

Depiction of Sex and Violence in Vijay Tendulkar's Play in the
Context of The Prevailing Social Economical and Political
Conditions of India

A thesis submitted to



THE MAHARAJA SAYAJIRAO UNIVERSITY OF BARODA

FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF

Doctor of Philosophy in Theatre Arts

(Dramatics)

Guided By

Prof. Dr. Mahesh Champaklal

Submitted By

Ashutosh Narendra Mhaskar

Faculty of Performing Arts

THE MAHARAJA SAYAJIRAO UNIVERSITY OF BARODA

BARODA -390001, GUJARAT, INDIA.

OCTOBER 2013

Preface

As a theatre practitioner, the theatre of literary genres specifically dealing with social concern has always remained a special area of interest for me. I know very well that to work on the contribution of a playwright of Vijay Tendulkar's stature is in itself a challenge and I will have to burn the midnight oil to roam into the world of this great creative artiste and theatre practitioner.

Many scholars and critics have shown a genuine interest in the literary output of Vijay Tendulkar who began his career as a journalist in a newspaper, but his soul belonged to a hardcore theatrical creativity. His devotion has earned him worldwide recognition and all those fellow practitioners, and actors are more than eager to support and stand by him.

There is more than one reason to fall in love with him. He chooses such subjects for his plays as have a direct relationship with our external as well as internal world. He is bold enough to show us where the shoe pinches. Formerly, no great dramatist dared to touch the sensitive issues like homosexuality, communal prejudices, gender-discrimination, caste & class discrimination, etc. But he thought it necessary to expose pretences and false notions of urban middle class people or we can say he exposed the violence beneath the civilized structures of the society.

For my research work, “Depiction Of Sex And Violence In Tendulkar’s Plays In The Context Of Social Economical And Political Conditions Of India”, I have selected specifically those three plays which deal with the violent interplay within class, gender, power politics in a unique way. As we know Tendulkar deals with the vibrant issues of the so called civilized society in his major plays.

Such as ‘Sakharam Binder’, ‘Shantata court Chaluhave’, ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’, ‘Gidhade’, ‘Kanyadan’, ‘Kamala’, etc. But, as discussed with my guide, Dr. Mahesh Champaklal I have focused on only three major plays which deal with different types of violence. These plays are,

1. Shantata Court Chaluhave
2. Sakharam Binder
3. Ghashiram Kotwal

The reason to select the above mentioned plays is that each play deals with an issue which not only is concerned with social situations but creates a mental storm within the spectators or readers. The play ‘Sakharam binder’ is related to gender violence, but it has a special value of dramatic moments. I must mention that all of the Tendulkar’s plays have special dramatic value and all are different from each other, but as I

examined the play “Sakharam binder” I feel that the title “a curious case of gender violence” is perfectly suitable to the play.

The second one is “Shantata Court Chalu Ahe”, which deals with the burning issue of abortion. After the long journey of civilization, we are now able to talk about women empowerment, women's liberation, but the basic question is, do we really accept the existence of empowered women in a male dominated society? And has a female gender realized a little bit of violence implanted by the society? Or is the violence deep rooted within as silence and is the form of violence changed as ‘accepted violence’? Still there is much possibility to discuss about the question raised, so much vibrant discussion is required to explode the violence beneath the silence hence, I gave the title “Cruel game of silence to suppress women’s sexual desire” – ‘Shantata court Chalu Ahe’.

The third play is ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’. It is partially based on the imaginative story of Nana Sahib Peshwa of Maratha dynasty. Tendulkar skillfully weaved the element of Tamasha form into this play. The issue of power in politics is a core thread of the play. Just like hunting animals in a wild forest, a human on one side is food of a hunter and on the other side he is a hunter searching for food. Once a human is oppressed by someone he may become an oppressor in future where the power acts as triggering force. It is a constant process of transformation, so I gave the

title “A violent oppressive transformation of power” – ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’.

In the first chapter I have embarked on the personality, uniqueness and creativity of Vijay Tendulkar as a writer. In his career as a journalist he dealt with so many crime stories. As said by him in his process of living life he tries to find out human values, more specifically he wanted to find humanity. His quest is to find internal reality of human being. The chapter is concluded with different factors affected and influenced him as a creative writer. This examination helps us to understand Tendulkar as a human being and as a creative writer.

In the second chapter I have tried to examine the ‘violence’ as constructive force. This chapter includes the views of psychologists, biologists, and social scientists and it further focuses on Tendulkar’s concept of inherent predominance of violence in human being.

Third chapter deals with different types of interplay of contradictions as found in Tendulkar’s plays. This chapter focuses on opposite forces inherent in different types of relationships, i.e. sexual relationship, family relationship and social relationship. Examination of the very nature of violence operating in forms of caste, class, gender and

relationship helps to trace out Tendulkar's depiction of sex and violence as a triggering force to the relationships.

As the subject of the present study, especially focuses on the depiction of sex and violence in Vijay Tendulkar's plays, it reveals multiple aspects of the problem which cannot be understood in totality without having grasp of diverse disciplines like psychology, sociology, political science etc. Valuable and creative discussion with my guide and his valuable suggestions have helped me a lot to understand the interdisciplinary complexities and intricacies involved in the subject.

Contents

Preface	I
Acknowledgement	VII
1. Chapter 1 : Vijay Tendulkar-life & Works	1
2. Chapter 2 : “Violence: the essential living fluid” Tendulkar on his own terms.	42
3. Chapter 3 : “Violent interplay of contradiction” Character-dialogues & theatrical devices of Tendulkar.	84
4. Chapter 4 : “Cruel game of silence to suppress women’s Sexual desire” – ‘Shantata Court Chalu Ahe’	135
5. Chapter 5 : “A curious case of gender violence” – ‘Sakharam Binder’	182
6. Chapter 6 : “A violent oppressive transformation of power ” – ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’	238
7. Conclusion.	283
8. Bibliography	302
9. Webliography	314

Acknowledgement

First and foremost I want to thank my guide Prof. Dr. Mahesh Champaklall. It has been an honour to be his Ph.D. student. I appreciate all his contribution of time, ideas, and guidance to make my Ph.D. experience productive and stimulating. He has been a source of friendship as well as good advice and collaboration. During tough times in the Ph.D. pursuit he was contagious and motivational for me. I am highly obliged and express my sincere gratitude to him.

The Faculty of Performing Arts, The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda has given me an opportunity to study Dramatics, from Diploma to Doctor of Philosophy. I express my gratitude towards late Sir Sayajirao Gaekwad, Late Shri C.C.Mehta, Prof. Markand Bhatt and Shri Y. D. Kelkar due to whose dedication towards theatre education and institutional training has been established a serious tradition of theatre arts providing platform to study and exercise meaningful theatre for the young generation. I want to thank all my teachers who have contributed to shape up my skills as a humble student of Dramatics. I will never forget the creative class room discussions with Shri Mahesh Chapaklall and Shri Prabhakar Dabhade which has inspired me to develop my career in the field of theatre arts. I am thankful to the Dean, Faculty of Performing Arts, Head of the Department of Drama and other office bearers for their encouragement and support.

The members of the 'Youth Ras Thatre' group have contributed immensely to my personal and student life at Drama Department. I would also like to thank my friends and students for providing great moral support. They have helped me in collecting study material for my thesis.

I am thankful to N.C.P.A. Library, Pune Library, N.S.D. Library, Advance Research Centre Library (Shimla) and my elderly friends, Dr. Dipak Kannal, Dr. Makarand Sathe, Shri Shrikant Bilgi, Dr. Rajkumar Hans and Shri Bakul Tailor for their valuable support. I am especially grateful to Kardambhai who supported me and enlighten me for the study. Creative discussions with him helped me for writing the thesis, without his interest and helpful comments this would not have been possible in time.

I also express my sincere gratitude to President, Banaskantha District Kelavani Mandal, and other officials. I am thankful to my colleagues, Principal, and other staff members of my college 'M.A.Parikh Fine Arts and Arts college, Palanpur'. I am also thankful to Shri. Girish Thakar, who supported me as my local guardian of Palanpur. I sincerely thank them all who have helped me in many ways for writing the thesis.

I would like to acknowledge my past and present students Ghodeswar, Ravi, Gadhavi, and Charlie who assisted me as my family member, without their help and support the thesis would not have been finished in time.

Last but not the least; I would like to thank my family for all their love and encouragement, esp. My parents, Narendra Mhaskar and Nilkamal Mhaskar, who raised me with a love of art and always supported me in all my pursuits. I am thankful to my brother Ambrish for free of cost Graphic Designing. And most of all for my loving, supportive, encouraging, and patient wife Dhvani and my little daughter Janhavi whose faithful support during the final stages of this Ph.D. is noteworthy. I thank one and all.

Ashutosh Narendra Mhaskar
October 2013.

Chapter -1

Vijay Tendulkar – Life and Works

It seems that words fall short while dealing with such a dramatist who tried his hand in dramas for the last four decades. Even these works seem to be simple on the superficial level, but all these dramas require deep rumination and hence demands specification before articulating any opinion. Vijay Tendulkar has been one of the most renowned as well as controversial playwrights of India. Like any litterateur, Tendulkar is also a product of his upbringing and his environment. The writing from the different perspectives stirs so many controversies at any occasions it has been alleged that the plays written during the beginning of his literary career have been affected by the western dramatic works.

There are some critics who have made allegation on him that his plays are translated from other languages which is in fact a groundless argument. It is certain that the dramatist like Vijay Tendulkar's stature must have studied the western dramas, but such inspiration should not be considered as plagiarism or stealing. Any talent of the modern literature whether it be a dramatist an actor a dance or a poet should always be willing to draw such creative inspiration. Plato the great philosopher shares the same ideology

about inspiration, which he called as 'creative imitation'.¹ As we know the films and traditional folk dramas also marks their impact on the mind of the writers so it cannot be neglected that may be Vijay Tendulkar gone through under such partial influence of western writers. As a matter of fact Tendulkar himself highlights the references which occur in his plays; even those works in which he does not refer to these sources may be influenced by the western dramas. But it is quite improper to say that his whole dramatic world has been under the direct western influences. The number of his dramas and its quality prove the fact that any plagiarist cannot produce so many dramas of merit.

'Vijay Tendulkar' was a leading Indian playwright, movie and television writer, literary essayist, political journalist, and social commentator. He mostly writes in Marathi language but his plays translated in so many international languages. He is most known for his plays, 'Shantata! Court Chalu Ahe', 'Ghashiram Kotwal', 'Sakharam Binder', Kamala, Gidhade and other. He won Maharashtra State government awards in 1956, 1969 and 1972; and "Maharashtra Gaurav Puraskar" in 1999. He was honored with the Sangeet Natak Akademi Award in 1970, and again in 1998 with the Academy's highest award for 'lifetime-contribution', the Sangeet Natak Akademi Fellowship (Ratna Sadasya). In 1984, he received

the Padma Bhushan award from the Government of India for his literary accomplishments. In 1977, Tendulkar won the National Film Award for Best Screenplay for his screenplay in Shyam Benegal's movie, *Manthan* (1976). He has written screenplays for some of the important art movies of India, such as *Nishant*, *Aakrosh* and *Ardha Satya*. For the past five decades, Tendulkar has been a highly influential dramatist and theatre personality in Maharashtra. Vijay Tendulkar can be acknowledged as the precursor of modern Indian drama. His contribution is marvelous and bulky in the development of modern dramatic sensibility.

Though he did write much more in Marathi, the translated work from Marathi to other Indian language is really mind blowing. His plays were translated in English as well as more than ten international languages. His plays were performed internationally in different languages. He was born in Kolhapur and grown up in a ritualistic Brahmin family; he began to write when he was only six years old. He didn't believe in idealism as his many plays derived inspiration from real life incidents or social upheavals which provides clear light on harsh realities. So we can say that Indian literature is fortunate enough to produce a versatile genius like Vijay Tendulkar whose contribution is remarkable not only in the development of the Indian drama

but also lies in providing proper name and magnitude to Modern Indian drama.

Vijay Dhondopant Tendulkar was born on January 6, 1928 in a Bhalawalikar Saraswat Brahmin family in Kolhapur, Maharashtra. He spent his early childhood in Bombay. There was a literature friendly atmosphere in his family. In addition to holding a clerical job, his father also ran a small publishing business. He was an amateur actor and director as well. The house was full of books and his father encouraged him to read. The literary environment at home and his interaction with books and writers at his father's shop inspired young Vijay to take up to writing. He at the age six he wrote his first story.

When Vijay Tendulkar was a child he was living in Bombay. He witnessed the communal riots from his balcony. He saw the incidents of stabbing. As a child he found difficult to understand death and suffering, but spectacles implant deep impact on him. His father, Dhondopant, was Head-Clerk at Longmans, Green and Company, a British publishing firm. He had been invited to join a professional theatre company but he refused because a career in the theatre was not considered respectable. Every Sunday morning his father takes Vijay to the large bookshop owned by his publisher friend.

So the books in the house and outside had become young Vijay's favourite friends and companions. At age eleven, he wrote, directed, and acted in his first play. At age of fourteen he participates in the 1942 Indian freedom movement, and leaves his studies.

Vijay Tendulkar's elder brother Raghunath was actively involved in the Gandhian movement. Raghunath was got blacklisted in college. Vijay's and Raghunath's temperament started clashing with each other. Due to frustration of life incidents Raghunath becomes an alcoholic during prohibition. Sometimes he can't able to walk by himself to home and hence Vijay had to pick him up from the liquor bar and take him home. The atmosphere of liquor bars and the people drinking over there opened up a new world for him. He was suddenly open to the elements to the uncivilized people of society. He became aware of the violence inherent in man. He starts to inspect more closely at the people around him and found the same things in them. All this entered into his plays later.

Vijay spent some part of his childhood in Kolhapur. He Witnesses the procession of the King pass by on the road with its escort of cars. It was an interesting experience for him. Watching the palace elephants, horses and leopards was Vijay's hobby. A Marathi film company's production manager

was a neighbour of the Tendulkar family. He gave a chance to Vijay to see the shootings. He even performed in two movies as a child artist.

Tendulkar at the age of thirteen shifted Poona with his family. He went to a new school. This period was the period of 'Quit India Movement'. Mahatma Gandhi called upon the students to boycott the schools run by the British Government to end the British rule in India. As many students responded to that call Vijay also responds and begins to attend secret meetings and distribute seditious pamphlets. He was also associated with the Rashtriya Swayamsewak Sangh and communist party for a while. These incidents bring out the fearlessness and adventurous nature of Tendulkar and his love for his country. These qualities later performed in his writings. Due to these activities Vijay Tendulkar was arrested but as he was a minor, he was let off after giving a serious warning to his father. Dhondopant prohibited him from taking any more part in the nationalist movement. Due to these activities he had fallen far behind in his studies. He would often be made to stand on the bench or leave the class. When all this became unbearable, Vijay began to bunk the classes and spent his time watching movies with the money given to him as the school fees. Sometimes he spends his time at the city library. After some time his parents came to know about this. They did not beat or scold him but this resulted in his alienation

from his family and friends. He was alienated from family and hence writing becomes his outlet. Tendulkar tells Mukta Rajyadhyaksha in an interview:

“I participated in a small way in the 1942 movement. Owing to that, I stayed away from school a lot and was often humiliated whenever I turned up in class. I was confused, a loner without many friends, not much of a talker. Writing was an outlet for emotions.”²

Most of these early writings were of a personal nature and not intended for publication.

Tendulkar got his early education from the municipal schools in Mumbai, Kolhapur and Poona. He has given the credit of creating his interest in literature to his teachers such as V.V. Bokil, N.M. Sant and P.G. Sahastrabuddhe. The knowledge and guidance provided by these teachers helped in shaping the writer inside Tendulkar. In Poona, young Vijay came into contact with Dinkar Balkrishna Mokashi and Vishnu Vinayak Bokil, both well-known names in Marathi literature. In an interview given to Gowri Ramnarayan, Tendulkar admits to having been influenced by the personalities and the style of writing of these two authors.³ Bokil teaches Marathi language in Vijay’s school. Vijay gets influenced by his thoughts. Many of bokil’s stories become conversational as well as successful. Bokil

never runs away from controversy. He inspired Vijay to develop his freedom of expression and questioning attitude without afraid of anything.

The incidences of Vijay's maternal uncle's suicide and another uncle's admission into mental asylum create traumatic effect on his personality. He acknowledged that he developed a soft spot for cranks and insanity because of his uncles. Vijay faces a large responsibility when Dhondopant was severely ill in his last days. Raghunath had left home after a quarrel with father. Vijay's elder sister, Leela, was forced to work to support the family. She could not get married because her father was against the custom of dowry. Thus Vijay had come into contact with suffering at an early age.

Tendulkar worked as a proof-reader in various printing presses from 1944 to 1947. Then Tendulkar started his career writing for newspapers and magazines. In 1948, he worked as sub-editor in daily 'Navabharat'. He also worked for 'Maratha' and 'Loksatta'. He was the executive editor of magazines 'Vasudha' and 'Dipawali' for some time. He wrote columns for 'Manus' and 'Maharashtra Times'. He also worked as a public relations officer for the Chowgule Group of Industries. During his career as a journalist, he got an exhaustive knowledge of society and human life. His

varied professional experience brought him in touch with people of all classes. While working for daily 'Maratha', he came into contact with Acharya Atre, an eminent Marathi playwright. Atre's guidance had a significant impact on Tendulkar's writing. Tendulkar's journalistic background sharpens his objective and narrative style of writing. According to N.S. Dharan:

“Tendulkar's creative genius sharpened by his keen observation and seasoned by journalistic experience, found expression in his plays.”⁴

Tendulkar settled in Mumbai in 1966. Along with his journalistic career he writes full length as well as one act plays. His collection of one-act plays 'Ajagar Ani Gandharva' wins the Maharashtra State Government Award in 1966. He also writes plays for radio. He comes into contact with Nirmala Sakhalkar at Mumbai Radio Broadcasting. They find life partner in each other. Their marriage blesses with three daughters, Sushma, Priya, Tanuja and a son, Raja. Due to Tendulkar's controversial plays his family members suffer a lot. He takes all the oppressions, threats and insults as challenges of life. He regards these disastrous incidents as learning experiences.

He had already written a play, "Amchyavar Kon Prem Karnar". At the age of twenty he writes the play "Gruhastha" (The Householder) but did not receive much recognition from the audience. After initial failure as a writer he swears that never to write again. Breaking the vow, in 1956 he writes "Shrimant", which establishes him as a good writer. "Shrimant" shocks the conservative audience of the times with its radical storyline. The play is about an unmarried young woman decides to keep her unborn child while her rich father tries to "buy" her a husband in an attempt to save his social prestige. His early struggle for survival, living in Mumbai "Chawls", provides him access to the full-bloodied stories from the urban lower middle class, which were prevailingly not present in modern Indian theatre, or presented in romanticized or sketchy versions. This rapidly changed the very storyline, of modern Marathi theatre, which flourished in the 50s and the 60s with experimental theatre groups like, 'Rangayan', where actors like, Shreeram Lagoo, Mohan Agashe and Sulabha Deshpande, brought new authenticity and power to his stories, while initiating new sensibilities into the modern Indian theatre.

In 1961 he writes 'Gidhade' (The Vultures) but it was first performed only in 1970. It was a play circle around in a morally collapsed family structure. He furthered explored within the theme of violence, and then he

worked on investigation to all its forms, domestic, communal, sexual or political violence. As Jabbar Patel says in an interview:

“He first depicted violence in his earlier work, 'Shrimant', that way 'Gidhade' turned out to be a turning point. For the first time Tendulkar came into his own terms and projects his explicit writing style through his characters for the first time”.⁵

His play ‘Shantata! Court Chalu Ahe’ (‘Silence! The Court is in Session’) was performed for the first time in 1967 and became his finest work. It is inspired by a short story 'Die Panne' (Traps) by Friedrich Durrenmatt. Satyadev Dubey in 1971, made a film based on ‘Shantata Court Chalu Ahe’ for which Vijay Tendulkar wrote his first screenplay. In 1970 Tendulkar’s play ‘Silence! The Court is in Session’ gets the Kamaladevi Chattopadhyaya Award. With success of this play Tendulkar gets recognition on the national scale.

This was only the beginning of his explorations; soon he switched gears to attacking gender hegemony with his next play ‘Sakharam Binder’ (Sakharam, the Binder) in 1972. The subject is about a man who doesn't believe either in conventional marriage, morality, or social codes yet want to use the society for his personal motives, without any personal ethics to guide him. He regularly gives 'shelter' to cast-off wives, only to later use them

himself for his personal gratification. All through this, he remains unconscious of the emotional and moral implications, as he can justify his every act, through his arguments and claims of modernity. He seems to be questioning is the garb of modernity and unconventional thinking which is used to enslave the women in our times into another kind sexual stereotype which even they buy into, as they want freedom so badly.

Gender violence of 'Sakharam', gave way to political violence. Political form of violence depicted in his most noted play 'Ghashiram Kotwal'. A political satire, created as a musical drama set in 18th century Poona. This play consist elements of traditional Marathi folk forms with contemporary theatre techniques. It was a new presentation style in Marathi theatre as well as Indian theatre. Today with over six thousand performances, both in the original and in translation, it remains one of the longest-running plays of the modern theatre. Tendulkar`s 'Ghashiram Kotwal', written and staged in 1972, won him an international reputation. A section of the society bitterly criticized him branding the play as anti-Brahmin. The agitation against him rose to such a high pitch that he had to seek police protection for his family.

He received Nehru Fellowship in 1973-74 for a project titled “An Enquiry into the Pattern of Growing Violence in Society and Its Relevance to Contemporary Theatre”. He travelled across the country to understand the reasons of the rising violence in the country. Amar Nath Prasad and Satish Barbuddhe aptly write:

“He was not satisfied with the ‘second hand’ information which he got, while sitting in the newspaper office. In his study tours he got ‘first hand’ information of the outside world.”⁶

Tendulkar tries to conquer the limitations of his bookish knowledge and ignorance. He observes the social problems and the oppression of the poor and the subjugated peoples. Through his plays he tries to sensitize the reader-audience to these matters.

His explorations of anger and violence also showed up in his screenplays of films like Nishant (1974), Aakrosh (1980) and Ardha Satya (1984). In all, he has written eleven films in Hindi and eight in Marathi, including 'Samana' (Confrontation, 1975), 'Simhasan' (Throne, 1979), and Umbartha (The Threshold) (1981), a revolutionary feature film on women's activism in India, starring Smita Patil and Girish Karnad, and directed by Jabbar Patel. During his career spanning over five decades, he wrote over 27 full-length plays and 25 one-act plays, several of which have proven to be

modern Indian theatre classics, his plays have been translated and performed in many Indian Languages, across India.

Vijay Tendulkar always came across controversies. The subjects of his dramas, his interviews and the circumstances made him controversial. Some people accused him that he knows the pulse of media and publicity and for the sake of the success of his plays he involves in controversy. When Makarand Sathe asked him about it he reacts:

“I don’t know about success, I don’t know why people felt that way but I think I was very honest and responsible regarding my statements. And if you want to talk about success, I must have to submit that I am very successful to share my thoughts.”⁷

Tendulkar never scared to express his thoughts in public. He talks on the death sentence, he talks on Godhara riots, he talks on Narmada dam, and his statements always make underground eruption in society. He became one of the most virulent and radical political voices in India, providing his scathing insight and viewpoint on every social event and political upheaval.

In theatre, while his contemporaries were still safely exploring the limits of social realism, he broke them convincingly, by jumping straight into the cauldron of political radicalism, and ruthlessly exposed political

hegemony of the powerful, and the prevalent hypocrisies in Indian social mindsets. Though his subjects are intellectual, his plays have a sharp and cutting edge. His writing is always thrilling, contains shock elements, and very powerful hence as Shanta Gokhale says:

“He is considered as profound dramatist of India.”⁸

Tendulkar is chiefly associated with practical dramatic writing and practical stage plays, means he is not a writer of textbook drama, but he knows the language of theatre very well. He has a proper knowledge of ‘Rangantra’ and his plays are performance plays. He contributed successfully in the field of professional stage plays so Dr. Shreeram Lagoo gave him title

“A dramatist of the stage plays.”⁹

Tendulkar always invites innovative ideas, but at the same time respect age old traditions. If we take into consideration the dramatic devices employed by him, even his opponent would agree that he is a modern dramatist.

His thrust for human anguish, his explorations to prove it true and restless and distressful theatrical expression has got him worldwide acclaim.

