birth of the child brings to her immense joy. Kamala Das may sound radical in sexual relationships, however, she is traditional in many ways as an Indian woman. As a creative writer, she combines many things traditional and modern and redefines woman's position in Indian society. On the whole, Kamala Das remains individualistic in her approach and articulation of creativity. She does not bother about Indian landscape or the nation as Judith Wright does likening her to the image of the earth mother.

Judith Wright's sensibility is quite different form that of Kamala Das's for she thinks of woman in a context of the earth-mother, procreator, nurturer of life. She is not as radical as Kamala Das in her sexual predilections. She certainly values ideal man-woman relationships. She is not a stranger in her own world; indeed she is a happy poet who wishes all the very best. Her ideal relationship with her philosopher husband and having a home full with love shapes her poetic sensibility. She certainly starts with looking at herself as an
individual person but works out on the relationships that persona has with others. The biological lack or difference does not trouble her for she looks at her difference as a gift that could bring meaning to her life.

She does not make her lack as a convenient weapon to challenge rather consider it as a means through which she can bring in happiness to herself and others. Emerged from this conviction is her attitude to men and issues like motherhood and spiritualism. She enjoys motherhood and the innocent smile of a child’s face brings to her heavenly feelings. In this mother-child ideal relationship she does not visualize the father as an intruder, he is in fact a part of it. Radical feminists may not like Wright for this conviction, however, she is correct in visualizing any woman as a representation of mother earth. The strength of Wright’s poetry is that she strongly identifies with the Australian landscape. The landscape of Australia resonates through a kind of metaphoric flourish that adds to her feminine poetic charm. From this emerges a cohesive and integrated aesthetic vision in her poetry.

Although Kanada Das and Judith Wright differ significantly in their perception of reality and realisation of individual subject positions, they are complementary to each other in significant ways that addresses divergent viewpoints of feminism. In reading both the poets while one, on the one hand, takes note of woman’s agonies and anxieties,
depressions and deprivations, on the other, looks at those ways that may bring to her consolation and comfort, enlightenment and spiritual bliss.

More than anything else, both poets have deep faith in poetry. Poetry has become a means for not only their self-realization but also for self-expression. The Muse, ultimately becomes the goddess for an escape for anxieties or agonies and also a means of self-realization and spiritual quest. It becomes a means for them to became many women and forge sisterhood of women across the world. Poetry becomes the poets. Whether appreciated or not, they believe in the Muse as the means of their salvation:

Be caution'd then my Muse, and still retir'd;
Nor be dispis'd aiming to be admired:
Conscious of wants, still with contracted wing.
To some few friends, and to thy sorrows sing;
For groves of Lawrell, than wert never meant;
Be dark enough thy shades, and be then there content.
Works Cited