He had to confront brickbats on home front as well, where the orthodox and the powerful, political bigwigs have tried to prevent his emboldened voice, sometimes by pressure and at others through censor, but nothing succeeded in hampering his expression or his pen.

His play ‘Kanyadaan’ was criticized as an anti-Dalit play. He was awarded the Saraswati Samman for this play. While speaking at the awards ceremony, Tendulkar revealed that once he had a slipper hurled at him for this play.¹⁰ Thus Tendulkar received awards and honours as well as curses and abuses at the same time for his plays. Arundhati Banerjee appropriately comments that Tendulkar is both a venerated as well as controversial figure in the country’s theatre scene.¹¹

Tendulkar wrote plays such as A Friend’s Story and Kamala. He wrote screenplays for Marathi movies such as Samna, Simhasan and Umbartha. In 1977, he became a member of the General Council of Musical Drama Academy. In 1978, he worked as a guest lecturer at Tata Institute of Social Sciences. He became the Vice-Chairman of the National School of Drama in 1979. He won the Filmfare Award for the best screenplay and dialogue for the film Aakrosh in 1980. Late in his career, he tried his hand at novel writing with ‘Kadambari: Ek’ and ‘Kadambari: Don’. ‘Vijay

Tendulkar Festival' sponsored by the Indo-American Arts Council was organized at New York in 2004. A Drama Festival of his plays was organized by the actor Amol Palekar at Poona in 2005.

Most of his plays derive inspiration from real-life incidents or societal upheavals. The political, Social, Economical cultural power structures of caste, class, gender and religious domination was his main area of exploration. He is almost fascinated by the interplay and functioning of various forms of violence as an essential need of humanity in all forms of social relations.

This can be very well seen in 'Ghashiram Kotwal', and in 'Kamala' when a journalist is involved in the buying of a woman from the rural flesh market, and who uses the act to sensationalize and promote his career, then disregard, all about the 'bought' woman, and in the 'Mitrachi Ghosta', inspired by a real life actress, whose acting career was ruined after the revelation of her same-sex affair.

Tendulkar had not written the play of the Sangeet Natak tradition of earlier Marathi theatre. ('Vitthala' is an exception in which there are few elements of Sangeet Natak). But he lavishly employed the different types of musical devices in his plays. It would rather be appropriate to say that

element of music is very delicately weaved in his drama, especially in ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’. We find a variety of style and colorfulness in his dramas. As he says:

“In my writing, I like to give more priority to the dramatic purpose rather than structure and style, thus, style and structure only move to be a complement for the dramatic purpose”.¹²

In his dramas, there is a perfect blending of structure, style and dramatic purpose in the real sense. In other words, he has not used structure and style for the gimmicks but he has wedded it to enhance the effectiveness of dramatic purpose. Tendulkar asserts that his intention lying behind writing these dramas is not self centered but as part of the society. He considers that it is his moral duty to spread the feeling of brotherhood and bring awareness about humanity.¹³

Though Tendulkar shares this ideology, it seems that this writing was spontaneous and there is no direct purpose to bring social awareness or brotherhood from the inner layer, it is more like that he is concerned with sex and violence and anxious about animal instincts in human beings. Tendulkar also not seems to be interested in giving remedy for the social problem. A quest for the harmonious and organized society for the human being is prominent in his works. Here the quest is in the centre not the

findings. It may be his purpose to explain 'man' with his basic rights. This sensitive writer is very much wounded by the social disorder. This can be easily seen in his dramas like "Shrimant", "Shantata Court Chalu Ahe", "Gidhade", 'Sakharam Binder', "Ghashiram Kotwal". As he says in his speech at Mumbai conference, it is not his aim to raise questions and presenting answers. His real intention is to study the situations which create such questions and to dig out the dramatic elements in such an endeavour.¹⁴

Tendulkar wrote the play 'Safar', ('journey' or The Cyclist) in 1991, a metaphorical play. He decides to retire from writing and he does not write for ten years. But, after a decade he wrote another play. In 2001 he wrote 'The Masseur', followed by two novels, 'Kadambari: Ek', and 'Kadambari: Don', it is based on the sexual fantasies of an aging man. Then he wrote his first play in English, a one-act titled 'His Fifth Woman' in 2004, it is a sequel to his earlier explorations with the women of 'Sakharam Binder' (1972); the play was first performed at 'Vijay Tendulkar Festival', New York. Tendulkar briefly wrote for the television, a powerful TV series (1992), 'Swayam Siddha', starring his daughter, Priya Tendulkar, in the lead role.

His work includes 16 plays for children, including 'Bale Miltat' (1960) and 'Patlachya Poriche Lagin' (1965); five anthologies of short stories, two

novels, and five volumes of literary essays and social criticism, including 'Raatrani' and 'Kovali Unhe' (both in 1971) and 'Phuge Sabanache' in 1974; and a biography, all of which have contributed to a remarkable transformation of the modern literary landscape of Maharashtra and of India as a whole.

Tendulkar died at Poona on May 19, 2008, after five weeks at the Prayag Hospital battling the effects of the rare muscular disease Myasthenia Gravis. Towards the end of his life, Tendulkar faced sufferings like the long illness of a bed-ridden wife, the death of a son and a daughter and his own health problems. But nothing could destroy his love of life. He tried to live each moment of life as it came, attempting to make sense of the experience. Writing every day was as natural as breathing to him. He was writing an autobiographical account of his times when he died. His passing away caused a huge loss to the theatre and literature field.

He has been the most influential dramatist and theatre personality in Marathi, the principal language of the state of Maharashtra, which has had a continuous literary history since the end of the classical period in India and has nearly seventy-five million speakers today.

Tendulkar's contribution in Marathi also includes eleven plays for children, four collections of short stories, one novel, and five volumes of literary essays and social criticism, all of which have contributed to a remarkable transformation of the modern literary landscape of Maharashtra and of India as a whole. He is also an important translator in Marathi, having translated nine novels and two biographies into Marathi as well as five plays. He is the author of original stories and screenplays for eight films in Marathi, including *Umbartha (The Threshold)* (1981), a landmark feature film on women's activism in India.

Even the aristocratic society is not an exception in inflicting pain on others, lust and violence, these snobs can bend down to any mean level. On the other hand we find a criminal full of humanity. As Vasant Davatar says:

“In Vijay Tendulkar’s dramas we find humanity with the blending of the embarrassing emotions spread out from the dialogues. Tendulkar does not praise or condemn any way of living but putting it in an ironic position. He portrays the nervous tension fantastically in the ways of living.”¹⁵

Tendulkar’s writing deals with the complexity of human’s instinctive relationship. Each contains a subtle critique of modern Indian society, and a distinct character and message. As we analyze his work we can see his

uniqueness in his character sketches. Tendulkar becomes meaning full through his character sketch. Through the interaction between characters, their Co-creativity progress and develop the plot. The characters are free to live their own lives. This may lead to unexpected events at the end of his dramas. For example, in the ‘Shantata Court Chalu Ahe’, Benare feels suicidal tendency. In ‘‘Kanyadaan’’ Jyoti deserts her doting parents and starts living with her husband, who is violent and full of addictions and thus embraces uncertainty of life.

Tendulkar expresses the boredom resulting in human life by showing these individuals’ broken dreams and their conflict with the society. Individuals’ confronting with other individuals has already been the theme in Literature. The next step is the confrontation between the individual and the reality. The ultimate stage is the individual’s conflict with his identity. The specialty of Tendulkar is he restricts himself to the individual. He is not a playwright commenting on social reality as such. The basic human instinct of sex-violence reflects through the theme of loneliness will come out as the major concern of Tendulkar in all his plays. Tendulkar says in his interview:

“Alienation of an individual from the society derived from the existential contradiction between human instinct and civilized society. The so called social system causes alienation in the

individual and as a result excitement increase in the subconscious state of mind and then the rebel is exposed in the form of disgust behavior which is a part of human nature from existence of humanity.”¹⁶

Tendulkar did not get a formal education of playwriting from any institution. He learned by a trial-and-error method. He got his earliest lessons in theatre in his home itself. His father and brother used to write plays and also acted in them. They used to take young Vijay for rehearsals. Vijay felt amused as well as puzzled to see men playing female parts. Tendulkar tells Gauri Ramnarayan in an interview:

“From the time I was four years old, I was taken to those rehearsals. They were a kind of magic show for me. That’s where I saw living persons change into characters. At that time women’s roles were played by men. Imagine my amazement when I saw some of the actors suddenly changing their voice and movements to become women. They didn’t wear saris, but in some mysterious way their pants and shirts stopped identifying them as men. I often fell asleep in the middle of those rehearsals. I suppose father carried me home. All I knew was that I woke up in my bed the next morning.”¹⁷

Watching the performances of the rehearsed plays later with sets, lights, costumes and make-up thrilled him. The sense of wonder that he felt

in watching the transformation of the crude actions in the rehearsals into the polished performances which aroused tears and laughter from the spectators resulted in Vijay's being drawn to the theatre. Tendulkar himself comments:

“I always feel that this first and repeated experience of the mystique of the theatre has something to do with my being drawn to the theatre.”¹⁸

In later days Tendulkar's interest in theatre led him to writing plays while at school, acting in them and discussing them with classmates. He became an avid play-watcher. Watching a play every day became a routine with him. He used to watch the complete play even if it was below quality. He tried to correct the faults of the bad plays in his mind. Thus it became an excellent exercise to learn the technique of playwriting.

Tendulkar's plays deal with the alienation of individual in diverse forms. The inter play of this basic existential contradiction is the heart core of the aesthetic beauty of the plays. Tendulkar never directly adhered to any ideology but to say that his works are free from the ideological constancy would be misleading. Many critics believe that ideology dilutes the aesthetic beauty the art works. The ideological adherence affected the artist in him. Tendulkar explores the ideology by various themes of individual's alienation. He tries to express or explain the functioning of these

contradictions at different levels. His explorations of social, economical, religious, moral and cultural levels and provide us a vivid canvas of this vast collage.

Another important influence on Tendulkar came from the Hollywood and Bollywood movies of the 1940s. The earliest movies which he saw were silent films, with an orchestra sitting below the screen and playing music right through the show. Then he saw the 'Talkies' of Laurel and Hardy, Charlie Chaplin and Harold Lloyd. He said to Gowri Ramnarayan in an interview:

“As a schoolboy I had watched the Hollywood films playing in my hometown, not once, but each one over and over again. I still remember the visuals, not the dialogues which I didn't understand.”¹⁹

Tendulkar learnt the sense of structure, which is an important part of playwriting from various activities such as listening to classical music, reading poetry aloud and witnessing the fake yet dramatic freestyle-wrestling matches. Roaming around the art galleries and observing paintings taught him lessons in rhythm, form and structure. Watching the performance of Marcel Marceau, the French mimic, had a profound influence on him. He felt that Marceau's mimes had achieved the same effect as that of a complete

play and that too, without the usual accessories of the play such as words and multiple characters etc. Even Marceau's face was hidden behind the make-up of a joker. In an interview, Tendulkar tells Gauri Ramnarayan:

“...watching Marcel Marceau from the last seat in the last row (which I could manage) was an enthralling experience. Not a single word was uttered, but so much was expressed.”²⁰

Tendulkar felt that using any number of words will not be enough to convey emotions as effectively as Marceau did through his mimes. Through this incident he learnt to use the words more carefully. He realized the unlimited possibilities of the visual and began to reflect on how to combine the visual with words to convey more out of his playwriting. Thus Marceau's mimes made him rethink on the concept of theatre.

We do not come across stereotyped events or characters from the plays of Tendulkar as they are full of uncertainties. It is a well established conviction from the analysis of various plays. This uncertainty does not distort the sequence of events any deviation or unexpected incident does not harm the harmony or unity of the play. Stage performance is the main purpose of his play; hence there is no binding of entertainment, percept ideal life, immorality etc. in the making of the play. Many of his plays have social families as yet each of it has a different background. Their culture differs

significantly. Different aspects of social order also get changed in his plays. It is perhaps because of this difference there is variety in sensitivity of his characters and in vibration of the sensitivity also, some characters have similar particularities. For example Raghu in “Baby” and Keshav in “Shrimant” gave the impression of madness due to imprisonment and of staggering, and due to starvation but both came from different family backgrounds, different place. Functions are also different in Raghu and Keshav. We can vary easily find various human values depicted in his works.

The question of humanity and protection of human values does not basically refer to rights but duties. It is associated with the consciences of human being and his sentiments and has nothing to do with laws rules or principles, now days there is a mad race between the powerful countries to dominate the entire world, by exploiting the weaker nation and harassing them in all possible ways. In such critical situation this process can be presented as a powerful symbol, in relation to male female in their relationship, through the medium of literature and art. Vijay Tendulkar had expressed the concept of sex and violence against women symbolically or broader expression of the human sensitiveness in his plays.

Tendulkar's take on violence is matter-of-fact. He feels that man is part of the animal kingdom and despite the veneer of culture; basic animal instincts are a part of his nature. As a writer, he is interested in the human tendencies and frailties that can change people almost overnight. He more than any other writer, read the pulse of society and foresaw the way in which violence rules us.

Vijay Tendulkar considers violence as a basic need of human life. According to him sex is also one side of a coin and violence is the other side.²¹ We find different forms and different layers of violence and sex everywhere in his works naturally for example the characters of “ Shantata Court Chalu Ahe ” belong to middle class works who are educated so-called civilized people they are refined and sophisticated by compulsion. Hence there is a sort of microscopic and sugar coated forms of violence beneath cruelty. All character committed the crime on mental level. This play brings before us not only pain, agony and misery of a woman entrapped knowingly or unknowingly in the net of violence. The play is about sexual hunger, desire, ambition, exposes hypocrisy, snobbery, pretences, prevalent in our society. It shows us how cruel and violent our male dominated society is towards a modern woman having free and modern personality. It is a heartrending satire on the age-old traditional tendency to suppress and

exploit a woman. Contrary to this violence moves from verbal to physical forms in such plays as “Gidhade”, ‘Sakharam Binder’, “‘Ghashiram Kotwal’”, ‘Baby’ etc.

It disturbs shocks and stuns the spectators witness violence against women characters so openly and aggressively presented through language and physical actions. The same type of violence can be found in racial forms in “Kanyadaan” as practiced by Arun Athawale against Jyoti Through his aggressive and cruel behavior. Yet the basic conflict is that of revenge and dominance which underlies its background. In the same way it reflects in the play ‘Baby’. The female protagonist becomes victim of great uncommon, inhuman mental torture because her brother has been declared insane and she has been forced to bark like a bitch, forced to drink liquor and raped by Shivappa. This Journey of a pious, dignified woman confining her to be only an ordinary helpless lady is a great blot on human society. Violence and cruelty towards women in the form of abuses, harsh thrashing and beating and killing exist without any difference in the characters of the play. Whatever social classes they represent but they belong to the same class of violent behavior. Tendulkar firmly believes that plays do not help much to rise into revolt but can create a new consciousness at least, can awaken people and that is why the play write aims at stimulating the spectators to

think on their own and to react spontaneously. Here the character is free enough to live and behave the way he or she likes to in human and natural manner.

Tendulkar's writings reveal two aspects of his ideology as a playwright. One is his keen sense of conflict in life and the other is his deep faith in life. Conflict in his plays has many dimensions. It is between two individuals in some plays. For example, Vimal and Sunetra in *Our Sweet Little Home*, Sakharam and Laxmi, Sakharam and Champa in *'Sakharam Binder'*, Ghashiram and Nana Phadnavis in *'Ghashiram Kotwal'*, Shreedhar and Dadasaheb in *Shrimant*. There are conflicts between the individual and his family *'Mi Jinkalo Mi Harlo'* (I won I lost), *'Gidhade'* (vultures). There are also a few instances of a conflict between the individual and the social circumstances (*'Manus Navache Bet'* (An Island Called Man), *'Kavalyanchi Shala'* (The School of Crows), and *'Pahije Jatiche'* (One Must be Born to be Like oneself).

Tendulkar's characters are simultaneously good and bad, weak and strong. For example Shreedhar in *"Shrimant"* (The Wealthy) is eccentric and cruel but very sensitive and emotional also. Tendulkar also shows the conflict between two value systems in some of his plays (*'Silence! The*

Court is in Session', Kamala, Vultures, etc.). In all these plays there is someone or something who or which is against the individual. However the subtle and significant conflict is within the individual himself.

His characters inflict pain to themselves while confronting with themselves. As a playwright an individual is most important for Tendulkar and therefore an individual's struggle with life is equally important for him. This research is focused on analysis plays of Vijay Tendulkar to show how he deals with the complexity in human life with the element of 'Sex' and 'Violence'.

It is obvious that a writer like Tendulkar deals with many complexities of life, but here the motto is to slice up the elements of sex and violence depicted in his work. Sex is the one side of coin and the other side of coin is violence. Tendulkar deals with the vibrant issues of the so called civilized society in his major plays but focus of the study is on three major plays which deal with different types of violence. These plays are Shantata Court Chalu Ahe, 'Sakharam Binder', and 'Ghashiram Kotwal'.

"Shantata court Chalu Ahe" deals with the burning issue of abortion. The society talks about women empowerment, women's liberation but reality is different. Still an empowered woman not accepted out of the moral

framework of society. Violence is deeply rooted in hippocratic society. This research focuses on Silence the court is in session as “Cruel game of silence to suppress women’s sexual desire” – ‘Shantata court Chalu Ahe’

‘Sakharam Binder’ is related to gender violence. The inter relationship of Sakharam-Laxmi-Champa is curious. This research focuses on ‘Sakharam Binder’ as “A curious case of gender violence” is perfectly suitable to the play.

‘Ghashiram Kotwal’ is partially based on the story of Nana Phadnavis of Maratha dynasty. Tendulkar skillfully weaved the element of Tamasha and other two traditional theatre forms into this play. The issue of power in politics is a core thread of the play. Once a human is oppressed by someone he may an oppressor in future. It is a constant process of transformation. This research focuses on ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’ as “A violent oppressive transformation of power”.

In all, Tendulkar has written thirty full-length plays. Out of these, the three plays which have been translated into English are the subject of this study.

A list of his plays is given below:

Gruhastha (The house holder)	Unpublished
Shrimant (The Rich)	1955
Manus Navache Bet (An Island Called Man)	1956
Madhalya Bhinti (Middle Walls)	1958
Chimniche Ghar Hote Menache (The Wax House of Sparrow)	1960
Mi Jinkalo, Mi Haralo (I Won, I Lost)	1963
Kavlyanchi Shala (School for Crows)	1964
Sariga Sari (Drizzle O Drizzle)	1964
Ek Hatti Mulagi (An Obstinate Girl)	1968
‘Shantata! Court Chalu Ahe’ (‘Silence! The Court is in Session’)	1968
Jhala Anant Hanumant	1968
Ashi Pakhare Yeti (So Come Birds)	1970
Gidhade (The Vultures)	1971
‘Sakharam Binder’	1972

Gharate Amuche Chhan (Nice is Our Nest)	1973
'Ghashiram Kotwal'	1973
Dambdwipacha Mukabala (Encounter in Umbugland)	1974
Bhalya Kaka	1974
Baby	1975
Bhai Murarrao	1975
Pahije Jatiche	1976
Mitrachi Goshta (A Friend's Story)	1982
Kamala	1982
'Kanyadaan'	1983
Vithala	1985
Chiranjeev Saubhagya Kanshini	Unpublished
Safar	Unpublished
Niyatichya Bailala Ho (To Hell with the Bull of Fate)	Unpublished
The Cyclist	2006
His Fifth Woman	2006

In addition to the thirty full-length plays, Tendulkar has written twenty-five one-act-plays, two novels, a biography, five collection of short-stories, sixteen plays for children and five volumes of literary essays and social criticism. His columns in news papers like 'Kovali Unhe' and 'Ram Prahar' became popular. He has translated nine novels, two biographies and five plays by other authors into Marathi. In 1990s he wrote an acclaimed television series 'Swayamsiddha'. He has written screenplays for twelve movies in Hindi and eight movies in Marathi. He was invited by some noted producer-director such as Raj Kapoor to write screenplays. But he felt that he won't get the freedom to write the way he wants and so declined their offers.

Tendulkar won the Maharashtra State government awards in 1956, 1969 and 1972; and 'Maharashtra Gaurav Puraskar' in 1999. He was honored with the Sangeet Natak Akademi Award in 1970, and again in 1998 with the Academy's highest award for 'lifetime contribution', the Sangeet Natak Akademi Fellowship ('Ratna Sadasya'). In 1984, he received the Padma Bhushan award from the Government of India for his literary accomplishments.

In 1977, Tendulkar won the National Film Award for Best Screenplay for his screenplay of Shyam Benegal's movie, *Manthan* (1976). He has written screenplays for many significant art movies, such as *Nishant*, *Aakrosh*, and *Ardha- Satya*. In 1991, he received the Kalidas Award. He won the Janasthan Award in 1999 which was followed by the *Katha Chudamani* Award in 2001.

Tendulkar always wrote whatever appealed to him and never bothered for blame or praise. His thinking about society and human life is reflected in his writings. He wrote about the defeated individuals struggle against antagonistic circumstances. M. Sarat Babu appropriately comments:

“Tendulkar perceives the realities of the human society without any preconceived notions, reacts to them as a sensitive and sensible human being and writes about them in his plays as a responsible writer.”²²

Tendulkar proved himself as talented writer who has great faith in his passion. His humanistic and fearless attitude becomes apparent from his literature as well as his social work. His writing never hesitated while expressing his own views. Tendulkar belonged to the middle class and depicted the assessment and problems, hopes and misery, in the life of the

middle class society effectively. Commenting on Tendulkar's unique place in the history of Marathi drama, Chandrasekhar Barve writes:

“Tendulkar pioneered and guided the experimental theatre movement in Marathi literature.”²³

In short Tendulkar is an exceptional personality who began writing as a means of earning ended up as a profound playwright of international standing.

References:

1. Ingemar Düring, Aristoteles: Darstellung und Interpretation seines Denkens (Winter, Heidelberg, 1966), p.164
2. 'My writing has always been honest'. Interview with Vijay Tendulkar. <http://www.flonnet.com/fl2224/stories/20051202001008500.htm>
Date: 26/5/2009.
3. Ramnarayan, Gauri, "View From The Balcony". Vijay Tendulkar in conversation with Gauri Ramnarayan", Katha publication, New Delhi, 2001.
4. Dharan, N.S, "Vijay Tendulkar's 'Silence! The Court is in Session' as a Gynocentric Play", Indian English Drama Critical Perspectives. eds. Jaidipsinh Dodiya and K.V. Surendran. New Delhi: Sarup and Sons, 2000. p. 93.
5. Patel, Jabbar,
<http://www.rangashankara.org/home/rangatest//index.php>
6. Prasad, Amar Nath and Satish Barbuddhe.eds.The Plays of Vijay Tendulkar Critical Explorations. New Delhi: Sarup and Sons, 2008. p. vi.
7. Interview of Tendulkar with Dr. Makarand Sathe in a documentary "Tendulkar and violence – Then and Now" on Vijay Tendulkar.
8. Gokhale, Shanta, "Playwright at the center! Marathi Drama from 1843 to Present", Seagull Books, Calcutta.
9. Lagoo, Shreeram. "Introduction to silence court is in session" Dipawali, (Magazine), Poona, 1970.

10. Tendulkar, Vijay. "Afterward", 'Kanyadaan', Delhi : OUP. 1996. p. 71.
11. Banerjee, Arundhati. "Introduction" Five Plays by Vijay Tendulkar. Mumbai : OUP. 1992. Pg.vii.
12. Interview of Tendulkar with Dr. Makarand Sathe in a documentary "Tendulkar and violence –Then and Now" on Vijay Tendulkar.
13. Ibid.
14. <http://www.vidyaonline.net/arvindgupta/tendulkar.doc>. Date: 18/7/2009
15. Davatar, Vasant, "Tendulakaranchi Natya Pratibha"
16. Interview of Tendulkar with Dr. Makarand Sathe in a documentary "Tendulkar and violence – Then and Now" on Vijay Tendulkar.
17. Ramnarayan, Gauri, "View From The Balcony", Vijay Tendulkar in conversation with Gowri Ramnarayan", Katha publication, New Delhi, 2001.
18. The Play is the Thing: Sri Ram Memorial Lecture, Sri Ram Centre for Performing Arts. New Delhi. 1997. p. xiii.
19. Ramnarayan, Gowri. "A New Myth of Sisyphus!"-Vijay Tendulkar and Girish Karnad in conversation with Gowri Ramnarayan. The Hindu folio on Theatre, Feb. 1998. p. 16.
20. Ibid. p.17
21. Interview of Tendulkar with Dr. Makarand Sathe in a documentary "Tendulkar and violence – Then and Now" on Vijay Tendulkar.

22. M. Sarat Babu. Vijay Tendulkar's 'Ghashiram Kotwal' A Reader's Companion. New Delhi: Asia Book Club. 2003. p. 25.
23. Barve, Chandrashekhar. "Vijay Tendulkar: The Man Who Explores The Depths of Life", Contemporary Indian Drama. ed. Sudhakar Pande and Freya Taraporwala. New Delhi: Prestige. 1990. p. 9.

All the textual references are taken from – "Vijay Tendulkar. Collected Plays in Translation", Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2006.

Chapter 2

“Violence: The Essential Living Fluid”

Tendulkar on His Own Terms.

Vijay Tendulkar is one of the most important playwrights of Indian theatre in the last four decades whose plays often depict the scenes of violence and cruelty. He is considered to be the most controversial Indian playwright of the last four decades, definitely the most radical and stands out as an excellent prototypical figure of Modern Marathi theatre. In the long span time between 1960 and 2000 he wrote 28 full-length plays, 24 one act plays several middles, articles, editorials and 11 plays for children. In his plays, he shocks the audience with excessive scenes of social and physical violence. He depicts verbalized violence with the images of violent relationship, torture, abuse, obsessive love, sexual desire, betrayal, humiliation, atrocity, pain and death.

Presenting a vast number of matters fundamental to many aspects of postmodern life and holding up a mirror to the question of violence which characterizes the postmodern condition, Tendulkar's plays confront people with its experimental theatrics that focus on violence beneath the civilized people of the society. He started his career as dramatist with his play

'Shrimant' (The Rich Man) in 1955. He not only pioneered the experimental theatre movement in Marathi but also guided it. While talking about contemporary Marathi theatre Dhyaneswar Nadkarni points out:

"Vijay Tendulkar leads the vanguard of the *avant-garde* theatre that developed as a movement separate from the mainstream. Tendulkar and his colleagues were dissatisfied with the decadent professional theatre that characterized the Thirties and Forties. They wanted to give theatre a new form and therefore experimented with all aspects of it including content, acting, and décor and audience communication." ¹

Tendulkar's plays often explore the acts of physical, sexual and verbal dimensions of violence. But violence is not only a tool for Tendulkar through which he criticizes the injustices of the world but he uses violence as a strong theatrical device. He is not interested in violence for the sake of violence. Vijay Tendulkar, as a sensitive, sensible and responsible citizen, could not quiet his agitated conscience with his journalistic career. So, he left journalism when he received Nehru Fellowship for the year 1973-75. During this period, he travelled extensively throughout India and saw directly all kinds of violence. From this experience, he infers:

“Unlike communists, I don’t think that violence can be eliminated in a classless society, or, for that manner, in any society. The spirit of aggression is something that the human being is born with. Not that it’s bad. Without violence, man would have turned into a vegetable.”²

In scrutinizing the corrupted history of human being, Vijay Tendulkar’s plays focus on violence as the single most significant aspect of history. Most of his characters are the victims of cruelty and aggression which characterize the postmodern civilized life. Thus Vijay Tendulkar always has a specific purpose for using violence in his plays. He uses violence as a shock tactic to inspire his audience not to sit idly by and to take action against the atrocities of life. According to Tendulkar there is no reason for human violence against human in the world. He believes that violence is a natural phenomenon for human as species in the same way as animals. But, in the light of this idea he uses theatre as a think tank arena where he criticizes and discusses the cycle of meaningless violence and the crimes of humanity.

As we analyze Tendulkar’s writing and his thoughts we can understand that he does not support ‘violence’ though he thinks that violence is the basic instinct of mankind and till today we are not able to eliminate it from our society. Tendulkar accepts and portrays his characters violent

behaviour as a nature of human being. He deals with gender inequality, social inequality, power games, false consciousness, with the devices of sex and violence in his plays. Etienne G. Krug defines violence as follows:

“Violence” is the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, which either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, or deprivation.”³

This definition is associated intentionality with the committing of the act itself, irrespective of the outcome it produces.

Violence can be divided into three broad categories according to the characteristics of those committing the violent act (a) self-directed violence, (b) interpersonal violence, and (c) collective violence. The nature of violent acts, on the vertical axis, can be: physical, sexual, psychological, involving deprivation or neglect. This initial categorization differentiates between violence a person inflicts upon himself or herself, violence inflicted by another individual or by a small group of individuals, and violence inflicted by larger groups such as states, organized political groups, militia groups and terrorist organizations.

Violent behaviour is an uncontrolled response to some form of stimulation. Violence is a basic human instinct that must be expressed in one form or another. Biological and psychological research has shown violent behaviour more likely to be a physical response to the perception that the 'self', i.e. one's sense of identity, is threatened. Being violated either emotionally or physically appears to result in a violent response. Violent behaviour can be seen as a mask which protects the 'self from pain and memories of traumatic experiences. *Psychology Today* (U.S. 1983) asked some people in a survey "If you could secretly push a button and thereby eliminate any person with no repercussions to yourself, would you press that button?" 69% of responding males and 56% of women said yes..

Violence comes in many forms and in many situations. On the extreme end of the scale, there are mass murderers, serial killers; terrorism, wars, rape and sexual violence, domestic violence, parent-child or sibling violence, violence by psychotics and people with antisocial personality disorders, physical and sexual child abuse, and ethnic or religious groups or nations that go to war. Great atrocities are attributed to crazed men--Hitler, Stalin, terrorists, etc. But, several psychological studies suggest that ordinary people can rather easily become evil enough to discriminate against, hurt, and brutalize others. How anger

develops. Is it innate? Certainly most three-year-olds can throw a temper tantrum without any formal training and often even without observing a model. Is it learned? Why are the abused sometimes abusers? Does having a temper and being aggressive yield payoffs? You bet. How do we learn to suppress aggression? How can we learn to forgive others? These are the questions which might disturb Tendulkar so he addresses all the questions into his plays.

Once he was titled as angry young man of Marathi theatre. He has exposed the different forms of anger in his major plays. 'Violence which turns into anger' or 'Anger which turns into violent act' is the major focus of Tendulkar to justify the portrayal of his characters. 'Anger' which can be the result of hurt pride, of unreasonable expectations, or of repeated hostile fantasies seen in his plays. Besides getting our way, we may unconsciously use anger to blame others for our own shortcomings, to justify oppressing others, to boost our own sagging egos, to conceal other feelings, and to handle other emotions (as when we become aggressive when we are afraid). Any situation that frustrates us, especially when we think someone else is to be blamed for our loss, is a potential trigger for anger and aggression. Anger is a feeling generated in response to frustration or injury. You don't like what has happened and usually you'd

like to take revenge. Anger is an emotional-physiological-cognitive internal state; it is separate from the behavior it might prompt. Tendulkar shows how violence can be expressed through Aggression, A violent action, i.e. attacking someone or a group. It is intended to harm someone. It can be a verbal attack--insults, threats, sarcasm, or attributing nasty motives to them or a physical punishment or restriction. All above mentioned scenes are found in Tendulkar's Plays.

When we analyze Tendulkar as a creative writer or as a human being who has the quest to find humanity in terms of expressing violence and sex as a device for his drama, we must have to understand Tendulkar's own terminology and views of different critiques regarding Tendulkar. Tendulkar expresses some idea of his belief of Indian society and form of violence in an interview taken by Makarand Sathe. As he says:

“Most men wish to beat their wives, in some critical condition”

4

He further mentions that:

“It is most probably a trait of the species, from the time of primitive man.”⁵

The culturalisation of Indian society also plays a part, because he sees a filthier form of it amongst the middle class as compared to lower class. Violence among middle class might not be physical, but it is very often psychological in nature, and that is

“More despicable, more perverse form.”⁶

For Tendulkar violent relationship does not mean simply physical violence or torture. It also means interpersonal relationship of dominance and violence--not only male dominance over female but also vice-versa. For Tendulkar human relations are power relationships and therefore are based on in-built violence. He believes that there is politics in man-woman as well as in other relationships, as every individual consciously or unconsciously tries to gain power over the other and it results into violent conflicts either physical or psychological. As he says:

“When we consider civilization or impact of culture I must say that the process of civilization is occurring on surface level only. In a condition when we are in confrontation with a panic situation, when circumstances arrive in a form of a tough exam, the mask of culture will be removed with a big blast and human will become an animal. Sorry to say but in that situation we react exactly as an animal reacts to the situation.”⁷

Tendulkar in his plays depicts such theory of violence with psychological implications. We can see situations develop violently in Tendulkar's plays when a person in an intimate relationship or marriage tries to dominate and control the other person. Tendulkar exhibits such psychological and emotional violence in a very subtle form in his plays. In his play 'Kamala', we find a subtle exposure of the manner in which women are treated as insensitive beings in the patriarchal system. Sarita, the wife of the journalist, is very apprehensive and extremely responsive to her husband's needs and tastes. She is always eager to pamper him to his whims and fancies and carrying out all his instructions, like taking note of all phone calls and looking after his physical and domestic needs. But Jaisingh considers none of his wife's good qualities as they are duties implied by the institution of marriage. He never understands that his wife is a live human being who works without complaints and feelings. He takes her patience, her desires, and her propriety for granted and he is also ignorant of her dreams, her fancies, and her desires.

Through Jaisingh's dialogue, "It's I who takes decisions in this house, and no one else. Do you understand?" (Pg. 42) Tendulkar depicts the natural tendency of every husband, to dominate his partner. It reveals a male thinking that they own their partners and are entitled to demand absolute

obedience from them. It may be physical, emotional or sexual in nature. As per age old tradition woman is treated as property of man at marriage and her husband has sexual access to her, even if it violates her own desires. But when this right is denied to him, it leads to uncontrollable rages, resulting in abusing his partner. Sarita has been shown in 'Kamala' as a sexual and domestic servant.

Another form of psychological abusive behaviour with which Tendulkar deals is fear resulting terror, which is a key element for violence and is often the most powerful way whereby an executor controls one's victim. Fear can be created by speech, looks, gestures or any other behaviour which can be used to intimidate and render the other person powerless. There are so many examples which we can find in Tendulkar's plays. Either Ghashiram stands in front of Nana Phadnavis or Benare locates herself in front of snatching verbal wolves. As Sarita feels powerless in front of Jaisingh and as Baby is frightened in front of Shivappa. Fear converted into violence is everywhere in Tendulkar's writing. In 'Kamala', Tendulkar exposes the tendency of male dominant society to consider woman as a commodity trade material.

In the play “Kamala” Tendulkar deals with normalized violence (in Kamala’s case) and invisible violence (in Sarita’s case). Tendulkar illustrates this psychological form of violence in almost every play. Characters like Benare from “Shantata Court Chalu Ahe” (Silence the Court is in Session), Jyoti from “Kanyadaan”, Rama from “Gidhade” (Vultures), and Champa from ‘Sakharam Binder’ or Lalita Gauri from “Ghashiram Kotwal” are examples of patriarchal oppressive suffering. Through the character of Rama in ‘Gidhade’ (Vultures), Tendulkar exposes a voiceless victim trapped in a sadistic cycle of violence, carried out by the family members and the cursed fate. Though Tendulkar’s female characters are usually shown to be the silent victims of the psychological pain and fear. He also sensitively renders certain male characters, which too face the agonies and pains and suffer psychologically.

Tendulkar quotes in response to a question asked by Makarand Sathe about cruel behavior, and ridiculous incidents in today’s world. He says:

“There is no doubt that the instincts of animals still exist in a human being. They not only exist, but are deeply rooted in human being and are preserved in their pure form.”⁸

Here Tendulkar is somewhat clear about human being’s violent nature. We can interpret it as a necessity of mankind but it does not mean

that these types of violent characters are absolute in our society. Tendulkar wanted to say that violence is an essential living fluid in terms of triggering force. If we look into account of Marxist theory of revolutionary violence, that violence is criticized by all peace makers. During the freedom fight the Gandhian philosophy was successful in achieving the goal of independence but the impact of “Jahal” movement (violent revolution theory applied by Shahid Bhagatsingh, Tilak, etc) which became headache for British Government was also a profound reason behind India’s Independence.

The Nobel-Prize winner Konrad Lorenz developed his ideas about human violence mainly from the study of animal behavior. He assumes that:

“The organism continuously builds up aggressive energy.”⁹

But, differing from Freud’s concept, Lorenz states that violent behavior will not occur unless it is triggered by external cues. Unlike Freud, who saw violence as destructive and disruptive, Lorenz views aggression as adaptive and essential for the survival of a species. Like Freud, Lorenz regards aggression as:

“Inevitable, and, at times, spontaneous.”¹⁰

However, he assigns greater significance to the possibility of releasing violent energy in a socially acceptable way and its displaced expression into channels which are not antisocial. The usual example suggested is through sports competition which is termed as creative violence.

Lorenz believes that while violent instincts first evolved in lower animals, the tendency towards senseless violence has reached its peak in human beings. Human males, for instance, often attack other individuals (including women and children) whether or not the attackers have high levels of male hormones. Human kills each other out of hatred, prejudice, politics, and just for fun- and not like animals, who kill only when the victim intrudes into the killer's home territory.

Central to all psychoanalytic theories is the orientation that things that happen early in the life of an individual influences his later life and the idea of a fixed amount of biologically derived energy which must be discharged in one way or the other. Although not widely accepted by social psychologists, the idea that violence is part of human nature has received serious attention particularly in light of the continued occurrence of violence throughout history and as reflected in literature.

When we analyze Tendulkar's Terminology on violence we must have to examine the violence as a force of energy. We all know about the power of nuclear weapon and its destructive effects but we cannot deny that its creation is aiming towards fortification of human race. In 1954, a year before his death, Einstein said to his old friend, Linus Pauling,

"I made one great mistake in my life — when I signed the letter to President Roosevelt recommending that atom bombs be made”¹¹

Here Einstein regrets of being maker of the atom bomb but we cannot neglect the energy or force he created through his theory of relativity. That energy can be used in development of human race. Electricity generated by atomic energy is the best example of positive force of a destructive device. It is upon us, that how we turn the destructive element into constructive force for mankind. Violence is that kind of tool a human have from primitive age.

The problem of culturalisation is the process of culturalisation itself. This process is aiming towards elimination of the basic energy tools like violence and sex. As we interpret Tendulkar's terminology about this fact we can say that violence and sex can be a tool as constructive force for mankind. The process of industrialization has also its impact on social structure. Tendulkar himself says in an interview with Makarand Sathe:

“When we face the industrialization we get development and as a side effect, we also get depressed. Not only in Europe or Western countries, the third world countries like India are also affected by the adverse effect of industrialization. The process of development suppresses the human under the machine and then we act like socialized animals. When we have the chance to get benefit we try to grab everything with an animalistic performance.”¹²

As a creative writer Vijay Tendulkar never gives us a verdict or conclusion directly. He mentions in the interview:

“We are in a country which has strong rigid conventions of Dharma and hence violence is deeply rooted within the society. We have to face challenges politically, socially, artistically and culturally. Hence I never tried to tell a solution, but always tried to convey the bitter reality which we don’t want to see.”¹³

He only shows us the real face of the society we are living in through the bioscope of his writings. He targets dramatization of various forms of violence and shocks his audience into an awareness of the reality of human nature and the world they live in. He thus also seeks to enhance the understanding of his audience about the factors and forces responsible for various ways and forms of violence ranging from the subtlest and covert to the cruelest and crude ones, this way he provides critical insights into the

complex dynamics of violence. He only presents various cases of violence in different forms in front of society for dissection and research. That is the reason Tendulkar is the most popular writer amongst theatre artists, readers, researchers and critics.

He placed the reality of violence in a highly fascinating and thought-provoking manner. It is the fact that his plays, as works of art, are mind blowing and they get a large applause from spectators and drama critics, not only from India, but also from all around the world. His plays have a universal appeal. He chooses violence as his major theme, and also aesthetically articulates the most brutal and dreadful human actions, experiences and situations. His recognition as a playwright of all times and cultures is mainly due to his agile and penetrating interpretation of not only the visible but also the profound and even primitive levels of violence in the human world. And he represents it in a highly skillful and hypnotizing manner. An investigation of all those features which make his plays so gripping, and eye-catching we have to agree about a fair appreciation of his mind and art.

Tendulkar himself asserted in one of his lectures:

“I was never able to begin writing my play only with an idea or a theme in mind. I had to have my characters first with me.”¹⁴

He further adds:

“These characters as “living persons,” led me into the thick of their lives”¹⁵

It suggests that it is the characters that carry the plots and meanings of his play, serving as a kind of backbone to their structures. His plays are written for the stage. The purpose of this confrontation is to focus on this serious contemporary writer who deals with religious violence, sexuality, cast and class discrimination and gender issues. The issues he chooses are topical and controversial. He deals with these issues in a different way. So many critics have put an allegation on him that he is basically a journalist and he knows the exact method to propagate things. But if we survey his works we find in him a very sensitive human being. His plays elicit right kind of emotional and intellectual responses from the audience.

As Tendulkar confesses, we are always denying the presence of animal inside us but the reality is that animal instinct has never ever been gone away. Tendulkar himself mentions in his own words:

“I am certain that my plays are a true reflection of socio-economic background. I am curious to know what the mental status of Hitler or Stalin is. And so I wanted to meet them personally.”¹⁶

It will be proved with the above mentioned statement that Tendulkar was curious about the cruel behaviour. He doesn't want to hate the person who carries cruelty but his concern is more psychoanalytical towards that behaviour. Tendulkar finds violence and the exploiter-exploited relationship as natural and eternal. It is the primeval need to subjugate, an expression of raw power exercised over the one without. His plays also exhibit the impact of social and political institutions and ethical norms through which this violence actually takes place. This shows Tendulkar's special interest in explorations of such factors effecting human behaviour.

Tendulkar firmly believes that the phenomenon of violence:

“Needs good expression in literature, the films, the arts; it simply reflects the larger patterns of violence in society.”¹⁷

So, he renders the characters as they are living in the society. As far as the perception and understanding of violent behaviour is concerned Tendulkar seems to believe that violence is an inherent and inevitable part of human nature. Thus, as reflected through his works, he appears to think that

the beast or the animal is always there hidden inside man along with the animal instincts, which are permanent. And when man acts to meet the challenges that come his way, he occasionally appears to behave like an animal. The hidden hatreds, insecurities, sexual frustrations and long suppressed violence burst out when the situations become oppressive. He saw violence as a metaphor for life and thus

“Wanted to study and understand what it is, where it comes from.”¹⁸

When we trace the incidents happened in the life of Vijay Tendulkar we may easily understand his characteristics. While living in Bombay as a child, Vijay witnessed the communal riots. Twice from his balcony he saw the incidents of stabbing. Too young to understand death and suffering, the spectacles thrilled him. Vijay Tendulkar's elder brother Raghunath who once upon a time involved in the Gandhian movement became an alcoholic and drunken Raghunath unable to walk by himself, Vijay Tendulkar had to pick him up from the liquor bar and take him home. Those illegal liquor bars and their atmosphere had a strong impact on Tendulkar's mind. He came into the contact of the unsophisticated characters. He was suddenly exposed to the people of slum area. He became aware of the violence

inherent in man. He began to look more intimately at the people around him and found the themes of his plays.

When Vijay was thirteen years old, Tendulkar family shifted to Poona. He was put into a new school. During Quit India Movement, Mahatma Gandhi called upon the students to boycott the schools run by the British Government as a part of the campaign to end the British rule in India. Vijay was one of those who answered Gandhi's call and began to attend secret meetings and distribute seditious pamphlets. He was also associated with the Rashtriya Swayamsewak Sangh and communist party for a while. These incidents bring out the fearlessness and adventurous nature of Tendulkar and his love for his country. These qualities can be found in his writings. A sudden raid at a secret meeting landed Vijay at the Police Station. As he was a minor, he was let off after giving a severe warning to his father. Dhondopant prohibited him from taking any more part in the nationalist movement and Vijay returned to school. By now he had fallen far behind in his studies.

He would often be made to stand on the bench or leave the class. When all this became unbearable, Vijay began to bunk the classes and spent his time watching movies with the money given to him as the school fees.

Some of this time was also spent at the city library profitably in reading books. After some time his parents came to know about this. They did not beat or scold him. But this resulted in his alienation from his family and friends. Lonely and sad, writing became his outlet. Tendulkar tells Mukta Rajyadhyaksha in an interview:

“I participated in a small way in the 1942 movement. Owing to that, I stayed away from school a lot and was often humiliated whenever I turned up in class. I was confused, a loner without many friends, not much of a talker. Writing was an outlet for emotions.”¹⁹

Most of these early writings were of a personal nature and not intended for publication.

When Tendulkar was only thirteen year old his parents shifted to Poona. In Poona, young Vijay came into contact with Dinkar Balkrishna Mokashi and Vishnu Vinayak Bokil, both well-known names in Marathi literature. In an interview given to Gauri Ramnarayan, Tendulkar admits to having been influenced by the personalities and the style of writing of these two authors.²⁰ Bokil was Vijay’s Marathi teacher in school. Many of his stories written in conversational Marathi had been turned into successful movies. He never shied away from writing on controversial subjects. He

advised Vijay to develop himself in a particular direction in addition to his formal studies in order to become successful in life. One of Vijay's maternal uncles had committed suicide and another one spent his life in a mental asylum. He admits that he developed a liking for cranks and madmen because of his uncles.

When he received Nehru Fellowship in 1973-74 for a project titled "An Enquiry into the Pattern of Growing Violence in Society and Its Relevance to Contemporary Theatre". He travels across the different corners of India in order to understand the reasons of the emerging violence in the country. Amar Nath Prasad and Satish Barbuddhe appropriately write:

"He was not satisfied with the 'second hand' information which he got, while sitting in the newspaper office. In his study tours he got 'first hand' information of the outside world."²¹

Thus Tendulkar tried to overcome the limitations of his scholarly knowledge. He observed the social problems and the oppression of the poor and the down-trodden from close quarters. Through his plays he tried to sensitize the reader-audience to these matters.

He said to Gauri Ramnarayan in an interview:

“As a schoolboy I had watched the Hollywood films playing in my hometown, not once, but each one over and over again. I still remember the visuals, not the dialogues which I didn’t understand.”²²

So we can understand that the fast action visuals from English films left a strong impact on him. And that is the reason behind the compactness of his plays. As he was inspired by visuals we can find some extraordinary dramatic visuals in his plays. He uses few words to express a dialogue, in fact the dialogue which comes out of his writing are combination of very essential and necessary words. And that’s why his plays are so eye-catching and thrusting.

The Indian society was based on the caste or Varna system and it was divided into four categories, the Brahmins, the Kshatriyas, the Vaishyas and the Shudras. The Shudras were not permitted to hear or study the ‘Vedas’ as their study was reserved for the people of higher classes. The original concept of Vedic Varna system was developed to fulfill requirements of the society. The system divided society into four classes according to the deeds and qualities of each individual person. In original system classification was based on work attitude and not by birth rights, even women had equal rights with men in that society. All these groups had been assigned specific duties

and responsibilities. The Brahmins were concerned with learning and scholarly pursuits. The Kshatriyas were the warriors whereas the Vaishyas were the businessmen. The Shudras were the laborers. The rigidity of the caste system caused social inequality. As this system was beneficial for the higher caste people, they made every effort to justify the social hierarchy and always strongly opposed its violation. The complete relapse of the Vedic system led the society toward the practice of assorting the caste on the basis of birth.

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar comments:

“Caste system is not merely a division of laborers which is quite different from division of labour—it is a hierarchy in which the divisions of laborers are graded one about the other.”²³

Such gradation resulted in persons of some castes being easily exploited, as there could be no unity amongst them. Thus exploitation and oppression has existed in our society since time immemorial. M. Sarat Babu aptly remarks:

“The divisions of men and women into various castes and classes and their hierarchy results in the people of higher rungs exploiting and oppressing those of lower rungs in our society

suffering from social inequality and the boundaries of caste are strongly guarded to sustain it.”²⁴

The Marathi drama, thus, acted as an ally to the movements for social reform and political freedom going on in the society during the latter half of 19th and the first half of 20th century. The Marathi playwrights used the drama not merely as a source of entertainment but as a vehicle of instruction and illumination. The theatre became a powerful weapon against social evils in the hands of the playwrights. Vijay Tendulkar continued this tradition in the latter half of the twentieth century and wrote as a reformist and hence became controversial. When we study his plays we have to agree with the remarks of M. Sharat Babu, who comments:

“Tendulkar perceives the realities of the human society without any preconceived notions, reacts to them as a sensitive and sensible human being and writes about them in his plays as a responsible writer.”²⁵

As per Tendulkar’s point of view, a ‘Society’ demands that an individual should lead the life according to the rules led down by society’s system. A conflict crops up when an individual refuses to obey these rules. Tendulkar draws our attention towards the gender discrimination, which punishes a woman but allows the man to get clean cheat for committing the

same crime. For example in the play “Shantata Court Chalu Ahe” (Silence the court is in session), protagonist, ‘Benare’ is punished for the sin of unwed pregnancy but no one says a word about Damle who is her partner in the crime. Tendulkar was so far ahead from his contemporary writers. Famous writers like Mahesh Elkunchvar, Satish Alekar accept that their writing was influenced by Vijay Tendulkar and Tendulkar was an inspirational force for so many other writers.

Writing about Tendulkar’s early plays, we may totally agree with what Arundhati Banerjee says:

“Tendulkar’s first major work that set him apart from previous generation Marathi playwrights was *Manus Navache Bet* (An Island Called Man, 1956), which gave expression to the tormenting solitude and alienation of a modern individual in an urban industrialized society. His dramatic genius was cut out for the newly emerging experimental Marathi theatre of the time.”²⁶

Every critique and scholar acclaims Tendulkar’s creativity as a playwright. Commenting on Tendulkar’s unique place in the history of Marathi drama, Chandrasekhar Barve writes:

“Tendulkar pioneered and guided the experimental theatre movement in Marathi.”²⁷

Tendulkar is an exceptional personality who began writing as a means of earning his livelihood and ended up as a playwright of international stature. He never ran after name, fame and money. Criticism and attack on his works could not prevent him from writing what he felt to be right.

Some critics put allegations on Tendulkar that he is a feminist writer, and he only portrays female in a state of an oppressed victim. Some even say that Tendulkar’s own philosophy and his culture as a member of upper cast lead him towards a pre-notion that lower class of society is more violent and hence he depicts the characters of upper cast into their lower-class mentality. The argument is about his portrayal of women characters. But if we trace the roots through between the lines of the dialogues written by Tendulkar and observe keenly the idea and research of violence as an essential living fluid, we find that the above mentioned allegations made by some scholars are not factual. If we thoroughly investigate Tendulkar’s writing, we find the impressive treatment given to the characters and his characters show us the mechanism human being adopts when disruptive and harsh conditions arrives in life. Tendulkar looks into human nature and capacities, both good and evil, in their struggle to survive. That is why he

appears to have portrayed characters driven by instincts and desire. He has presented characters as more evolved and complex human being who respond hurtfully and violently.

The responses of his characters to the inhospitable situations appear to be as wide-ranging, varied and complex as life itself. This is evident from the fact that even when some of his characters tend to epitomize certain general human traits and values, they exhibit them in subtly varying forms along with the working of the contrary human impulses making their responses look more humanly, real and complex. It is for this reason that the different ways people in his plays adopt to cope with unsettling and traumatic experiences defy all attempts at rigid categorization. However one can trace certain broad trends in the behaviors and attitudes they adopt in the face of thwarting conditions. One of the ways a large number of his characters appear to adopt is to survive their plight by submitting rather passively to their circumstances.

This is noticeable mainly in his women characters who, conditioned by tradition and handicapped by economic dependence appear to have no other alternative but to suffer their fate resignedly. But here too, one finds a considerable variety of attitudes and behaviour towards the

violent and oppressive situations in their lives. If there are those who surrender to their predicament rather ungrudgingly because of their complete lack of hope and vision for a different kind of life, there are also women who submit themselves reluctantly because of the overwhelming pressures of social and material life. Because of their lack of inner resources and inability to show any sign of stamina to struggle against oppression, none of them emerges as an admirable figure even if the reader may pity or even sympathize with them. In the absence of any significant desire or determination for a better deal in life, they register no perceptible growth in their perceptions, attitudes and responses.

The inner core of almost all works of Tendulkar is rooted in his deep compassion and respect for human life – for life in the social reality of post-colonial India. Seeing its exploitation and waste, his response was an unrelenting literary output and non-stop social activism. Until his death, through his literary output his ultimate purpose was in fiercely seeking justice for the victimized – mainly the poor and those disfranchised by communal riots and structural violence. Unlike the makers of the confrontational theater of the late 1980's, he did not believe that an evening at the theatre would change society, but he was always hopeful that a good

play could raise public awareness. It is because of this reason that there has been hardly a play by him that has not ended up in controversy.

If we trace the controversies playing around Tendulkar, we find the public image of a fighter, of a writer at cross-purposes with the mainstream. Tendulkar in his whole life become controversial. If we look in past, around his play's performances and controversies running around those plays, we find three major names. Those are 'Ghashiram Kotwal', 'Sakharam Binder' and 'Gidhade'. "Ghashiram Kotwal" and "Sakharam Binder," both staged during the 1970's. In "Ghashiram Kotwal" there was the controversial depiction of the historical character of Nana Phadnavis, a respected statesman during the Peshwa rule in Maharashtra that angered Brahmins and led to a series of protests. The troupe of "Ghashiram Kotwal," directed by renowned director Dr Jabbar Patel faced violent protests from the audience. The protestors targeted the artists using eggs and tomatoes in theatre halls to stop the performances. It was former Lok-Sabha Speaker and Shivsena leader Manohar Joshi who was in the forefront of the anti-"Ghashiram" agitation in Mumbai as the party stopped the staging of the play in the metropolis in 1971-72. In Poona also, protests marked the staging of the play with allegations that it insulted the Brahmin community and maligned its culture. The attacker of Tendulkar even approached

Bombay High Court to prevent the play “Ghashiram Kotwal” from going abroad to stage performances on invitation but did not succeed in getting a favorable verdict.

However, Tendulkar was never remorseful over the characterization of Nana who was portrayed as a lecher hunting for women notwithstanding his stature as a Maratha Hero. Tendulkar never surrendered and in fact he mentioned that he was entitled to freedom of expression and that though the character of Nana had a historical base, the treatment was fictional. Thus the play unfailingly challenged the accepted concepts and norms pertaining to morality in society and brought to the fore the hidden cruelty and lust in the human psyche, exposing hypocrisy that covered it.

A similar controversy erupted when Tendulkar came out with ‘Sakharam Binder’ inviting the charge of obscene presentation. Eminent stage and film actor Nilu Phule played the role of the protagonist from the lower strata of society. The play had so many scenes which depict violent reaction of a natural man-woman relationship. The play showed the female character drinking wine and speaking abusive words, language of the play is criticized by critiques. The major allegation on the play is portrayal of a Binder, who is a Brahmin by cast and who had total disregard for moral,

social and cultural customs. However Tendulkar won the battle with the censors clearing the play for performance on stage.

Again in 1970 came “Gidhade” (“Vultures”) which shocked the conservative Maharashtrian society by its explicit depiction of violence. The play is a brutal portrayal of the dark side of human nature and depicts its inborn evil tendencies like greed, selfishness, wickedness and violence. It is the most violent of all the plays written by Vijay Tendulkar. He lays bare the intricate nature of human relationships in it. In the words of Prof. Avinash Kolhe:

“Gidhade, which has a ruthless dissection of human nature, revealing violence, avarice lying beneath the put up personality, was a fascinating expose of social reality.”²⁸

Conservative sections of society did not approve of the blunt depiction of illicit sexual relations and scenes of violence in it. As a result, it attracted a lot of opposition. Tendulkar expresses the degeneration of the modern society through the portrayal of the basic aspects of human nature in the Pitale family. The play was considered obscene because it showed a woman with a huge red spot on the front of her sari. The Censor board objected to the play, but cleared it after some cuts.

Controversies like this and many more were common for a Tendulkar's play. It is obvious to get involved in controversies for the person like Vijay Tendulkar who has the vibrant philosophy of violence. Some people make allegation that he was interested in controversy but it is the society (the public) who has created these controversies. It is interesting to note that most of the calls for banning his plays did not come from the government but from particular segments of the public who saw in his dramatizations attacks on their power positions—challenges to caste, gender or class structures.

Tendulkar had been attacked for his work many times, sometimes physically. After "Gidhade," someone actually beat him with a stick. After "Kanyadaan'," he was literally thrown a slipper by members of the Dalit caste. But Tendulkar never shrank from public controversy as it gave him a unique opportunity to engage his opponents in public discourse. He portrayed Man in his primal avatar, removal of his socially acceptable trappings and prey to the rawest of animal passions thereby exposing us to a disturbing truth. It is perhaps his daring attitude of exposing the truth that in spite of all the controversies, most of the plays at the same time gained him not just popularity but also fame and honor. "Ghashiram Kotwal" stood up to all the controversies to create a record of being the longest-running play in

the history of Indian theater with a tally of 6000 performances in India and abroad. The popularity and the theme of “Kanyadaan” awarded him with the Saraswati Samman. In his speech at the award ceremony, he added:

“You are honoring me with the Saraswati Samman today for a play for which I once had a slipper hurled at me. Perhaps it is the fate of the play...”²⁹

Tendulkar never afraid to express his ideological statements and views publically. In 2006 when decided to felicitate literary figure S.P.Bhagavat by Lok-Sabha speaker Manohar Joshi, Vijay Tendulkar, had given a new dimension to the age old conflict between litterateurs and politicians by questioning the moral authority of Lok-Sabha speaker Manohar Joshi in felicitating literary figure S.P.Bhagavat. Tendulkar urged senior critic S.P.Bhagavat not to accept the prestigious Chaturang award later from Lok Sabha speaker Manohar Joshi on account of his "dubious character". Tendulkar's remarks had drawn a lot of flak from media and literary figures; Tendulkar seemed unapologetic as he hinted at similar confrontations at the “Punyabhushan” award presentation in Poona. Tendulkar created quite a stir in the literary circle by his comments; noted actor and social activist Nilu Phule supported Tendulkar's stand in a public function.

Many social activist who know Tendulkar as a strong offender of death penalty were amused when following the post-Godhara communal carnage in Gujarat in 2002, he reacted by saying that "If I had a pistol, I would shoot Gujarat Chief Minister Narendra Modi." This reaction of Tendulkar had evoked mixed reactions, local Modi supporters burning his effigies while others lauding his remark. Later, when he was asked if it was not strange that he, who was known as a strong voice against death penalty, had a death wish for Modi, Tendulkar had said that "It was spontaneous anger, which I never see as a solution for anything. Anger doesn't solve problems."

As he mentioned in his lecture, he was very analytical towards persons, society and human being. Delivering the prestigious Sri Ram Memorial Lectures for Performing Arts in 1997 in New Delhi, Tendulkar summed up his lifelong involvement in theater as follows:

“What I like about those years is that they made me grow as a human being. And theater which was my major concern has contributed to this in a big way. It helped to analyze life--my own and lives of others. It led me to make newer and newer discoveries in the vast realm of the human mind that still defies all available theories and logic. It's like an ever-intriguing puzzle or a jungle that you can always enter but has no way out.

Not that I was any wiser than the fool when I entered the theater. I still act like a fool and think like one; but there is a difference. Now I am aware of what I am doing while I do it. I am my own audience and the critic, if one may use the language of the theater. Now I enjoy my foolishness and laugh at it; and of course the foolishness of others too, at times.”³⁰

Tendulkar has transparent and honest writing skills; he never imposes self judgment on his characters. Tendulkar never gives verdict, but his motto about play writing is to explore the stage as a play ground to put his ideology and asking spectators to think about the problem of society. He is courageous about his own terminology and never afraid to express what he believes through his statements or through his dramas. When we analyze and research on Tendulkar’s own terminology we get fascinated about his creativity. Though, he has imbibed his ideas about ‘violence’ as an essential living fluid in his plays, his writing never become boring for audience. This is the specialty of Tendulkar, and that is why he got success as a playwright. Tendulkar’s plays incorporate the devices of deliberate verbal assaults, de-masking of persona and exposing the true selves of the characters, the brutes behind the masks.

If we trace Tendulkar’s terminology in different themes of his plays, we come across similar themes, for example, sex and violence are

predominant features of the plays such as Gidhade (The Vultures) 'Sakharam Binder', 'Ghashiram Kotwal'. Violence along with the battle of wits is observed in the encounter in Umbugland. Kamala and Kanyadan deal with another social theme of violence which can we say the internalized violence and also with the issue of changed social order which is the outcome of modern period and the political reforms wiping out the boundaries of caste, class etc.

When we examine the statements or expert opinions given by different scholars, we find that almost all of them accept Tendulkar's social concern for violence and its different aspects. Shailaja B. Wadikar views Tendulkar as a "silent social activist" with clear social commitment giving "the crude and banal aspects of life a dramatic garb."³¹ Wadikar describes him as a dramatist who demonstrates faith in human values, expressed without any attempt at moralizing and philosophizing about them.

Other critics and scholars express the same view about Tendulkar. We find in him a social scientist, political scientist, and psychologist who deal with the primitive instincts of violence and sex. He expresses his views through his theatre, his plays, and through his living characters and the violence, the inequalities, gender discrimination, hollow institutions, and

hypocrisies of middle class life. His insightful objectification made him realize that the root cause behind the social crises of the society that disturbed him was the basic human instinct of violence and sex. He genuinely attempted to study, explore and validate 'violence' as the natural phenomenon and thereby the root cause of all problems of life through his plays. But through this attempt, he took up socially controversial themes for his experimentation that jolted the orthodox Marathi theatre completely, causing it to protest vehemently against all of them. The fact that most of these plays had censor trouble compelling the producers to go to court, gave Tendulkar the public image of a fighter, of a writer at cross-purposes with the mainstream. Dr. Shreeram Lagoo appropriately addresses him as "Bravo Tendulkar" in his article on 'Gidhade'.

References:

1. Nadkarni, Dhyaneswar, “‘Ghashiram Kotwal’,” *Enact*, No. 74-74 Jan-Feb 1973.
2. Tendulkar, Vijay, *the Vultures*, trans. Priya Adharkar, *Five Plays*, p.207
3. Krug, Etienne G., Dahlberg, Linda L., Mercy, James A., Zwi, Anthony B. and Lozano Rafael, "World report on violence and health", World Health Organization, 2002.
4. Tendulkar, Vijay, “*Tendulkar and Violence: Then and Now.*” Dir. Atul Pethe, ICCA, Documentary, 2010.
5. Ibid,
6. Ibid,
7. Ibid,
8. Ibid,
9. Semin, Gun. R, “K. Lorenz qtd. In Gun R. Semin and Klaus Fiedler”, Pg. 347.
10. Sadock, Benjamin, “K. Lorenz qtd. In Benjamin James Sadock and Virginia Alcott Sadock”, p. 150.
11. <http://varsityeduinfo.com/albert-einstein/Pg.3>
12. Tendulkar, Vijay, “*Tendulkar and Violence: Then and Now*”, Dir. Atul Pethe, ICCA, Documentary, 2010.
13. Ibid.

14. Tendulkar, Vijay, "The Play is the Thing: Sri Ram Memorial Lecture I," Vijay Tendulkar: "Collected Plays in Translation, ed. Samik Bandyopadhyay (New Delhi: OUP, 2005), Pg.21.
15. Ibid. Pg. 21
16. Tendulkar, Vijay, "Tendulkar and Violence: Then and Now", Dir. Atul Pethe, ICCA, Documentary, 2010.
17. Maheshari, Uma, "Tendulkar qtd. In R. Uma Maheshari", "Vijay's World of Words," The Hindu, Saturday 20 Jan. 2007, Metro plus Hyderabad.
18. Wadikar, Shailaja B., "Vijay Tendulkar, qtd. In Shailaja B. Wadikar", "Face to Face with Vijay Tendulkar," Vijay Tendulkar: A Pioneer Playwright (New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 2008), p. 151.
19. 'My writing has always been honest' An Interview with Vijay Tendulkar. <http://www.flonnet.com/fl2224/stories/20051202001008500.htm>
Date: 26/5/2009.
20. Ramnarayan, Gowri, "View From The Balcony". Vijay Tendulkar in conversation with Gowri Ramnarayan", Katha publication, New Delhi, 2001.
21. Prasad, Amar Nath and Barbuddhe, Satish.eds.The Plays of Vijay Tendulkar Critical Explorations. New Delhi: Sarup and Sons, 2008. P. VI.
22. Ramnarayan, Gowri, "A New Myth of Sisyphus!" Vijay Tendulkar and Girish Karnad in Conversation with Gowri Ramnarayan, The Hindu folio on Theatre, Feb., 1998, p. 16.

23. Ambedkar, Babasaheb, Writings and Speeches, Bombay: Government of Maharashtra, 1987. Pg. 67.
24. M. Sarat Babu, Indian Drama Today A Study in the Theme of Cultural Deformity, New Delhi, Prestige, 2003. Pg. 146.
25. M. Sarat Babu, Vijay Tendulkar's 'Ghashiram Kotwal' A Reader's Companion. New Delhi: Asia Book Club. 2003. Pg. 25.
26. Banerjee, Arundhati. "Introduction" Five Plays by Vijay Tendulkar. Mumbai: OUP. 1992. Pg. 570.
27. Barve, Chandrasekhar, "Vijay Tendulkar: "The Man Who Explores The Depths of Life"." Contemporary Indian Drama. Ed. Sudhakar Pande and Freya Taraporwala, New Delhi, Prestige, 1990. Pg. 9.
28. Kolhe, Avinash. "The Doyen", Gentleman (April 2001). p. 75.
29. Tendulkar, Vijay, "Saraswati Samman Speech" Katha publication, New Delhi, 2001.
30. Tendulkar, Vijay, "The Play is the Thing: Sri Ram Memorial Lecture I," Vijay Tendulkar: Collected Plays in Translation, ed. Samik Bandyopadhyay (New Delhi: OUP, 2005), Pg. 36.
31. Wadikar, Shailaja B., Vijay Tendulkar: A Pioneer Playwright (New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 2008), Pg. 9.

All the textual references are taken from – "Vijay Tendulkar. Collected Plays in Translation", Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2006.

Chapter 3

“Violent interplay of contradiction”

Character—Dialogues & Theatrical Devices of Tendulkar.

According to dialectical materialism, contradiction usually refers to opposition or conflicts inherent within one realm or one unified force or object. That means no object or entity can exist without having inherent conflicts within it. These contradictions of opposite forces exist in nature; it does not cancel each other but actually defines each other. As far as the plays of Tendulkar are concerned these contradictory opposite forces are the driving energy to the plays.

Mao in his essay ‘On Contradiction’¹ had explained how these contradictions are universal. He had said that this law of contradiction is the core of existence and its development itself. He also explained the universality of this contradiction in man as well in matter. The law of contradiction is responsible for the development or the change that occurs either in nature or society. Development and clashes are always present in the society and identity and struggle remain constant in a human being.

The Mata physical outlook of idealist world holds that all the different things in the universe are static, their characteristics have been the same, unalterable ever since they exist. According to this theory the exploitative relationship exists in human life since most primitive stage of society, and it will exist for ever unchangeable. The factors affecting social development of the society are geography and climate. And per faculty of psychology the factor affecting to a human being is society. That's what Marx says. He says:

“It is not our consciousness, that determines our existence but it is our social existence which determines our consciousness.”²

Mao explains how this law of contradictions can be seen in nature and human life. He explains the universality of this law of contradiction as follows:

In mathematics:	+ and -, Integral and Differential
In mechanics:	Action and Reaction
In physics:	Positive and Negative Electricity, Proton and Electron,
In chemistry:	The Combination and Dissociation of atoms.

In social science: Class struggle which takes different forms while interacting with Caste, Gender, Religious, National identities.

In war: Offence and defense, Advance and retreat, Victory and defeat

Mao says:

“These are all mutually contradictory, conflicting violent phenomenon. One cannot exist without other. These two aspects are at once in their violent interplay of conflict and their interdependence constitutes the totality of the phenomenon, whether you call it family, society or war, which pushes the process of change forward.”³

Tendulkar is interested in this relationship of opposites which can be seen in his each of the characters, between the characters, between the situations and the central themes of the plays. Tendulkar says, “Violence is the human relationship. Though it looks cruel, violent, but it is the heart core of human life.”

Tendulkar says in an interview about his fascination for violence:

“As a writer, I feel fascinated by the violent exploiter and exploited relationship and obsessively delve deep into it instead of taking a position against it. That takes me to a point where I

feel that the relationship is external fact of life however cruel, it will never end. Not that, I relish this thought while it grips me but I cannot shake it off.”⁴

It is the relationship of mutually opposite forces which drives each character and at same time it is interplaying with other characters of the play and gives an organic unity to the play. The characters of Tendulkar's plays cannot be categorized as good or bad, positive or negative or in black and white. They are neither black nor white they have simply gray shade. Shanta Gokhale also appropriately says the same thing. The characters are conflicting opposites; contradict with self and with others. We can see beautiful process of chaos and order, struggle and unity within each character at an individual level and in their relationship with other characters at a collective level.

The classical literature has played an important role in the shaping of Marathi literature; its impact upon Marathi culture has been no less profound. In contemporary Marathi poetry and drama, the dominant strain is that the writers are using the classics as a lens through which the oppressive and taboo themes of violence and sex in modern life are viewed. The result is often a deliberate inversion of gender roles, the construction and assertion of peace being a feminine principle that is placed in a primary position

instead of more violent masculine attitudes. The Marathi authors work from within this binary representation of a patriarchal order to demonstrate its ineffectiveness in both domestic and political terms, but they perform this criticism through the medium of the theatre in order to gain a more objective vantage point. This is not simple neoclassicism, but rather a method to expand imaginative possibilities in modern material.

So many writers in Marathi literature explore the feminine peace from within the patriarchy, creating some form of hope against the surrounding violence of their society. Vijay Tendulkar is the most progressive author of the survey, working freely from both the feminine and male perspectives, yet still adhering to an abhorrence of masculine arrogance. The objective of his stories and plays is not to hold the world of Indian culture as shining examples of how a society should be, but to explore the ancestral reflection of primitive animal instinct imbibe in humanity. Rather than becoming lost in language segregated from experience, he uses the human being as "symbols adequate to our dilemma."

Tendulkar is a versatile writer. Along with plays he wrote film-scripts, novels, short stories, literature for the children, journalistic writing, translations, adaptations and essays. Tendulkar has made noteworthy

contribution to the stage and has made some changes in the art of writing. He has made significant contribution to the Indian National Theatre Movement. His plays are not based on the value of entertainment but they provoke the audience to think. He is a contemporary writer and he shares the contemporary social and national concerns of the country.

Vijay Tendulkar shows the lust, greed and violence in the lives of people using the contemporary setting and language. Vijay Tendulkar uses historical figures like Nana Phadnavis and 'Ghashiram Kotwal' in his play 'Ghashiram Kotwal' in order to show how the political persons like Nanas use Ghashirams like pawns and throw them away when their purpose is over. Sex, violence and greed are the main themes in the plays of Tendulkar.

Tendulkar maintains the impersonality in portraying complex characters and their hidden motives behind their actions in a challenging way. Tendulkar does this without imposing his position, thoughts and feelings over of his characters; he simply allows them to interact freely with each other and with the central theme and thus discloses their inner conflicts and personalities.

Tendulkar brings out the intellectual and moral qualities of his men and women by putting them in conflict ridden situations on the stage. Thus

in Tendulkar's plays, theme or central plot becomes an effective means of character exposition. Tendulkar uses plot as a tool to provoke his characters to violently confront with the central idea of the play.

In a way he puts collective experience of our time crystallized in plot on acid test by allowing each character to confront with its own experience of life. Thus in Tendulkar's plays, the plot serves as a departure point which triggers violent interaction or interplay between characters, between stage situations and the reality which exists in the society, between stereotypes of positive- negative characters, hero, heroine or villain by triggering the inherent dilemma, conflicts already present in each character.

When we investigate the characters of Vijay Tendulkar we find physical, psychological and sexual suppression of women. Leela Benare is seduced, first by her maternal uncle and later on by Prof. Damle. Rama is victimized by her husband, Ramakant. Laxmi and Champa are victimized by their husbands. Ghashiram barter his daughter Lalita Gauri for his Kotwalship. 'Kamala' is bought from the skin market only for two hundred and fifty rupees. Even Sarita has been used like a puppet by her husband. Jyoti is beaten by her beloved husband though she purposely has married an untouchable. Manik in 'Gidhade' is beaten by her brothers. The suppression

of the women sometimes leads to their devastation and in some case death also. 'Leela Benare' of 'Shantata! Court Chalu Ahe' is ordered by the court to abort her child. Sakharam murders Champa after finding that she has love affair with Dawood. Ramakant and Umakant beat Manik to such an extent that there is abortion. As revenge Manik ensures that Rama also aborts. In 'Ghashiram Kotwal', Lalita Gauri dies at the time of her abortion.

Though most of the women characters in the plays of Vijay Tendulkar are oppressed, some of them rebel against the situation to find an escape. There are women characters created by Tendulkar who struggle against the situation. In the plays of Tendulkar the women characters do not surrender to the situation. Leela Benare of 'Shantata! Court Chalu Ahe', Rama of 'Gidhade', Champa of 'Sakharam Binder', Sarita of 'Kamala' and Jyoti of 'Kanyadan' fight against the situation.

When we investigate complexities between man and women, gender and class discrimination with examples of the characters, dialogues and dramatic situations in the plays of Tendulkar we have to analyze various relationships. Contradictions interplayed as complex family relationship in Tendulkar's different plays. The family concept is being destroyed day by day and this contradiction in family relations is found in the plays of Vijay

Tendulkar. In the plays of Vijay Tendulkar the family relationships are complex. In 'Gidhade', brother deceives other brother, sons beat father, and brothers beat sister. The very existence of 'Sakharam Binder' is based on the destruction of the family because Sakharam brings only those women who are deserted by their husbands. In the play 'Ghashiram Kotwal' nothing is mentioned about Nana Phadnavis' family. In the play, he is seen marrying for the seventh time. In Kanyadan, Arun beats his wife in order to take revenge of the treatment given to his mother by his father.

In Vijay Tendulkar's 'Shantata! Court Chaluh Ahe', Leela Benare is seduced by her maternal uncle and her mother blames her for it. Mr. And Mrs. Kashikar are not happy with each other but they do not show it in the public. In the public, Mrs. Kashikar buys a bush-shirt for Mr. Kashikar whereas Mr. Kashikar buys a garland for the hair of Mrs. Kashikar. As they do not have child, they have adopted Balu Rokde as their son.

Vijay Tendulkar's 'Gidhade' presents the most diverted family. The family relationships portrayed in 'Gidhade' are totally collapsed. Conflict between family members is significant. Umakant, Ramakant, Manik and Pappa are the shellfish. Lust for money drives them to do anything. They can perform transgression to the family members as well as anyone outside

family for money and property. Manik is illustration a young female who is spoiling her life. She drinks and smokes early in the morning in the presence of her family members. Her day starts with liquor and cigarettes. She consumes the contraceptive pills without hesitation. She was become pregnant before her marriage. The most striking thing in the play is Umakant's and Ramakant's beating of Pappa. Tendulkar became successful in showing the family contradictions in terms of the 'Vultures'

In 'Sakharam Binder', Sakharam is opponent of marriage system. He doesn't believe in conventional family but he brings deserted women in his house and asks them to serve him as his wife. Champa's mother sold her to Fauzdar Shinde. Fauzdar Shinde marries her but he was torturing her and insisting that Champa should earn money by prostitution. Laxmi's husband abandoned her because she was unable to give him a child. In case of Champa, she left her husband because he was unable to give her a child. In 'Sakharam Binder' the marriage system demonstrates serious crisis and conflicts.

In 'Ghashiram Kotwal', Ghashiram exchanges his own daughter for the power. He used his daughter as bargaining chip. Tedulkar doesn't portray Ghashiram's wife and her reactions for above mentioned act. For

Ghashiram and Nana the family relationship is negligible compare to the power.

In ‘‘Kamala’’, arrival of ‘Kamala’ becomes a tool of wisdom for Sarita. ‘Kamala’ makes Sarita aware of her conditions and she comes to know that she is no more than a slave to her husband. In ‘‘Kamala’’ family relationship’s crisis are portrayed as interplay between Sarita’s consciousness and her moral duties as a wife implanted by the society.

In Kanyadan, Devalalika family’s relationship is portrayed as symbol of ‘freedom of expression’. Everyone has freedom to think and behave accordingly. The decision of marriage with Arun is Jyoti’s own decision. Father and mother of Jyoti are involved in social services and hence ideal of inter-caste marriage is responsible for the contradiction between father-daughter, mother-daughter, and husband-wife relationship. The reality of century old caste system and caste hatred on one hand and ideal of inter-caste marriage on other hand generates the typhoon of complications. In short we can see that in Vijay Tendulkar’s plays the family relationships are in danger. These are the violent interplays portrayed as family relationship.

In the plays of Vijay Tendulkar there is a focus on the sexual relationships. The exposure to sex and carnal instincts is one of the major

characteristics of the plays of Vijay Tendulkar. Vijay Tendulkar became a controversial playwright because of the explicit portrayal of sex in his plays. The sexual relationship of the modern man is very complex. Women suffer due to the exploitation in the hands of men because men in their life look at sexual pleasures as their revenge to their own exploitation.

In the plays of Vijay Tendulkar, depicts sexual relations in such a way that it brings out its inner violent exploitative nature sharply. We can find that Vijay Tendulkar never presents a situation in a sugar-coated form but he portrays reality in its naked form. He depicts child sexual molestation in “Shantata Court Chalu Ahe”. Benare was molested by her maternal uncle when she was teenager. When Leela Benare asks her uncle to marry her he avoids the responsibility in the name of customs. Here, Tendulkar exposes dual standards of self-centred male characters. These characters are custom conscious only when it helps them. Benare falls in love with her maternal uncle in her teen-age when she is not aware of the consequences of sexual pleasures. Benare has deeply wounded and she could not forget the exploitation. In fact she actually realized about sexual abuse when she second time deceived by a father figure Prof. Damle. Benare loves Prof. Damle who is already married just because of she needs emotional and caring support. She loves Prof. Damle whom she regards as an intellectual

God but this God makes her pregnant and runs away from his responsibility. Here, Tendulkar brings out typical type of the custodian-sexual exploitation where a guardian male exploits a female – Benare. Here Tendulkar exposes the dubious male sexuality which manipulates a female's regards and faith into sexual exploitative relationship.

In 'Gidhade', Rama can't be a mother of Ramakant's child as he has become an impotent due to excessive drinking. So Rama chooses Rajaninath who is her well-wisher and a passionate lover for getting a child. Manik has sexual relationship with many men. She loves the King of Hondur who is her fourth lover. While Rama's adultery is for the fulfilment of her passions because she is treated ruthlessly by her husband, Manik strays out only for the sake of earning money. Here Tendulkar shows interplay of contradiction between money, lust, passion and 'compassion'.

'Sakharam Binder' is a curious case of sexual relationships and Vijay Tendulkar has sharply shown it in the play. Sakharam does not believe in the marriage system and he brings home the women who are deserted by her husband. Laxmi is his seventh woman and Champa is eighth. Sakharam brings women to his home; uses them as his wives for a year or two and when he is fed up with them, he deserts them once again. Laxmi is deserted

by her husband because of her infertility. When Sakharam is tired of Laxmi, he makes her quit the home. Champa has been bought by Fauzdar Shinde from her mother but he tortures her physically and sexually to such an extent that she rebels against him, beats him and runs away. Sakharam brings Champa to his home as his eighth woman. At the beginning she does not allow Sakharam to come near but at last she surrenders herself to Sakharam's instincts.

Champa involves in sexual relation with Dawood also which leads her to her death. Sakharam has sexual relations with many women but he expects that the woman should be faithful to him when she lives with him. Once the bond is over both, Sakharam and his women are free to do anything. The very marriage system is questioned by Tendulkar in 'Sakharam Binder'. Here the sexual relations between Sakharam-Laxmi and Sakharam-Champa bring out dual violent nature of male and female sexuality.

In 'Ghashiram Kotwal', Nana Phadnavis is shown as a lusty person. Though he is on the verge of old age, he is sexually attracted towards the beauty of Lalita Gauri. He is in the habit of visiting Bavannakhani, the red light area, and visits Gulabi for his sexual hunger. Nana's sexual relationship

is symbolic depiction of male superiority of power over female. 'Lalita Gauri' and 'Kamala' are symbolic characters who represents female as a product in male dominated society.

Tendulkar puts a question mark to the marriage system in his plays. He contradicts the mentality that that marriage gives social respect as well as security to a woman. First hand we can see that Mrs. Kashikar of 'Shantata! Court Chalu Ahe' gets security whereas life of Leela Benare is insecure due to her singleness. But truth is different. Mrs. Kashikar seems respected by others in her presence but we cannot assume that in her absence she may not become the character of gossip. Her position is like a puppy that gets respect in response to obey her master. If we scrutinize we find that there are plenty of instances of extra-marital sexual relationships in the plays of Vijay Tendulkar. The notable treatment to this issue is these instances lead to a lot of bloodshed in the plays of Vijay Tendulkar.

Before Tendulkar, the Marathi theatre was involved in sentimentality and family was always on the background of all events in human life. Vijay Tendulkar changed this picture. He did various experiments with the theatre and the theatrical form. He took the Marathi drama out of the shackles of the middle class sentimentality. He was associated with theatre and film

personalities and he took Marathi drama overseas. Tendulkar has described his plays to be about reality surrounding him:

“I write to express my concerns, vies-a-vies my reality. The human conditions as I perceive it”.⁵

In Tendulkar's plays we can see contradictions in the society. The class- distinction and caste- distinction is focal point of so many plays. In 'Gidhade', Jagannath the gardener is trampled by Ramakant as he demands his salary. In 'Sakharam Binder', Laxmi opposes to allow Dawood, a Muslim friend of Sakharam to take part in the aarti of Lord Ganesha. Sakharam dislikes this and he blows Laxmi with his belt. For Sakharam, look like secular, the class distinction and caste distinction do not matter. He shares a chillum with his Muslim friend Dawood and he does not ask any woman about her caste which he brings his home on contractual basis. In the play 'Ghashiram Kotwal', conflict between local and outsider is sharply demonstrated through Brahmin from Kanoj and Brahmins from Poona. The power is in the hands of Brahmins of Poona. In the reign of the Brahmins a poor Brahman who comes from outside is suppressed. The insiders treat outsiders as if they are their slaves.

The most controversial play of Tendulkar regarding the caste system in India is his 'Kanyadan'. A daughter of a Brahmin social reformist marries a Mahar boy and the things become very complex. Arun Athawale, husband of Jyoti, though educated is unemployed. He has seen how his father used to drink and beat his mother in his childhood. He has also seen the poverty and the consequences for poverty right from his childhood. It has turned him into an angry young man and he wants to put the whole world on the fire. The violent thoughts of this untouchable boy are the results of the inhuman treatment given by the upper class society to the untouchables years to years. But the treatment given to Jyoti by Arun Athawale is also inhuman. In 'Ghashiram Kotwal', Ghashiram takes revenge on the Brahmins of Poona as he is suppressed by them. In 'Kanyadan' Arun Athawale takes revenge on the Brahmin community by torturing his wife Jyoti. One cannot advocate and support the behaviour of Arun Athawale and Ghashiram. Here Tendulkar shows Revengeful tendency of an oppressed personality.

If we inspect violence and its interplay in Tendulkar's plays we find the bitter realistic picture of Indian social structure. The division of the Indian society into various castes and creeds, the injustice done to the lower class people, suppression of the poor, revenge motif, lust for power, and ex-

marital relationship are some of the basic causes of violent interplay in the plays of Vijay Tendulkar.

In Tendulkar's plays, sex, violence and power politics and its interplay is at the centre. Tendulkar skilfully portrays interplay through 'violence' as a theatrical device. In 'Shantata! Court Chalu Ahe', there is a lot of verbal violence. She is made the culprit and a case of infanticide is filed against her. In the play within the play she is victimized and tortured in such an extent that she tries to run away from the room but the door is bolted from the outside. Her condition is like an injured bird whose feathers are taken away compellingly. The remaining characters enjoy the victimization, helplessness and powerlessness of Leela Benare. The human instinct of violence makes the remaining characters happy to see how a poor helpless character like Leela Benare is trying to escape from the clutches in which she is put. At last she is sentenced to undertake the abortion which is the most violent act of the play.

The play 'Gidhade' is full of 'violence' and the violence is used as a theatrical device and depicted at various levels. It is physical, sexual, verbal and psychological. The title of the play itself suggests that the characters in the play would behave like vultures and the same thing happens in the play.

Except Rama and Rajaninath, the behaviour of all the characters is very close to 'Gidhade'. Jagannath is beaten by Ramakant, Sakharam is made to run away as he demands his share in the property. Ramakant and Umakant including Manik beat their father for money. Ramakant and Umakant beat their sister Manik and Manik puts ashes on the womb of Rama so that she should undergo an abortion these are the incidents of violence in 'Gidhade'.

In the play 'Ghashiram Kotwal', revenge resulted in 'violence' is a core theatrical device. Ghashiram takes revenge against the treatment given to him by Nana and Brahmins of Poona. After obtaining Kotwalship, Ghashiram turns into a savage and victimizes the Brahmins of Poona. In 'Sakharam Binder', Laxmi is beaten by Sakharam with his belt. Champa beats and kicks her husband Fauzdar Shinde. When Laxmi returns to Sakharam from her nephew and once again she is beaten by Sakharam. The most violent action in the play 'Sakharam Binder' is Sakharam murders Champa. Here Tendulkar uses sex and violence as a device of interplay. In 'Kamala' Jaisingh uses 'Kamala' to serve his purpose and throws her away in the asylum. He exploits even his wife Sarita physically as well as psychologically. Here Tendulkar uses Psychological violence as a device of interplay. The play Kanyadan depicts physical as well as psychological violence. The behaviour as well as thoughts of Arun is violent and he wants

to set fire to the whole world. He wants to drink up the blood of high caste society. Arun's violent thoughts are the product of age old injustice done to the dalits by the upper class community. He narrates how his mother was beaten inhumanly by his father and in the same way he starts beating his wife Jyoti. His beating of Jyoti is his revenge against the injustice done to him by cast system. Tendulkar's plays put 'sex' and 'violence' at the centre as a theatrical device of interplay.

In case of interplay of action, In Vijay Tendulkar's 'Shantata! Court Chalu Ahe', the mock trial leads the battle to present and past of Leela Benare. The technique of play within the play helps the writer to show the actions which have taken place in the past life of Leela Benare. The play 'Gidhade' is full of violent actions which take the characters to the vulture's level. But in all these actions there is uniformity which makes the play effective. In the play, 'Sakharam Binder' the interplay begins with Laxmi's arrival at Sakharam's home and the play ends with Champa's death. In between these two interplay many contradictory violent actions are blended together, such as Sakharam's beating of Laxmi, Laxmi's going away to Amalner to stay with her nephew, Champa's entry into Sakharam's home and life, Champa's beating to her husband; are all the actions resulted into development of contradictions. The play 'Ghashiram Kotwal' is also full of

violent interplays. The play observes the folk-theatre form and it is turned almost into a musical. It is the combination of Tamasha, Khele and Dashavatar. We can call it as a play of total theatre. The actions in the play are carried out by form itself. The insult of Ghashiram and his going to jail for the theft which he has not committed turns Ghashiram into a monster. And as avenge, he treats the Brahmans of Poona in a violent manner.

In 'Kamala', the actions are oriented towards the representation of oppression of women in male dominated society. Jaisingh's buying of 'Kamala' and his presentation of 'Kamala' in press conference, his dismissal from his job, indicate how power matters and the powerless are harassed. Vijay Tendulkar's Kanyadan is a play based on caste system in India. Nath Devalalikar, a reformist, wants to exterminate untouchability and class-distinction from the society but he fails. Arun as revenge oppresses his wife Jyoti and at last Jyoti wants her father not to interfere in her relationship with her husband, and as she has accepted him as her husband it is her responsibility to be loyal with him. The actions reflected in the plays of Tendulkar are based on the real life incidents and causative force for interplay of contradiction.

The women characters in Tendulkar's plays include housewives, teachers, mistresses, daughters, slaves and servants. He brings a broad range of emotions in his plays through his penetrating and multi-layered characterization of these women. As Shanta Gokhale has suggested in her earlier writing:

“Tendulkar's characters are drawn from the widest range of observed examples and are allowed to inhabit the entire spectrum from the unbelievably gullible to the clever, from the malleable to the stubborn, from the conservative to the rebellious, from the self-sacrificing to the grasping.”⁶

The women portrayed in the plays of Tendulkar are oppressed by male dominated society. His plays persistently probe the operations of power, the hidden scenes of violence in Indian history and the obstacles that stand in the way of social change and modernization. The play 'Shantata! Court Chalu Ahe' is about the pathetic condition of women in the male dominated Indian society. The problems of a middle class Indian woman are put forth by Tendulkar in the play. The problem with Leela Benare is that she is too much of a woman. She is sexually alive. She needs to fulfil her desires and the most important thing is she is not ashamed of her instincts. She is tortured purposely by the male characters as well as by a female character Mrs. Kashikar.

In the play 'Gidhade', Rama is oppressed by Ramakant and Manik is beaten by her brothers. But there is a contradiction in the behaviour of these three characters. Rama is emotional, sensitive and a polite character whereas Manik is exactly opposite. She is responsible for her destruction. Through presentation of Manik, Tendulkar interplays between the wildness and freedom in modern Indian women. Her drinking and smoking on the stage was shocking to the orthodox minded people. Even, in case of Rama her emotional and sexual attachment with Rajaninath was quite shocking for the audience. But sympathy of the audience goes to Rama whereas they dislike Manik. Ramakant is not involved emotionally in his wife. Just he wants a child from her and for that he takes her to number of fake saints for the treatment. When she is pregnant, Ramakant treats her with great passions. But when he comes to know that she is pregnant due to Rajaninath, he is distressed. Here Tendulkar interplays with emotions. Manik is involved in many love affairs. The brothers beat her for the sake of money. In 'Gidhade', interplay of contradiction is between money, property and desire of every character.

In 'Ghashiram Kotwal' violent interplay of contradiction is power politics concerned with gender. Gulabi is a dancer woman. She is used by Nana as well as by the Brahmins of Poona for the sake of entertainment.

Lalita Gauri, the daughter of Ghashiram is used by her own father for bartering the power. Nana Phadnavis showers Kotwalship of Poona city on Ghashiram only because he gets a beautiful young girl in return. Both Ghashiram as well as Nana Phadnavis behave in a shameless manner with Lalita Gauri. She is the victim of the power politics. Kalindi Deshpande writes:

“It is saddening to know that almost all his (Tendulkar’s) women characters meekly submit to the injustice, violence and harassment done to them. They seem to be helpless and have no other alternative but to go through the way that life has chosen for them.⁷

A careful reading of Tendulkar's plays brings to light the fact that his characters are either victimizers or victims. Sometimes there is a shift in their roles during the course of the play and the victimizers become victims and vice versa. Character’s quest for freedom and restrictions of society is summit of interplay of contradiction.

Violent interplay of contradiction is more verbal and emotional in the character of Leela Benare in ‘Silence! The Court is in Session’. Tendulkar has highlighted the plight of woman in an exploitative, male-dominated society. She is lively and enthusiastic by nature. Benare's relations with the

members of her group do not seem to be pleasant. She expresses her contempt for them through her sarcastic comments to Samant. An interesting thing is her colleagues are failures in their professions and in their lives. They are jealous of Benare who is successful in her career. They do not approve of her unconventional behaviour. The mock-trial gives them an opportunity to settle their scores with Benare. They gang up against her and hurt her feelings deeply by making her private affairs public. Tendulkar has interplayed the woman's psyche through the character of Benare. Benare wants to fulfill her sexual and emotional desire. She engages here sexually with two men who entered at different stages of her life.

She had tried to commit suicide when she was immature but she was saved. Then she ventured into a love-affair with Damle at a mature age. He made her pregnant and refused to accept the responsibility of the child. Benare wants to give birth to her child. Here contradiction is between conventional rules of morality. Benare wants freedom as well as wants to fit in the frame of society. So she wants that the child must have a father's name otherwise the society will make its life a hell. So she starts begging to different men like Ponkshe and Rokde. Her flirting with Samant at the beginning of the play is probably an effort to entice him in a prospective

romance and marriage. Hemang Desai has already written about the same point of view that:

Benare's flirtations are a proof of her inveterate belief that maternity outside wedlock is deemed abysmal from the social stand point and that it can be legitimized only by trapping a man.⁸

But interesting thing is, Benare is aware of her rights for freedom of behaviour. Here, her problem is, she has not enough courage to live outside of the moral structure of society. So, Contradiction of Benare's interplay is between her concept of freedom and her anxiety to get justification to her freedom.

Benare remains completely silent during the dissection of her personal life by her fellow actors during mock-trial. Even if she tries to speak, she is silenced by them. This is a clear example of verbal violence. She is given a chance of defending herself at the end of the trial. Tendulkar mentions that all the characters remain in a frozen state during her long reply. The playwright wants to contradict two symbols. One is Benare who wants acceptance of her freedom and second symbol is deaf ears of society which never accepts her freedom. Tendulkar suggests that her reply falls on deaf ears. Benare must have to accept the

Court's verdict and she must have to live in social structure. Tendulkar clearly depicts about Benare's condition in his stage directions at the end of the play "Benare feebly stirs a little... then gives up the efforts..." (Pg. 120)

Tendulkar has drafted Rama's character in his play 'Gidhade' as an ideal kind and submissive Indian woman. Rajaninath, her brother-in-law, describes her as an innocent dove that, after marriage, had come to a place where vultures lived in the form of men. She sincerely performs her duties as a wife, sister-in-law and daughter-in-law. But she never received an appreciation from anybody. Rama's obedient patience during nerve-racking mental torture imposed by her family members establishes her as a traditional Indian woman. She does not utter even a single word against them. She continues to suffer silently.

Tendulkar depicts contradiction as innocent people and vicious people lives under a roof. Rama suffers from the vulture-like tendencies of her family members. Tendulkar describes her distress in her words. Rama says to Rajaninath, "Every day, a new death, and every minute a thousand million deaths. A pain like a million needles stuck in your heart, blinding you, maddening you with pain." (Pg. 240) It is extremely painful and it is the violent interplay that she cannot think of any alternative either.

Rama cannot become a mother because of Ramakant's impotency. She is fed up with the frequent visits to doctors and saints. She wants to tell her husband to stop drinking. But she does not dare to tell him. Sometimes she thinks of committing suicide. Tendulkar clearly reveals the dilemma through her long soliloquy. She feels that her womb is sound and healthy. She was born to become a mother. She feels that her husband that is responsible for her childlessness. Tendulkar uses Rama's words as big blast after silence.

Rama's intense desire to be a mother involves her in sexual relationship with Rajaninath. She interplays and contradicts traditional and conventional way of society and tries to emphasize her individuality. Her act is incorrect in social moral conventions. But we find that it is the single caring and compassionate relationship in the play. Rama and Rajaninath imbibe with the common threads of goodness and innocence.

The playwright succeeds in making it clear that it is not lust but Rama's sorrow which makes this happen. When her husband knows about this relationship he aborts her forcibly. The last optimism in her life is gone. She becomes a totally lifeless body hereon. Ramakant runs away and he takes Rama with him. She follows him like a ghost. She is speechless. It is

clear that joy and hope are gone from her life. Tendulkar reveals the violent interplay of contradiction through unjust suffering of good people.

Laxmi, in 'Sakharam Binder', is the most violently contradictory character created by Tendulkar. Laxmi is Sakharam's seventh mistress. Initially, she appears to be helpless, submissive, and religious. She gets transformed into a fearless and cunning conspirator. Tendulkar depicts that a religiously staunch believer is more violent than a modern person. Laxmi enters on the stage as quite simple and mild. She looks obedient. She surrenders to Sakharam's demands for sexual intercourse without any protest. Here Tendulkar interplays with her sensitivity through conversation with ants and crows.

The most dominant trait in Laxmi's personality is her unshakable faith in God and religion. She accepts Sakharam as her husband. Laxmi is almost a fundamentalist. She can go to any extent in behaving as per what she believes to be morally correct. She cannot accept Dawood's presence during the worship of Lord Ganesha.

After leaving Sakharam's house, Laxmi goes to live with her nephew and his wife. They throw her out of the house on the charge of stealing. Laxmi who still thinks of Sakharam as her husband returns to him. Realizing

that Champa has taken her place, Laxmi agrees to play a secondary role to her. She accepts all the conditions imposed on her by Champa. Her moral concepts are rigid hence she does not like the way Champa treats her husband, Shinde. She becomes sympathetic towards Shinde and tries to comfort him by offering food. When she finds out Champa's affair with Dawood her moral sense becomes violent. When Sakharam decides to throw out Champa, Laxmi discloses Champa's secret to Sakharam. She leads Sakharam towards Champa's murder.

Tendulkar's thoughts about life reflect in the treatment of his characters. Tendulkar believes that:

“When circumstances push a person to the wall, it is not only natural but even justifiable for him to become aggressive.”⁹

Laxmi's other motto to survive in the house is also fulfilled with murder of Champa. Laxmi due to interplay of circumstances changes from a simple, generous and sensitive woman into a cunning, ruthless and brutal lady and becomes responsible for Champa's death at the hands of Sakharam. Violent interplay of contradiction is seen when Laxmi manages Sakharam to take him in her control and help him to bury the dead body. She is cool and

Sakharam is shocked. Laxmi's future is bound with Sakharam. Tendulkar reveals that violent interplay exists at the time of battle against circumstance.

'Kamala' is a symbol of an interplay of a modern Indian woman who is caught between the contradictory pull of tradition and modernity.

According to Shibu Simon:

"Tendulkar exposes the chauvinism intrinsic in the modern Indian male who believes him-self to be liberal through his delineation of Sarita's character." ¹⁰

Sarita is an educated urban lady and not aware of the slave-like existence of her. In absence of Jaisingh she looks after everything devotedly. She does everything that is possible to please Jaisingh.

When Sarita observes that Jaisingh uses 'Kamala' for lifting up his career as breaking news, she realizes her existence as a replica of 'Kamala'. She understands Jaisingh's real attitude of looking at her as only an object of enjoyment and as a caretaker of the house. Shailaja Wadikar appropriately observes:

"Sarita realizes that she is bound to her husband in the wedlock to slave for him permanently after the entry of 'Kamala' in her house." ¹¹

Sarita decides to change her condition and declares her individuality. There is a noticeable change in her behaviour towards her husband. Earlier she used to defend Jaisingh in whatever he did. Now she confronts him. She objects to Jaisingh's decision to send 'Kamala' to an orphanage. She refuses to accompany him to a party. She is angry and frustrated because of her husband's behaviour. She thinks to arrange a press conference to expose Jaisingh. She refuses to submit to Jaisingh's desire for physical intimacy.

Sarita's rebellion is short-lived. When she knows that Jaisingh has been sacked by his employer, Sarita postpones her rebel. Tendulkar interplays within Sarita's inner conflict. Contradiction between 'Sarita as a modern woman' and 'Sarita as moral support', when her husband needs her is delicately portrayed by Tendulkar. She is mentally prepared for the struggle with society to declare her identity but quit the battle. Shanta Gokhale has already said the same thing about Sarita's attitude. She says:

“A compassionate human being who defers her rebellion against her husband as he is in an acute need of her moral support.”¹²

But Sarita is a changed personality at the end of the play. She has become conscious of her identity and is determined to change her life in future.

Tendulkar's character 'Jyoti' in "Kanyadaan" is a result of contradiction between ideological decisions and harsh reality of life. Tendulkar interplays with tragedy of a girl. Jyoti is the daughter of Nath, a politician with socialist ideology. Jyoti has imbibed all the ideals and principles of her visionary father. She is firm to get on a path of truth and goodness shown to her by her father. Arun who belongs to the backward class, proposes Jyoti and she agrees to marry him. She does not know contradictory effect of caste discrimination deeply rooted in our society.

Jyoti has not fallen in love with Arun. There are no intense feelings about each other. He proposes to her and she accepts it. She is obedient and respects her father's ideology. Thus she appears to be in a very confused state of mind. Her father thinks about the chance this marriage will give him of the elimination of caste system.

Nootan Gosavi has already said the same:

"Nath is overjoyed by the prospective marriage not because his daughter has found a good husband but because it will fulfill his long-cherished dream of breaking the caste barriers."¹³

Both Jyoti and Nath fail to foresee the disastrous consequences of their decision.

After marriage Arun treats her in an inhuman manner. Every night in drunken state of mind Arun beats her. Nath Devalalikar does not want her marriage to fail. He appeals to Jyoti to save the marriage as it is an important ideological experiment. Nath believes in the essential goodness of man and trusts Jyoti to improve Arun by her love and care. Tendulkar portrays a father's exploitation of his daughter in implementation of his ideology. Due to his idealistic philosophy, Nath neglects harsh realities of life. At the end Jyoti decides to go back to Arun because she doesn't want to disturb her parents.

Arun psychologically interplays between his ancestors and his wife. He categorizes Jyoti as a representative of the upper class. She experiences the contradiction in the theory of man's essential goodness and reality. Arun's brutal behaviour has convinced her of the essential beastliness of man. She is angry with Nath for imposing a false view of life. She turns her back on father at the end of the play and disallows him to interfere in her life. She decides to stay with Arun and mutely suffer all the tortures inflicted by him. Thus Jyoti chooses a path of stubborn self-destruction.

Tendulkar's uses characters like Rajaninath, Nath Devalalikar and Kakasaheb to express his ideas on certain issues. They are commentators on

contradictions of human life and the speakers of truth as the playwright perceives them. Through these characters, Tendulkar's feelings, opinions, aspirations and his view of the world become known to us.

Some characters in Tendulkar's plays appear to be symbolic representative of society. The behaviour, thinking and actions of these characters make them representatives of certain types of people in society. The contradictions in characters are significant. Some are sensitive and tender and some characters are insensitive and cruel. Tendencies such as simplicity, innocence and submissiveness exist as well as tendencies such as selfishness, heartlessness and wickedness also remain present in Tendulkar's plays.

Tendulkar has sketched Rajaninath as a sensitive, kind and good hearted individual in his play, 'Gidhade'. Being an illegal son of Pappa (Mr. Hari Pitale), Rajaninath is cursed to live a pathetic life right from his birth. Pappa has neither completely disowned him nor looked after him properly. He lives in the garage of the Pitale household. He is a much neglected, much hated and lonely being. The fact of his illegitimacy is always at the back of his mind. He hates Pappa because of this reason. Pappa is fully conscious of

the vulture- like nature of his siblings who cannot tolerate his existence and their extreme dislike for him is interplay of contradiction.

Rajaninath was just a boy when Rama had entered the Pitale household after her marriage with Ramakant. She has sympathy for Rajaninath and so she looks after him against her husband's instruction. It is natural interplay that Rajaninath has great affection for Rama. He knows about her suffering. But he cannot do anything for her.

He says: “She laid on me. The burden of her oath... Again and again... It was her oath, and I kept it. I didn't speak.” (Pg. 205).

As per Rama's strict instruction of not to interfere he becomes a mute witness to Rama's silent sufferings. Rajaninath is fully conscious about Rama's intense desire to be a mother. His affection and Rama's desire interplays and he involves sexually with her. She becomes pregnant. Arundhati Banerjee appropriately observes that: “The sexual aspect of Rajaninath's relationship with Rama is merely an extension of his love for her and is the only redeeming feature in the morbid and claustrophobic atmosphere of the Pitale family. Deeply concerned with Rama's plight, he wants to make her happy. Though morally wrong, it is a tender and humane relationship” According to Samik Bandyopadhyay:

“Rajaninath gets a release from his sense of shame about his connection with the family of vultures through his illicit relationship with Rama.”¹⁴

This relationship is an outcome of violent interplay between vulturous tendency and humanity. Rajaninath says: “A curse that's on us... On us all. If you at least can escape that curse - why shouldn't you? If I can be used for that, why should I say 'no'? Why? Virtue and vice are for other people! For us on whom this terrible curse has fallen, there is nothing but this curse. And a burning body. A burning mind.” (Pg. 243).

This relationship results in the Rama's pregnancy. When Ramakant comes to know about this, he forcefully aborts her. Here Tendulkar engages himself in recreation of violent interplay of contradiction between good and evil.

Rajaninath does not want wealth or property. Pappa offers to make him his heir. For that he has to help Pappa in court case to get the property back. But Rajaninath is fully aware of the evil consequences so he refuses the offer. At the end Rajaninath prays to God to show the right path to his degraded family members.

As far as the theatrical devices of interplay are concern Rajaninath has a dual role to play in 'Gidhade'. He functions as a Sutradhar and as a character simultaneously. His memories and poetry are device of interplay to portray the incidents happened in twenty two years. Rajaninath represents the human sensibility. We can see clear contradiction in his language. He uses a gentle and poetic language to describe the good and pure Rama and he uses ugly metaphors and words like mangy dogs, lepers, death-heads, skeletons and rotting noses. He reflects the characteristic of Vijay Tendulkar.

Through the character of Kakasaheb in 'Kamala', the playwright expresses ethical ideas of journalism. Tendulkar portrays Kakasaheb as a journalist of the old school tradition. As per old school journalism is a resource of spreading awareness in society and removing the social problems. Throughout the play, Kakasaheb keeps objecting to Jaisingh's sensational style of journalism. He suggests Jaisingh that if he really wants to solve the social problems, he should join a vernacular newspaper. The English newspaper is not the voice of common man. Kakasaheb clearly realizes the selfish motives behind Jaisingh's adventurous journalism. According to Shailaja Wadikar:

“Tendulkar throws light on the exploitation of women in society for centuries through the character of Kakasaheb.”¹⁵

Ramakant, ‘Sakharam Binder’, ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’, Jaisingh Jadhav and Nath Devalalikar are the male protagonists. All of them have been portrayed as developing characters by the playwright. They are quite contradictory from each other in personality, class, temperament and social position. The common thread in each character is that they all are symbols of male dominant society. All above mentioned characters consider women as the objects to satisfy their various requirements. Catherine Thankamma appropriately comments:

" Whatever be their socio-economic background, Sakharam, Jaisingh, Ramakant and Umakant in ‘Gidhade’, all have one thing in common - they see women as subject to be exploited, as possessions, not as individuals with feelings and desires of their own." ¹⁶

Ghashiram also uses his daughter to gain elevation in his social status. Nath Devalalikar looks liberal but he becomes responsible for disaster in his daughter’s life.

Ramakant's character in ‘Gidhade’ is violent interplay of cruel, crafty, unscrupulous and greedy nature of a man. A. P. Dani writes that:

“The character of Ramakant bears testimony to Tendulkar's firm conviction that the vulturine instinct in man is deeply rooted and his endeavour to manifest the unspiritual and desolate sensitivities stemming from the pervasive alienation of devastated and devastating middle class man.¹⁷

Ramakant is an alcoholic person. He busts the family business set up. His words and actions prove indecency of his nature. He addresses his father as a "confounded nuisance" and a "bloody burden to the Earth". He has an excessive lust for money and spends all his intelligence and energy in making money. Excessive drinking has made him impotent. He never follows morality or legal restrictions. He is a self centered person. In response to Pappa's bad words as bad for him Ramakant says: "As the seed, so the tree! Did we ever ask to be produced?" (Pg. 211).

Ramakant violently interacts with each member of the family. His financial condition is not good and he wants more money. He constantly dreams of a bungalow, car and money. He violently interplays with his family members one by one. He hatches a conspiracy with Umakant and Manik to rob Pappa. Afraid of getting injured, Pappa agrees to hand over his remaining money to Ramakant. There are many incidences depicting the physical, sexual and verbal violent interplay of contradiction in 'Gidhade'.

Ramakant kicks Manik in the belly repeatedly and aborts her. The violent actions of Ramakant show inhuman behaviour in blood relationship.

Ramakant treats his wife as genuine egoist and male chauvinist throughout the play. He desperately wishes to have a son but does not accept reality that his excessive drinking is responsible for this problem. He has no regard for his dutiful wife's sane advice. He orders Rama to look after the home.

When Ramakant comes to know that Rama is carrying child of Rajaninath, he forcefully aborts the child. At the end of the play he runs away from the house and escapes from his creditors. Unlike other characters of Tendulkar, Ramakant does not have grey shed. He is portrayed as only black shed character and no goodness is there.

‘Sakharam Binder’ is a character of interplay between basic instinct of sexual urge and violence in a human being. The playwright has brought out the complexities in the human nature through his insightful portrayal of Sakharam as a strange combination of sensibility and insensibility. Sakharam is man who lives life according to his own beliefs. He does not believe in the institution of marriage. He offers shelter to women who have been deserted by their husbands and makes them perform all the wifely

duties in his house. Tendulkar portrays him as a self-centered pleasure-seeker who exploits the deserted women to satisfy his lust.

The bitter experiences in his childhood have crushed his tender feelings. Such experiences of, have life turned him into a rough and tough guy who is a live example of terror. Shailaja Wadikar observes that:

“The want of love has generated a kind of fierceness in Sakharam's temperament. As a result, he turns into a masochist who seeks pleasure in inflicting pains and miseries on others.”

18

While explaining the rules of living in his house to Laxmi, Sakharam condemns the hypocrisy of the people in the society. He looks like a liberal man but as far as his house is concern he is rigid. He mocks at women for showing devotion to their cruel husbands and ironically he behaves in the same manner. He makes them slave. V.M. Madge says:

“The self-proclaimed unorthodoxy of Sakharam provides Tendulkar an opportunity to rail at the middle-class sensibilities of his audience and shock them by his unorthodox views and opinions.”¹⁹

Sakharam is unaware of the self-contradictions in his behaviour and thinking.

The few months' relationship with Laxmi changes Sakharam. He starts behaving like a gentle person. Sakharam's relationship with Laxmi cannot last for a long time due to the inherent differences in their personalities. Sakharam is fed up with Laxmi. He kicks her out and brings Champa to his house as his next mistress. Champa is exactly opposite to Laxmi. Sakharam interplays complexity with the changing circumstances. The physical beauty and aggressive nature of Champa inflames Sakharam's sexual hunger. Once a wild animal is now in control of a ring master.

When Laxmi returns to his house Champa forces him to allow Laxmi to stay in the house. The violent interplay of contradiction of simultaneous presence of Laxmi and Champa makes Sakharam impotent. His ego is deeply hurt when Champa refuses to have intercourse with him citing his impotence as its reason. Laxmi discloses the fact that Champa is having an affair with Dawood. Sakharam become furious and he murders Champa. Sakharam realizes the gravity of his crime and is frightened.

Sakharam is never scared by anyone. He is now scared of punishment by law. He is forced to hide Champa's corpse in order to escape punishment from law. He is frightened and unable to move. Laxmi takes control of the

situation and starts instructing him what he should do. At the end Sakharam is in total control of Laxmi.

Tendulkar believes that violence and sexual urge are the basic instincts of human beings and natural traits of human nature. G. Mallikarjuna says:

“The eponymous character of Tendulkar’s play ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’ stands for the basic human instinct of violence and that of Nana Phadnavis in the same play stands for the instinct of sexual urge.”²⁰

Through these two characters and their interplay, Tendulkar wants to explore the process of transformation of power. The playwright conveys that wherever there is Nana Phadnavis, there is Ghashiram, and vice-versa.

Ghashiram, a North Indian Brahmin, arrives in Poona in search of a fortune. Being a Kanauj Brahmin, Ghashiram is an alien in the Poona Brahmin Community. Ghashiram had come with high hopes to Poona, but he only gets pain and humiliation. Mad with rage and grief, he vows to take revenge. Ghashiram needs power. He presents his daughter to Nana and in return he gets Kotwalship of Poona. He suppresses his conscience.

After becoming the Kotwal, Ghashiram begins a control of terror in Poona. He starts persecuting the Brahmins of Poona. His daughter Gauri dies during her abortion. Ghashiram becomes furious and he approaches Nana with murder in his heart. Nana suggests Ghashiram that he will lose the Kotwalship of Poona if he dares to go against Nana. Ghashiram obediently surrenders to Nana's authoritarian talk. He decides to forget the death of his daughter in order to retain his Kotwalship.

Nana realizes that Ghashiram may become harmful to him in future. He hands over Ghashiram to the bloodthirsty crowd of Brahmins. Crowd beat him to death. Ghashiram in his dying moments blames himself for his daughter's death and accepts his suffering and death as a just punishment of that crime. Tendulkar tactfully articulate violent interplay of contradiction through 'Ghashiram Kotwal'.

Tendulkar exposes the hypocrisy of Jaisingh. He is a symbol of modern society. He just wants to use 'Kamala' as a ladder to get money, reputation and fame. He is not really concerned about the difficulty of helpless women. Shailaja Wadikar observers:

“Jaisingh uses ‘Kamala’ as a means by which he can get a promotion in his job and win reputation in his professional career.”²¹

He does not have concern about ‘Kamala’'s future after his press conference.

Jaisingh's attitude towards his wife is the same. He uses her only as an object of enjoyment and as a slave to look after his house. Catherine Thankamma aptly comments:

“Jaisingh remains totally indifferent to Sarita's feelings. He expects Sarita to submit to his desire for intercourse whether she wants it or not and calls her a ‘bitch’ when she refuses to cooperate with him.”²²

Some powerful elements in society dislike the act of Jaisingh so he is dismissed from the job. Jaisingh is a pitiable figure at the end of the play. Through the character of Jaisingh, Tendulkar interplays on the contradictions of male egoism, domination, selfishness and hypocrisy of the modern success-oriented generation.

Tendulkar focuses on the inherent contradiction of human being. He brings out the dark side of human nature through the horrible actions of these characters and generates hatred for evil in the minds of his reader and

audience. It is Tendulkar's indirect method of removing the social evils by interplaying through his characters. He expresses man's inhumanity to man and the fundamental evil inherent in human nature. We find doomed individuals struggling against a hostile society as well as the flaws in their own nature in his plays. Tendulkar ruthlessly dissects human nature and exposes its basic aspects such as lust, greed and violence. Thus Tendulkar uses violent interplay of contradiction in terms of self contradiction, person to person contradiction, group contradiction and contradiction within the society.

References:

1. Tung, Mao-Tse, "Selected works of Mao-Tse Tung", Vol.2, People's Publishing House Ltd, Bombay-4, 1954, Pg. 10
2. Marx, K. Engels, F. (1848) The Communist Manifesto. Source: Marx/Engels Selected Works, Moscow: Progress Publishers, (1) 1969, Pg. 98-137
3. Tung, Mao-Tse, "Selected works of Mao-Tse Tung", Vol.2, People's Publishing House Ltd, Bombay-4, 1954, Pg. 13
4. Tendulkar, "Vijay Tendulkar and Violence: Then and Now" Dir. Atul Pethe, ICCA, Documentary, 2010.
5. Ibid.
6. Gokhale, Shanta. "Tendulkar on his own Terms", Madge V.M. Vijay Tendulkar's Plays An Anthology of Recent Criticism. New Delhi: Pencraft International. 2007. Pg. 32.
7. Deshpande Kalindi. Capitulation to Conservatism: Vijay Tendulkar's Women Characters. Madge V.M. Vijay Tendulkar's Plays An Anthology of Recent Criticism. New Delhi: Pencraft International. 2007. Pg. 91.
8. Desai, Hemang, Polarity in Female Psyche: Burrowing into the Mystery in Vijay Tendulkar's Silence! The Court is in Session <http://www.flonnet.com/fl2224/stories/20051202001008500.html>. Date 18.6.2009

9. Interview: Vijay Tendulkar in Conversation with Gowri Ramnarayan. Madge V.M. Vijay Tendulkar's Plays An Anthology of Recent Criticism. New Delhi: Pencraft International. 2007. Pg. 171.
10. Simon, Shibu. Man-Woman Relationship in the Plays of Vijay Tendulkar. The Plays of Vijay Tendulkar Critical Explorations.eds. Amar Nath Prasad, Satish Barbuddhe. New Delhi: Sarup & Sons, 2008. Pg. 187.
11. Wadikar Shailaja B. Vijay Tendulkar A Pioneer Playwright. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers & Distributors (P) Ltd. 2008. Pg. 77.
12. Gokhale Shanta. Tendulkar on his own Terms. Madge V.M. Vijay Tendulkar's Plays An Anthology of Recent Criticism. New Delhi: Pencraft International. 2007. Pg. 42.
13. Gosavi, Nutan. 'Kanyadaan': An Expose of Political Progressives. Madge, V.M. Vijay Tendulkar's Plays An Anthology of Recent Criticism. New Delhi: Pencraft International. 2007. Pg. 158.
14. Bandyopadhyay, Samik. Vijay Tendulkar. Collected Plays in Translation. New Delhi: OUP, 2003. Pg. 2.
15. Wadikar Shailaja B. Vijay Tendulkar A Pioneer Playwright. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers & Distributors (P) Ltd. 2008. Pg. 123.
16. Thankamma, Catherine. Women that Patriarchy Created: The Plays of Vijay Tendulkar, Mahesh Dattani and Mahasweta Devi. Vijay Tendulkar's Plays An Anthology of Recent Criticism. ed. Madge V.M. New Delhi: Pencraft International. 2007. Pg. 83, 84.

17. Dani, A.PG. Vijay Tendulkar's 'Gidhade' ('Gidhade') and John Webster's The Duchess of Malfi. Ed. Madge V.M. Vijay Tendulkar's Plays An Anthology of Recent Criticism. New Delhi: Pencraft International. 2007. Pg. 114,115.
18. Wadikar, Shailaja B. Vijay Tendulkar A Pioneer Playwright. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers & Distributors (P) Ltd. 2008. Pg. 102.
19. Madge, V.M. Vijay Tendulkar's Plays An Anthology of Recent Criticism. New Delhi: Pencraft International. 2007. Pg. 123.
20. G. Mallikarjuna. 'Ghashiram Kotwal': A Study. Vijay Tendulkar's 'Ghashiram Kotwal' A Reader's Companion ed. M. Sarat Babu. New Delhi: Asia book club. 2003. Pg. 85.
21. Wadikar, Shailaja B. Vijay Tendulkar A Pioneer Playwright. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers & Distributors (P) Ltd. 2008. Pg. 102.
22. Thankamma, Catherine. Women that Patriarchy Created: The Plays of Vijay Tendulkar, Mahesh Dattani and Mahasweta Devi. Madge V.M. Vijay Tendulkar's Plays An Anthology of Recent Criticism. New Delhi: Pencraft International. 2007. Pg. 81.

All the textual references are taken from – "Vijay Tendulkar. Collected Plays in Translation", Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2006.

Chapter 4

“Cruel game of silence to suppress women’s sexual desire”

Shantata Court Chalu Ahe.

‘The central idea and life depicted in this play belongs here only’ Vijay Tendulkar. ¹

This statement is written in preface of the play which shows that ‘Silence the court is in session’ depicts the life of Indian society. The Play ‘Shantata Court Chalu Ahe’ is based on a program of mock court. A mock court is always based on incidents of day to day life with a thread of humour. Of course there is intellectual discussions, satire, is always there in the performance but the prime focus is entertainment of the spectators. It is one kind of fixed improvisation so mock court has its liveliness.

‘Silence! The Court is in Session’ is a play which somehow spontaneously turns into a cruel mock-trial. ‘Silence! The Court is in Session’ is a three-act play. A group of around ten people arrive at village from diverse backgrounds. They all are members of “The Sonar Moti Tenement (Bombay) Progressive Association (SMTPA). Their main intention is to create awareness by enacting a mock trial. For this particular

evening, the group is meeting to perform a mock trial protesting against President Johnson's production of atomic weapons.

The action takes place in a hall near a village. As the setting remains the same throughout the play and there is not much lapse of time, there are no scene divisions of the acts in the play. Through the dialogue between Leela Benare, the protagonist of the play and Samant, a villager, Tendulkar provides the background information to the reader-audience. First act is of introduction of the salient features of different characters of the play. Tendulkar introduces the character sketch through routine talk and general gossip between the characters. The performance of mock court is scheduled at evening so they have to kill the time. Here Tendulkar skillfully articulate intricacies and nuances of characterization through routine talk between the members of the group.

The characters are as follows. Raghu Samant is a mild-mannered and friendly young man of that village. Leela Benare is a school teacher of eight years standing. She is independent and bold. She has good sense of humour. She has been charged for having illicit relationship with professor Damle and for infanticide. Sukhatme is introduced as a lawyer in the stage directions. Balu Rokde is a young boy, he was given shelter by the

Kashikars, who fed, clothed and educated him. He accompanies them and takes orders from them. Ponshe is a Science student. He has failed his intermediate examinations. He smokes a pipe and works as a clerk at the Central Telegraph office. Mrs. Kashikar is wife of Mr. Kashikar. Her husband is very rude towards her, puts her down on every occasion. Mr. Kashikar is the dominant husband to his wife. He is referred to as the chairman of the group by Benare. Karnik is an experimental theatre actor, shown as habituated to chewing pan. Benare tells Samant and the viewers more about the other characters than she lets on about herself.

Benare is quite unprepared when she is approached by Kashikar as she comes out of the washroom, singing. She is accused of the crime of infanticide, the killing of the new born child or infant. This is a crime that despite being punishable by the law often surfaces in modern India. The first act ends with everyone looking serious and Benare in a stunned condition with her being accused of the crime of infanticide. Suddenly, play acting moves into a more real world of intrigue, suspicion, crime and recrimination. The first act of the play concludes on a note of great tension. While Act I allowed Benare to modulate our responses to all the other characters, Act II reveals to us new aspects of Benare's life.

At the beginning of Act II After a few false starts, slapstick and comic in nature, Benare who is charged with the crime of infanticide denies it. This is followed by the argument of the prosecution, represented by Sukhatme. Sukhatme preaches on the significance of motherhood and highlights the glorification and deification of the role of the mother in Indian culture. Kashikar adds to this, quoting from the Sanskrit and reiterates the high status of the mother and the motherland, both of which supersede even that of heaven. Such glorious elevations of women as mothers are part of the history of the nationalist movements. At that time women's identities were fixed within the domestic procreative space around notion of the motherland. After declaring that the status of a mother is sanctified, the court proceeds to cross-examine Benare.

Now sudden shift comes in the play. The play or mock trial moves from the question of infanticide to an exploration of personal relationships in Benare's case. A great deal of shocking pleasure and smugness is displayed by all the characters who offer gossipy details of their exchanges with Benare. This is really the private secret that is slowly unveiling itself in Act II and will finally be made public in Act III, namely how men view women and how the very mention of women conjures up certain stereotypical roles and identities for women.

Act III is longer, the most intense and most serious of all the three acts. The cross-examination now is firm and harsh. She does not answer any of the questions that are directed at her. The characters go on how this is only a mock trial. The entire focus of Act III shifts from an investigation of the possibility of infanticide to a gradually constructed narrative of Benare's illicit relationship, her immorality and an indictment of her very presence which is seen as a "canker in society."

Benare breaks her silence in Act III and communes with the audience, with her soliloquy. Benare's soliloquy allows the audience to view her situation from a different perspective. Yet, literally and metaphorically, the characters in the play who represent the community she lives in do not hear her. Her version falls on deaf ears and frozen hearts and brains. Kashikar, the judge announces the verdict of the mock trial. Benare is seen as attempting to short-circuit all social codes and mores. She is accused of having committed a terrible crime and she is informed that the child in her womb will be destroyed. The last image on the stage is that of a Benare who struggles to move, but cannot. The play ends with a song of a grieving sparrow whose secure world has been destroyed by predators. The play ends here.

When play starts we can see a room with useless things spread all over and two doors, one is to go outside and second one is entrance. When Entrance door opens, audience is able to see a man holding a lock and a parrot made by green cloth in his hands. His first dialogue is “This is it. Come in. This is the hall. They seem to have cleaned it up a bit this morning – because of the show.” (Pg. 55) clearly depicts that he is a newcomer to this place.

Now very interestingly we find a detailed description ² of physical gestures of that newcomer and a woman named accordingly Samant and Benare. Benare holding her finger into her lips and physical movement of Samant depicts that he is a simple and shy person.

Now conversation starts. Samant tells specialty of the entrance door. Due to some defect it has become a trap door which opens only from outside. If someone closes the door strongly from inside it will stuck from outside and the person is trapped inside. Now audience realizes that Samant is not a newcomer. He added the story how his finger got jammed in the stopper and how he had suffered.

Benare says “Goodness! I am feeling marvelous. I got down at the station with all the others, and suddenly, after many days, I felt wonderful! I

felt even more wonderful coming here with you. I'm so glad the others fell behind! We rushed ahead, didn't we? Let's leave everyone behind, I thought, and go somewhere far, far away with you!" (Pg -55)

What does these dialogues reflects? Childishness? Dreamy state of mind? Or a desire to start a new life with a new man? Desire to live a new natural life? Or all of these? Benare looks cheerful and carefree like a child. She is free of hypocrisy that characterizes the rest of the group.

Tendulkar portrays all these intricacies very well. This artistic depiction is the specialty of Tendulkar. He plays with the intellectuality and emotions of the spectator. The 'truth' behind 'mock' is significant. He symbolizes each and every aspect of central character. For 'Silence! The Court is in Session', Tendulkar got inspiration from a real-life incident. As he says:

"I met an amateur group that was on its way to stage a mock trial in Vile-Parle, a suburb of Mumbai. While overhearing their conversation, the outline of the play began to take shape in my mind, and the ultimate result of it was the birth and creation of the play." ³

The original Marathi play was written for the Rangayan at the instance of Arvind and Sulabha Deshpande in 1967, and was first performed

in its English version in 1971, in Chennai, and was directed by Ammu Mathew.

Expression of Ms. Benare creates confusion for Samant. He says “With me? You’re very nice indeed. And shall I tell you something? You are a very pure and good person. I like you.” (Pg. 55/56) This depicts that he is spellbound by Benare. And Benare enjoyed playing with his innocence and asks many questions which he reply with energetic innocent answers. This conversation and words like ‘Mohinividhya’, ‘Jadu che prayog’ (Magic Shows), ‘Dhrashtibhram’ etc. creates humor.

In reply Benare expresses so many things. Here, she falls into past. She talks about her personality, her discipline, dedication, spontaneity, etc, but her words like snatching blood and run away like coward, character investigation, and low level of colleagues are impossible to understand by Samant, so he continues with his own thoughts. It creates humor beneath seriousness. Here, Tendulkar skillfully portray Benare’s characterization.

Here, we have two people in front of us, ‘Benare’, in her trance, and ‘Samant’ in his confused state of mind. After generous questioning by Samant, Benare comes out from trance and behaves as a normal being humming an English song. Song used by Tendulkar is also symbolic, which

depicts inner reality of Benare. Suddenly she gets diverted to another thing which depicts her unstable psychological condition.

This type of scene is specialty of Tendulkar's writing. The silence between the dialogues, silence between physical actions is clearly instructed in text of the play by Tendulkar.

Though dialogues between Samant and Benare are sort of comic touch and blurred, the entire conversation is connected to Benare's life. Tendulkar is one of the writers who use each and every word with precaution. Tendulkar never uses a single word meaninglessly. His characters are unique in action and every character has its own language of expression. We never find implantation of Tendulkar's language on His characters.

As Tendulkar says:

“The one characteristic of my plays, which I can legitimately boast of is characterization. My character are not cardboard characters; they do not speak my language; rather I do not speak my language through them; they are not my mouth-pieces; but each of them has his or her own separate existence and expression”⁴

While conversing with Samant, Benare introduces other characters sarcastically, as per her words: “There’s Mrs. Hand-that- Rocks –the – Cradle. I mean Mrs. Kashikar. What an excellent housewife the poor woman is! A real Hand-that-Rocks-the cradle type! Balu Rokde. Who else? Well, we have an Expert on the Law. He’s such an authority on the subject, even a desperate client won’t go anywhere near him! He just sits alone in the barristers’ room at court, swatting flies with legal precedents! And in his tenement, he sits alone killing houseflies! And there’s a ‘hmm!’ with us! (Puts an imaginary pipe in her mouth.) Hmm! Sci-en-tist! Inter-failed! And we have an Intellectual too. That means someone who prides himself on his book learning. But when there’s a real life problem, away he runs! Hides his head” (Pg. 59/60) reflects humor as well as internal anger of Leela Benare. Reaction of Samant, accumulate humor but seriousness beneath loneliness of Benare, discomforts the audience.

Other characters of the play come into the hall and after some normal activity they all discuss about each other. Though it will not help the play to get motion, Tendulkar subtly emphasizes on the relationship of the characters with each other, all people are snatching each other but here, Tendulkar makes situations in comic way. At this level of the play audience is not aware about what is going to happen in next level of the play.

A gentle discussion is going on between the people gathered there about how to kill the time till show. The play is scheduled to be performed in the evening. The group has nothing to do before that. Bored, the members hit upon a plan. They would enact improvised trial. The proposal is ironically, made spontaneously by Benare. All agree to rehearse a fake trial with a fake charge on someone. Motive of the rehearsal is to show Samant, procedure of mock court but something is rotten in the state of mind of all characters except Benare so the others find in it an opportunity to dig up Benare's past 'sins'. They get an opportunity to humiliate and punish her publically and establish them for being the conscience keepers of society. And a sudden announcement takes place:

“Prisoner Miss Benare, under Section No 302 of the Indian penal code you are accused of the crime of infanticide. Are you guilty or not guilty of the aforementioned crime?” (Pg-74) Suddenly situation changes... Benare is stunned. Audience is shocked and first act drops with an interval Second act starts with above mention announcement.

The mock trial exposes the real functioning of the judicial process which is supposed to deliver justice. Leela Benare's sin in the society's view is that she is an unwed mother and including this sin she got abortion and

killed that unborn child. She has been in love with Professor Damle. She must be mesmerized with Damle's intellect capacity. Damle is a Married man, with five children. Damle exploits Benare physically and discards her when she asks him to help her. Later on she says: "He wasn't a god. He was man. For whom everything was of the body, for the body! That's all! (Pg. 118)

Damle is the second elderly man in Benare's life who used her physically and then cast her off. The first person who exploited her was her maternal uncle who physically abused her when she was an innocent child of thirteen years only. It is very interesting portrayal of internalization of violence inside a woman. The hesitant relationship of love-hatred and admiration-contempt can easily locate in her attitude towards the authority of the mock-trial court, particularly as represented by Kashikar and Sukhatme. She wants to refuse them but can't bring herself to refuse to stand trial before them. She simultaneously protests and accepts their authority.

The society remains silent; this authority remains silent and never wanted to punish Damle for his sin to exploit a woman who wants to fulfill her emotional desire. Damle's absence does not invite any punishment or even criticism from the court. He is the absent center of Leela's destiny. The

power he wields even in his absence hints at the hidden power of the discourses that lie behind the cruelty of gender discrimination in society. In his absence, he appears to wield the authority of the Freudian father figure, which Leela at once rebels against and is fascinated by. It is the same authority, embodied in Kashikar, the judge and Sukhatme, the public prosecutor that enchants and paralyzes Leela when her sins are being recounted and judged.

The judicial process aims at exposing the victim's sins. The prosecutors of Leela Benare find it a most pleasurable thing to do since it satisfies their sadistic impulses: the more the victim is tormented, the greater is their pleasure. If the victim refuses to be a part of the process by refusing to answer their questions, the persecutors feel frustrated and powerless. They accuse her of spoiling the game. Sukhatme says: "Why are you so grave all of a sudden? After all, it's a game. Just a game, that's all. Why are you so serious?" (Pg-75) Tendulkar uses the word "game" which is significant. Though it is an improvised mock trial, game has begun internally. It is the game of silence and its core is cruelty. People like Kashikar, Sukhatme, Ponkshe, Rokde and Karnik represent the herd instinct of the failed and the powerless who try to cover up their weakness and failure under the guise of morality. Anyone who does not confront to the herd morality must be shown

the way and normalize with the process of torture and sacrifice. It is the false mask of morality which subjugate to a woman who has her own desires. And reality is, these people are weak and hypocrite and just trying to behave like strong.

This is the thing Nietzsche discusses in his book on Genealogy of Morals. Like he says:

“The so called ideals are an excuse of the weak for not being like the strong.”⁵

In second act of the play starts with the freezing point of first act and as the play within the play unfolds, we witness the performance of the trial. Yes it is a performance because a real trial is not possible; the crime is not fit in the parameter of judicial rules of law. The trial is conducted on the basis of rules of morality. But, though it is very clear that this trial is a performance, it is not a farce. The trial achieves goal of the offender-victim's punishment and the victimizers' self-gratification. Here victimizer's target is victim's innocence, spontaneity and brilliance not only because of gender bias but these qualities of victim make others feel smaller and inferior. We can also notice the naturalness with which all the characters perform their improvisational roles, which shows the genuineness of their

prejudices which are against a woman who wishes to be free, who chooses the way to fulfill her sexual-emotional desire. Benare's persecutors are very natural in their self-conduct, almost childishly innocent, ignorant in their cruelty, yet they are treacherously destructive.

It is obvious thing that the cruel game begins. We can say it never stops. This game of silence to suppress a woman's sexual desire is infinite. From old age civilization we, the society embed the rules of morality and it is obvious that desires always rebel against so called rules of the society. Society considers these rebels as a different human being.

Here, Leela Benare is different, and this is what makes her the target of her persecutor's rage. This game is about the wish to normalize, to eliminate any difference, to bring every individual in to ideal structure of society. The group tried to implicate that the powerful motive behind the mock-trial is establishment of moral values but truth is different. They tried to settle the score with Benare. Reliable and hard working teacher like her is superior to others is unacceptable to others: "But my teaching's perfect. I've put my whole life into it—I've worn myself to a shadow in this job!" (Pg. 58)

She is also aware of her accomplishment as a reliable teacher: “In school, when the first bell rings, my foot’s already on the threshold. I haven’t heard a single reproach for not being on time these past eight years nor about my teaching. I’m never behindhand with my lessons! Exercises corrected on time, too! Not a bit of room disapproval – I don’t give an inch of it to anyone!” (Pg. 57) But we cannot fail to notice that her extremely accurate attitude towards her work indicates the internalization of an extremely powerful and demanding father figure. It is the desire which leads her in to this type of accuracy into her work. Her desire is to be a leader, desire is to get attention which she could not get these years, and desire is to be taken care by a masculine intellect personality. These all desire leads her in to a relationship where she doesn’t want more but only emotional support. She gets support from Prof. Damle in terms of physical relationship.

Her satisfaction invites the jealousy of her to less fortunate and less successful colleagues and makes them to find out one or other fault with her moral conduct. The mock trial is the only opportunity they get to settle their imaginary scores with her. As a result, they crouch down as low as anyone can in order to degrade her and to show that she is morally inferior to them. This cruel game of silence is their way of proving their own superiority to her.

The play also throws light on the double edged weapon of the popular debate of motherhood, nationalism, honour, social responsibilities. These discourses are supposed to empower woman but often used against women's desire. People of the society blend desire with ethics. Women are held responsible for the dignity and honour of motherhood and through that for preserving the ancient cultural tradition of the country. Practically speaking, instead of empowering them these discourses crush their freedom in the name of responsibility and the process of squashing is silently running and no one wants to confront about this process. The vague and unjustified notions of morality and motherhood are used to restrict Leela Benare's freedom during trial.

Here Tendulkar puts words into the dialogues of characters like Kashikar, Sukhatme which are very significant. It reflects inner reality of the hypocrite society. Mr. Kashikar calls her "A sinful canker on the body of the society." (Pg. 112), the words suggesting a utopian dream of recovering some lost organic purity of woman. In the words of Nanasaheb: "It is a sin to be pregnant before marriage. It would be still more immoral to let such a woman teach in such a condition!" (Pg. 113)

Miss Leela Benare tries to defend herself through a long soliloquy. "The parrot to the sparrow said, "Why, of why, are your eyes so red?" Oh, my dear friend, what shall I say/" Someone has stolen my nest away. Sparrow, sparrow, poor little sparrow 'oh brother crow, oh, brother crow. Were you there? Did you see it go?" No, I don't know I didn't see, what are your troubles to do with me? O sparrow, sparrow, poor little sparrow."(Pg. 121)

But Sukhatme neglects and says :

“The woman who is an accused has made monstrous blot on the scared brow of motherhood... Her conduct has blackened all social and moral values.... If such socially destructive tendencies are encouraged to flourish, this country and its culture will be totally destroyed... woman is not fit for independence...” (Pg. 114-115). Here crushing of woman’s freedom is important. A woman has no right to fulfill her desire, and if a man wishes to fulfill his desire, he can have so many ways and no one even talks about that.

Men are portrayed and delineated as embodiments of hypocrisy, selfishness and treachery. Men like Kashikar, Sukhatme, Ponkshe and Karnik whose words and deeds expose their inherent malice and hypocrisy.

Women, on the other hand, are portrayed as helpless victims of the conspiracies hatched by men. Benare of 'Silence! The Court is in Session' is being mercilessly harassed by a cruel game played innocently by co-actors.

The anti-rational attitude is confirmed when Kashikar supports the custom of child-marriage, wishing, that it should be revived. Here the most interesting thing is Tendulkar's specialty of putting the opposition of ideas and social progress in the excuse of preservation of national culture. In contrast to this, there is Leela Benare's passionate declaration of individuality, her defense of personal freedom and her expression of the rights of the body:

"I despise this body – and I love it! I hate it – but it's all you have in the end, isn't it? It will be there. It will be yours. Where will it go without you? And where will you go if you reject it? Don't be ungrateful. It was your body that once burnt and gave you a moment so beautiful, so blissful, so near to heaven!" (Pg. 118)

Woman has always been the subaltern across cultural boundaries. Men need her, love her, adore her and write about her; but they do so in relation to their own lives. In patriarchy, male privilege is marked as having control over protection and representation of pleasure. Cultural

representations have been designed to accommodate male preferences and patterns of gratification. Women's pleasures have been reduced in importance to implanted morality.

Here Benare's expression is not only an expression of a character in a play, but, it is an expression of a primitive woman whose freedom was crushed in the process of civilization. The ambivalence and complexity of Leela's attitude to the body is duly articulated by the playwright and seems to indicate the absence of any solution. Similarly, Benare asserts her right to give birth to her child, the product of the ruined union, and her right to live her life in her own way: "I'll decide what to do with myself; everyone should be able to! That can't be anyone else's business; understand? Everyone has a bent, a manner, an aim in life. What's anyone else to do with these?" (Pg. 117).

But it is also clear that she is a victim of an imbalanced and distorted man-woman relationship which places woman in subjugation to man and society. Her playful overtures to Samant, her turbulent relationship with Damle, her unhappy infatuation with and exploitation by her maternal uncle and her marriage proposals to Ponkshe and Rokde, all these are used against her during the mock-trial to discipline and subjugate her. To these are added

the narratives of various witnesses which are then used to fabricate a pseudo-reality. For example, Rokde accuses Benare of holding his hand and trying to take advantage of him. Ponkshe accuses her of proposing to him.

Tendulkar skillfully presents the mentality of so called moral values. The meaning between the lines presented in the play applies to our lives which cherish the illusion of freedom, lives which itself is in the process of illusionistic liberalism and idealism.

How far our lives are shaped by narratives is made stunningly clear through the interplay of fiction and reality in the play. The make-believe narratives are accepted by others as true. When called upon to act as a witness, Samant reads out his “statement” from a novel he happens to be reading. The testimony is accepted to be true simply because Samant’s story-out-of-the-novel seems to fit in well with the already half-cooked narrative of Leela’s moral transgressions. The mock judge knows well that Samant’s story has nothing to do with Leela. When Samant protests against the outcome of his testimony, Sukhatme say, “Mr. Samant, for the sake of the trial, we’re taking some things for granted,” (Pg. 90) at which Karnik says, “The crime itself is imaginary. What more do you want? It’s all

imaginary... that's all what it is" (Pg. 90) And Ponkshe remarks, "Only the accused is real" (Pg. 90).

Similarly, in the incidents narrated by Rokde and Ponkshe, reality and fiction intermesh. The power of story-telling is so overwhelming that people accept these stories as history because they seem to provide the missing links in the narrative of a person's life. The witnesses conjure an imaginary picture of Leela's objectionable behavior and, through their stories, succeed in constructing a make-believe reality. The Leela of their stories is as much a construction as the events told in the stories are. Gradually, even she loses the ability to see herself as distinct from the stories that are told about her. In fact, every character in the role of witness comes to believe in the imaginary "truth" of his or her stories.

The mock-trial, thus, turns out to be an improvised performance within which various characters construct their own as well as others' identities. It becomes a kind of mirror of the society constructing identities through performances, which is obviously one of the major concerns of the play. The once exuberant Leela's reduction to a half-dead person is thus significant. The mock-trial divides Leela's life into two phases, pre-trial and post-trial. She is a confident, assertive and sensuous woman before the trial:

“I say it from my own experience. Life is not meant for anyone else. It’s your own life. It must be. It’s a very, very important thing. Every moment, every bit of it is precious --” (Pg. 61).

She knows what she is doing and what she wants out of life, and she thinks it is nobody’s business to interfere with her life or decide about it. But she is an altogether different woman after the mock-trial. Her attitude towards others in the group undergoes a complete change as the trial progresses. Earlier she had a mocking, jeering attitude towards all other members of the group. As she speaks:

“Kashikar can’t take a step without a prime objective! Besides him, there’s Mrs. Hand-that-Rocks-the-Cradle. I mean Mrs. Kashikar. What an excellent housewife the poor woman is! A real Hand-that-Rocks-the-Cradle type! But what’s the use? Mr. Prime Objective is tied up with uplifting the masses. And poor Hand-that-Rocks-the-Cradle has no cradle to rock!” (Pg. 59)

About Sukhatme and Ponkshe respectively, she has this to say: “He just sits alone in the barristers’ room at court, swatting flies with legal precedents! . . . And there’s a ‘Hmm!’ with us! Hmm! Scientist! Inter-failed!” (Pg. 59).

Her observations are very perceptive. Hence it is ironic that the same Kashikar, Sukhatme and Ponshe should make such a song and dance about her behavior. Slowly, in the course of the trial, her attitude changes and she becomes tolerant, docile and submissive. At the beginning of the trial, she showed traces of a mocking humor: “Thanks, for that, a masala pan is hereby issued to you” (Pg. 78), she says when Sukhatme warns her against showing contempt towards the court, she says pointing towards the washroom, “The court has gone into that room. So how can contempt of it be committed in this one?” (Pg. 81-82).

Her powerful humor slowly transforms into rage before she finally sinks into helplessness and submission, “I’ll smash up all this! I’ll smash it all to bits – into little bits!” (Pg. 93), and “You’ve all deliberately ganged up on me! You’ve plotted against me!” (Pg. 93)

By the end of the trial, she is a half-dead woman: “No, no! Don’t leave me alone! I’m scared of them... (Terrified, she hides her face and trembles) It’s true I did commit a sin” (Pg. 117), and “Life is very dreadful thing. Life must be hanged” (116).

She is no longer the proud, self-assertive and confident woman she was at the beginning of the mock-trial. The mock-trial continues until the

qualities which the others disapproved of in her are extinguished one by one and she has become an altogether different person. She loses her previous self and becomes another person – the morality-conscious, submissive self of a sinner. Her old and new states are symbolically suggested by the toy-parrot that is presented to her by Samant; the toy evokes her old, childlike innocence, but it is also an inarticulate piece of craft.

So, even as it indicates her loss of innocence through the death of the child in her, it also reflects her treatment as a plaything of social forces and collective psychological motivations. The conflict between the claims for freedom as an autonomous person and the demands made by society reveal an embattled territory. Leela Benare wants to be independent, assertive and alive to the senses, to be the person that she was before the trial, but society wants her to be submissive and a slave to its norms of morality.

The demands of society make her what she is post-trial. Her ‘self’ undergoes a terrible change during the process of the trial. But she only reluctantly accepts the new ‘self’ that others have forced on her. The mock-trial is thus indicative of the killing of her real ‘self’ and its replacement by a socially appropriate ‘self’ imposed on her. Tendulkar makes her condition

evident through direct intervention in the form of specific stage directions: “She looks half dead” (Pg. 109), and the following:

“There she sits down, half fainting. Then in paroxysms of torment, she collapses with her head on the table, motionless” (Pg. 119).

The play can be seen as deconstructing the stereotype of the Indian woman as Devi or Shakti: it demonstrates that there is no ideal Indian woman as such, apart from the real flesh-and-blood women. The identity of a woman is socially and culturally constructed, and the constructions serve certain socio-political and personal ends. Leela Benare is the example of a woman who, though antagonistic to socially acceptable codes of morality, appears to be an idealist; Mrs. Kashikar is the example of another kind of woman who is ostensibly respectable and morally superior yet proves to be spiteful, vengeful, unsuccessful, frustrated and jealous. Mrs. Kashikar would also like to be independent and strong-willed like Leela Benare, but since she lacks what it takes to be Leela Benare, she instead chooses to disgrace her publicly, “It’s the sly new fashion of women earning that makes everything go wrong. That’s how promiscuity has spread throughout our society” (Pg. 100), and “Free! Free! She’s free alright – in everything!” (Pg. 100) Mrs. Kashikar herself is a product of her economic dependence and

carries the stamp of her husband's relentlessly degrading attitude towards her.

We thus witness in the play a conflict between two subject positions, the real 'self' and performed 'self' through what the people in the amateur theatre group really are, what they would like to be, what they present themselves to be, and how the implicit and explicit social codes determine their identities. There is a kind of duplicity in the identities of almost all members of the group, including Leela Benare, of which they themselves may not be aware. This duplicity can be clearly grasped if we regard it in the light of the concept of subjectivity. Though Leela is different from others in not deceiving herself about her motives and intentions, yet she is helpless before the so-called system of morality. It is for this reason that she so desperately looks for someone who would lend to her unborn child his name as father: "He must have a mother... a father to call his own – a house – to be looked after – must have a good name!" (Pg. 118)

The society, with its moral codes and restrictions, is therefore already settled in Leela's consciousness. That is why the mock-trial hurts her so much. If she were above the society's normative codes, she would not have been hurt at all, or at least not so much. It appears that there is a distinction

between how others in the group see her and how she sees herself, but near the end of the play, when she cries out that she has committed a sin, these distinctions fade away. On the other hand, the authorities representing the law themselves are seen to be implicated in the violation of the law.

In the person of Damle, the law first seduces its subject to violate it and then pronounces judgment on her and punishes her. The inside and the outside are thus revealed as only convenient distinctions, behind which deeper complexities lie concealed. The play can thus be explored to reveal the construction of a woman's prejudice under the twin discourses of patriarchy and individualism. Whereas patriarchy oppresses and tames a woman into subjugation, the discourse of individualism makes her challenge and defies patriarchal norms.

The woman is, thus, caught in a web of multiple discourses pulling and tearing her apart. On the other hand, the play also looks into the bias of the oppressors as to what makes them so cruel, intolerant and unreasonable. That is the reason M. Sarat Babu quotes this:

“The play, (Silence the court is in session) exposes the inhuman violence in its verbal form of the patriarchal society against woman”⁶

Here, M. Sarat Babu's statement clearly indicates that there is existence of a silence towards this type of violence and it is exposed in the play. The society never allows a feminine gender to live free. Though we are talking about woman empowerment we are not ready to accept free form of freedom. It is a constant scenario that will be changed or not is a big question.

When a reporter asks Tendulkar after performance of his play "Sakharam Binder" in Tendulkar festival arranged by 'Ank' Mumbai, about the effectiveness and mirror image of contemporary society, he says:

"It is very sad that my play is contemporary... I wish we can raise a society where questions raised by me become outdated... I never wish for immortality of my play, but I always wish fatality of the problems in our society. But I mention we will never able to throw away the animal quality and hence problems remain constant." ⁷

There are so many critics discussed about this play. So many scholars say different opinions but suppression of desire is common among all. If we talk about issue of gender, it is a fact that we are born whole human beings, but gender based division of labour breaks us into male and female fragments. Each fragment retains only half of human potential. The retained

part overgrows to compensate for the other part that remains underdeveloped. These two polarized, deformed fragments are called men and women. These gender deformities are thus caused and gradually canonized by socio-cultural programming of sex roles. They are glorified and children trained to attain them through socialization since their birth.

Hogie Wyckoff writes:

“As women and men we are socialized to develop certain parts of personalities while suppressing development of other parts. This programming promotes a predetermined, stilted, and repetitive way of acting life”⁸

As per fundamental of psychology, every human has the potential for nurturing, controlling, rationality, intuition, spontaneity and adaption. To be masculine, men develop the faculties of controlling and rationality and to be feminine, women develop the faculties of nurturing and intuition. A game of suppression occurred in the process of civilization. Civilization suppresses the faculties of nurturing and intuition into masculine gender and it suppresses the faculties of controlling and rationalities into feminine gender. Development of adaptation is occurred in terms of culture, but not in nature. Means it is not developed by default natural process but it gradually

developed by culture, civilization. But in this process both gender lost their faculty of spontaneity and neither enjoys life.

The faculties of nurturing and intuition help women perform their culturally allotted function, child-rearing and house-keeping while control and rationality help men to perform their culturally allotted function, bread-earning. These differences cause alienation and antagonism between men and women. These alienation and antagonism leads to games to suppress each other and hence with the ownership of faculties of controlling and rationality masculine gender rules the society. So, the game of suppression of feminine desires prominently takes place in our society.

The ‘Silence! Court is in Session’ reflects everlastingness of the game. And it shows that when a character specifically a woman has natural qualities of liveliness and spontaneity the game starts. Leela Benare has a strong desire to enjoy life without being suffocated by the hegemony of culture. She is an embodiment of Nature’s innocence and spontaneity. When her behavior is classified as childish behavior she says: “Why, in the classroom, I’m the soul of seriousness! But I don’t see why one should go around all the time with a long face. Or a square face! Like that Ponkshe! We should laugh, we should play, we should sing! If we can and if they’ll let

us, we should dance too. Shouldn't have any false modesty or dignity! Or care for any one! I mean it. When your life is over, do you think anyone will give you a bit of theirs?" (Pg. 60-61)

Benare's lively nature and innocent beauty that are not distorted by culture attracts philanderers and thus lands her in danger several times. She withstands the violence and continues living joyfully. In her teens, she is seduced and sexually exploited by her own uncle. He does not marry her and is supported by her own mother. Benare overcomes this shock and completes her education. She becomes a teacher and earns a good reputation as a teacher. Her academic interest takes her to Prof. Damle whom she respects for his scholarship and intelligence. Though married, he exploits her sexually and betrays her. She request Rokde and Ponkshe to marry her. They refuse. Benare ridicules their diffidence and hypocrisy. Benare is very frank and open minded woman. She exposes the hypocrisy of people and laughs at their errors.

Benare is interested in drama, acting. So she becomes a member of drama troupe of amateur artists. Other than Benare all people of this group failed in life try to gratify their unfulfilled wishes through drama. Benare ridicules them. Here, quite interesting thing is the characterization developed

by Tendulkar. Rokde studies law but no client dares to go near him and he is going to play role of the lawyer in the mock trial. Pongshe who failed in intermediate is going to play scientist in the mock trial. Prof. Damle who is absent today's mock trial but Tendulkar explores his characteristics through dialogues of other people. And we can see that Prof. Damle is a great hero of books but runs away when the real problem arises. In our society we find ourselves confused about freedom. Instructions made by parents in childhood are deep rooted in our mind. So, we never ever dare to break the laws of society, laws of morality and laws of culture. In different way we can say that if we can't do it, we will never allow anyone to do it. It is a vicious circle created by process of development of culture.

So, here in this play all the people who don't get satisfaction, gather and try to take satisfaction through running a cruel game to suppress Benare's desire through tools of morality and idealism. All these people plan to vanquish her and settle the debt of mockery did by her. In the name of mock trial they play a game and expose her private life, humiliate her, and hurt her heart. They do not find fault of Prof. Damle, in fact no body discussed it. At first they accuse her of infanticide for trying to abort her fetus. Later, they accused her of becoming pregnant without marriage. All the people vanishes the arguments which made by Benare in her self-

defense. Concluding the trial, Sukhatme, the public prosecutor in the mock-trial, says to Mr. Kashikar, the judge: “Milord, the nature of the charge against the accused, Miss Leela Benare is truly dreadful. The woman who is an accused has made a heinous blot on the sacred brow of motherhood – which is purer than heaven. For that any punishment, however great that the law may give her will be too mild. The character of the accused is appalling. It is bankrupt of morality. Not only that, her conduct has blackened all social and moral values. The accused is public enemy number one. If such socially destructive tendencies are encouraged to flourish, this country and culture will be totally destroyed. Therefore, I say the court must take a very stern, inexorable view of the prisoner’s crime, without being trapped in any sentiment. Woman bears the grave responsibility of building the high values of the society. ‘Na Stri Swatantrayamarhati’ ‘Woman is not fit for independence’... That is the rule laid down for us by tradition. (Pg. 114-115)

Though men commit worst sexual crimes, people still say that women spoil the society. As Jandhyala Kameshwari argues, men are tacitly permitted to seek extra marital sexual pleasure while women’s sexuality is limited to motherhood within the marriage. Leela Benare strongly protests against these unjust patriarchal values and demands not only freedom but also the right over her body and to live in the way she likes. Benare says:

“Who are these people to say what I can or can’t do? My life is my own. I haven’t sold it to anyone for a job! My will is my own (Pg. 58)

Here Benare expresses her desire and her right to fulfill them. Still as play conveys we find that though she believe in her rights she wants recognition from the people around. She wants identification for her rights to fulfill desires which shows how the concepts of moral deeply rooted within a woman. She wants to prove truthfulness of what she is doing or did. This is the irony of our society. The victim of the game wants acceptance from the victimizer. This is the effect occur in the process of culturalization. So, we can see a woman can oppress a woman in the name of morality.

Here, even, Mrs. Kashikar joins the men in attacking Benare without any compassion. Like most of the women, she supports patriarchal values in spite of their being harmful to women. That is why the cynics of feminism declare that women are the enemies of women. But as we discussed as above, this happens due to the fact that woman urged for their survival to absorb, observe and propagate patriarchal culture. As argued by Srilata Batliwala in her brilliant article, “Why do women oppress women?”⁹ Same argument is made by M. Sarat Babu in his introduction. As he compares this play with Girish Karnad’s “Nagamandal” and Mohan Rakesh’s ‘Ashadh Ka

Ek Din' he finds the exposure of the gender biased value system of the patriarchal society in above mention plays.¹⁰

At the very beginning of the play, we find Benare as a lively, emotional but a self-assertive woman. She is deeply committed to her profession. But there are latent hints of her suppressed sufferings—"They're holding an enquiry, if you please! But my teaching's perfect. I've put my whole life into it—I've worn myself to a shadow in this job! Just because of one bit of slander, what can they do to me?" (Pg. 58) and "My life is my own—I haven't sold it to anyone for a job! My will is my own. My wishes are my own" (Pg. 58) This voice of self-assertion, this voice of individuality endows Benare with the identity of 'a new woman' emerging against the coercive attacks of patriarchy.

In this connection, Smita Paul comments in her book Theatre of Power:

"The women characters in Tendulkar's theatre undergo a series of sufferings and tortures as the victims of the hegemonic power-structure. In the male- dominated theatre-world they are constantly being 'other-ed'. In Silence! The focal point of interest lies is the struggle between women like Benare and her

antagonists headed by the orthodox Kashikar and his associates.”¹¹

As mentioned in play we can see that Benare undergo a series of suffering throughout her life. We can easily see that there are latent hints of her suppressed sufferings in her dialogues. This voice of self-assertion, this voice of individuality endows Benare with the identity of ‘a new woman’ emerging against the coercive attacks of patriarchy.

Before passing the final verdict on Benare, she is given ten seconds to defend her case. Now the motionless Benare stands up erect and says, “Yes, I have a lot to say” (Pg. 116) Then follows a long monologue in which Benare expresses her zest for life and tells how she is deprived of her wishes:

“My life was a burden to me. (Heaving a great sigh) But when you can’t lose it, you realize the value of it... There’s great joy in a suicide that’s failed. It’s greater even than the pain of living... I swallowed that poison, but didn’t even let a drop of it touch them! ... I cried inside, and I made them laugh. I was cracking up with despair, and I taught them hope. (Pg. 116-117) Benare hurls her denigrating attack against patriarchy in this monologue: “These are the mortal remains of some cultured men of the twentieth

century. See their faces—how ferocious they look! Their lips are full of lovely worn-out phrases! And their bellies are full of unsatisfied desires.”

(Pg. 117)

In the final verdict Benare is equated with ‘criminals and sinners’ and the court orders that she should live but the child in her womb should be destroyed. Writhing in pain, Benare, at first strongly resists and then stifled sobs come from her. In this context, L. Rahman in his book Tendulkar’s ‘Silence! The Court is in Session’ comments:

“Once Benare finds her voice couched in questioned language does make no truth-effect, she begins to sob with the idea in mind that though the field be lost, all is not lost; she has a mind which remains and will remain unconquered by the oppressive patriarchal ideology.”¹²

Though Benare desperately fights her lone battle and clamors that her life and her choices are her own; her voice is silenced by the destructive agencies of patriarchal institution.

It is well-known that ‘Shantata! Court Chalu Ahe’ was written under great pressure with the performance date hanging over Tendulkar’s head. Scenes went into rehearsal as and when they were written. Tendulkar finished writing the play just a few days ahead of the show. Despite the

impossible shortness of time, Arvind Deshpande, the director, insisted that it was incomplete without a statement by Benare at the end. She couldn't simply accept the terrible verdict pronounced against her and say nothing in her own defense. Tendulkar argued stubbornly against such a statement. As per Tendulkar, Benare, the character he had created, would never make it and the impact of the brutal verdict would in fact be reduced by its presence. He is against such monologue or statement.

But, finally, however, Deshpande won the round. Tendulkar allowed himself to be literally locked up in to a room to write the speech. His craft then comes into play and, instead of a speech, he wrote a kind of internal monologue which could be taken as speech in self defense but was actually and articulation of all that she had ever thought, felt and lived through.

Sulabha Deshpande refers to Tendulkar's doubts about the artistic validity of this dramatic monologue in her essay on doing Benare.¹³ She writes about the young girls who come to her for guidance in speaking this monologue for college competitions. None of them read the full play, yet those who have some initiative skills may even won the prizes for this monologue. Then a question rose that was the monologue that was forced out of Tendulkar against his wishes, indeed an external imposition on the

play? Sulabha Deshpande's answer to this question is negative. She argues that the monologue is so full of Benare's internal turbulence, her world view, her rebelliousness, her rage against a society that is happy to live in a rut without aim or purpose, her bitterness at the harassment she has suffered at its hands, she says:

“The resulting helplessness, her yearning for the laughing, romping, dancing life that is soon to be hers, her determination to bear it”¹⁴

This monologue has a strong impact, words are concentrated, and it reveals intricacies and nuances of Benare's suppressed emotions. It is obvious that this monologue can't be written reluctantly. Though Tendulkar was forced to write the monologue we can see clearly that Benare's internal thought are revealed forcefully. There is always discussion about whether Benare would have revealed so much of herself in the presence of the very people who would be the last to understand her feelings. As per Shanta Gokhale justified Tendulkar's point of view she writes:

“Benare, as Tendulkar has drawn her, never speaks directly. She needs so much to hide the pain in her from the crass and intensive world around her, that practically every remark she makes is tangential, devised to glance off the centre of her pain, to deflect attention from it. She is deliberately jocose, almost

frivolous, erratic in her responses, teasing, and mocking her colleagues. However, as the mock trial proceeds and quite accidentally stumbles on this inner arena of profound pain, she is numbed by its viciousness into silence. This is why Tendulkar felt that a long statement at the end would be out of character.”

15

Benare remains completely silent during the dissection of her personal life by her fellow actors during mock-trial. Even if she tries to speak, she is silenced by them. She is given a chance of defending herself at the end of the trial. Tendulkar mentions that all the characters remain in a frozen state during her long reply. The playwright wants to contradict two symbols. One is Benare who wants acceptance of her freedom and second symbol is deaf ears of society which never accepts her freedom. Tendulkar suggests that her reply falls on deaf ears. Benare must have to accept the Court's verdict and she must have to live in social structure. Tendulkar clearly depict about Benare's condition in his stage directions at the end of the play "Benare feebly stirs a little... then gives up the efforts..." (Pg. 120)

Director's point of view about this monologue can be justified through a simple argument made by Sulabha Deshpande:

“The play would have completely collapsed if the audience had felt, even for one moment, that the punishment Benare was

awarded was justified since she had committed the “crimes’ of falling in love with her uncle and attempting suicide at the age of fourteen, and, conducting an ‘illicit’ relationship with a married man, insisting on having his illegitimate baby and still asking to be permitted to face her impressionable students at school as if she had done no wrong”¹⁶

But we can clearly see that, Tendulkar though writes the monologues, he cleverly creates an internal expression made by Benare as a statement. As per one interpretation it will never be able to express her vibrant speech in reality but expressed as internal thought expressed through a monologue. And a woman remains silent as a result of a cruel game.

We can understand this game of silence through a story, that is:

There is a function in a house. So many children have come for the occasion. Children are playing in a room. One kid opens the window and suddenly a little sparrow comes from the window, enters in the room. All children are shouting. They are happy because they get a live toy for playing. All of them start playing with the little one. They want to catch her. Sparrow is enjoying the game. She only can fly. She is flying through fan, going in-out through window.

Children are happy, sparrow is happy. A naughty child closes the window. Now there is little fear in sparrow's mind, but still she is enjoying the show. She comes near the kids. All are happy. They start touching her. Little one doesn't mind. She knows children are innocent. Then what happens? And innocent child pulls a wing of her. She hurts, but is assured about innocence of children. Then another kid repeats the action, and one by one pulls wings of sparrow. It is the slaughter of innocence. Blood spreads, victim stands on the edge of die.

Suddenly a voice comes from kitchen "Food is ready". All kids run towards kitchen. Subjugated sparrow is alone, she isn't dead. She must have to experience extreme pain and sorrow. Children are in kitchen. They find Gulabjamun in plate. All of them forgot the sparrow. All are happy. They never able to know what happened in that closed room.

Society is like this room and the people of the society are like the children. After a long span of civilization we never understood the starting point of the cruel game. This game is nowhere else but it is within us. When a woman want to live free, when a woman wants something different than conventional reality, game starts and it is an endless process.

As a result of 'the cruel game of silence to suppress woman's sexual desire' we find a great, thrusting torch bearer play "Shantata Court Chalu Ahe". "Silence The Court is in Session."

References

- 1 Tendulkar, Vijay, introduction, 'Shantata Court Chalu Ahe' Mauj Prakashan Gruh, 1971
- 2 Ibid.
- 3 Vijay Tendulkar interviewed by Elizabeth Roy, in Indian Review of Books, Vol. 2, No. 7, April-May, 1993. Quoted by Samik Bandyopadhyay, Introduction, Collected Plays in Translation, New Delhi: OUP, 2002, xii-xiii.
4. Tendulkar, Vijay, Introduction, "Collected Play in Translation" Vol II. New Delhi: Penguin, 2005. Page, vii.
5. The Genealogy of Morals, translated by Horace Barnett Samuel, New York: Courier Dover Publications, 2003.
6. "Vijay Tendulkar's 'GHASHIRAM KOTWAL', A reader's companion" introduction by M. Sarat Babu, New Delhi: Asia Book Club, 2003
7. Interview of Tendulkar to Dr. Makarand Sathe in a documentary "Tendulkar and violence – Then and Now" on Vijay Tendulkar.
8. Hogie Wyckoff, "Sex role scripting in men and women," Scripts people live, Claude M. Steiner (New York: Bantam, 1980), Pg. 196.
9. Batliwala, Srilata, "Why do women oppress women?" The Hindu, Sunday Magazine, 2 May 1992, Pg. III.
10. Vijay Tendulkar's 'Ghashiram Kotwal' "Introduction" by M. Sarat Babu, Asia Book Club, New Delhi, 2003.

11. Paul, Smita. "Theatre of Power", Books Way Publishers & Distributors. Kolkata (2010)
12. Rahman, L. (2010). Tendulkar's 'Silence! The Court is in Session': A Study in Perspectives, Kolkata: Books Way Publishers & Distributors.
13. Ten Ani Amhi, ed. Pradip Mulye, Rajiv Naik, Vijay Tapas, Awishkar Prakashan, Mumbai, 1992, P. 16
14. Ibid., p.16
15. Gokhale Shanta, (2001), "Vijay Tendulkar" 'An Article written on Tendulkar on his own terms', Katha, New Delhi, 2001
16. Ten Ani Amhi, ed. Pradip Mulye, Rajiv Naik, Vijay Tapas, Awishkar Prakashan, Mumbai, 1992, P. 16

All the textual references are taken from – "Vijay Tendulkar. Collected Plays in Translation", Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2006.

Chapter 5

A curious case of Gender Violence - 'Sakharam Binder'

Tendulkar's 'Sakharam Binder' is a three-act play with brilliant use of interpersonal as well as personal conflicts of the characters. The first act consists of twelve scenes. Some of the scenes in the play are quite short. The third scene of the first act has no dialogues and only stage instructions regarding the visual to be presented.

Tendulkar portrays Sakharam's relationships with Laxmi and Champa, his seventh and eighth mistresses respectively, in this play. Sakharam is antagonist of institution of marriage. He prefers to have a contractual relationship with his women. He puts conditions before each woman he brings home. If she accepts his rules and conditions of his house including that of to satisfy his sexual need as her wife, then she is allowed to stay in the house otherwise she can straight way leave.

The first act begins with the arrival of Laxmi, Sakharam's seventh mistress, in his house. She is unable to adjust with Sakharam's hot temper and excessive demands. So Laxmi leaves Sakharam's house at the end of the first act. Though Laxmi's life is full of misery during her stay at Sakharam's

house, she manages to make him religious, soft and domesticated up to certain extent.

The second act deals with Sakharam's relationship with Champa, a sensuous and unconventional woman. This act depicts Sakharam's lust towards Champa. Sakharam once again becomes drunkard. Due to her worst circumstances Laxmi comes back to Sakharam at the end of the second act.

In the third act, Tendulkar portrays the complex psychological effect on Sakharam due to the simultaneous presence of Laxmi and Champa in his life. The presence of Laxmi and Champa at the same time creates chaos in Sakharam's mind. On one hand he was dissatisfied with Laxmi's coolness and religiosity and on other hand Champa's readiness to satisfy anyone even to dog or to corpse after getting drunk, also disturbs him. In presence of Laxmi he becomes impotent in his sexual relation with Chapa.

So, Sakharam orders Laxmi to leave his house. Laxmi discloses Champa's affair with Dawood to Sakharam so that she can manage to live with him. Sakharam murders Champa in his rage. The end of the play is ironic as Sakharam who used to pride himself for the openness of his behaviour is forced to seek help of Laxmi to hide Champa's corpse so that he can escape from punishment. Moreover he gets moral justification from

Laxmi that there is no sin in killing such sinner woman. We find a dramatic transformation of Laxmi into a cold blooded conspirator. The play ends.

Gender Violence is the core element of the play and Tendulkar has skillfully depicted it through the behaviour of all characters. Vijay Tendulkar

Comments:

“At very sensitive level, violence can be described as consciously hurting someone, whether it is physical violence or psychological violence... violence is something to be accepted as fact. It is of no use describing it as good or bad. Projections of it can be good or bad. ... Violence when turned into something else can certainly be defined as vitality, which can be very useful, very constructive. So, it depends on how you utilize it or curb it at times.”¹

‘Sakharam Binder’ is one of the most violent theatrical act of Tendulkar which had consciously hurts the religious moralist sentiments and psyche of the society at large, including authority- Censor board. A section of critics, mainly moralists and cultural constabulary criticised this play as vulgar, sensationalism. They had associated Tendulkar’s name with indecent Sexuality and violence. The first performance of the play or say the entry of ‘Sakharam Binder’ on the stage had created a havoc or rebel in Marathi and Indian Theatre. It had shaken the prevailing sophisticated theatre world. The

play was banned by Censor Board because Vijay Tendulkar had given a powerful detonation to all the previously established religious and moralist values, norms, artistic and aesthetic notions of culture and arts prevailing in the society. The great polemical debate and violent protest against the play and counter offensive in defence of play not just by theatre people but by all those who love democracy, freedom of expression unleashed the chain process of conflicts and radicalization of cultural domain and paved the way for better understanding of psycho-socio dynamics of culture, art and dramaturgy in relation to gender, gender violence.

It will be interesting to investigate Vijay Tendulkar's concept of 'Gender Violence' with his own theatrical works and to see how exactly he uses the violence as a device in his own theatrical works and how far this device succeeded in creating desirable constructive vitality in cultural field and society in general. As far as gender violence is concern we have already witnessed the fact that gender violence prevailing in the society. When depicted by Tendulkar in the play and when it lived by the characters like Sakharam, Laxmi, Champa and Dawood on the stage it is obvious to stumble upon invited violent attacks from the society. Tendulkar's theatrical act of violence turned into transformation of power structures of the society. We may be called these happenings as cultural polemics, ideological

debates, conflicts or struggles. If we thoroughly examine Tendulkar's 'Sakharam Binder' and its impact over the prevailing society, we find that Tendulkar succeeded in generating very vital, progressive and constructive social- cultural energy out of theatrical usage of violence – particularly gender violence. Tendulkar says that:

“Violence can be turned in to vital, useful, constructive transformative force; it depends upon you that how you use it or curb it at times.”²

So let us understand how he deals with gender violence through cross sectional analysis of this play. Tendulkar uses violence as a theatrical device to deconstruct the prevailing exploitative notions and values which administrates man-woman relationship functioning at basic social unit called 'family' or say 'house' as Sakharam calls it. Tendulkar shows us desirable, vital and useful end of reconstruction of Man- Woman relationship on more equalitarian ground by deconstructing all stereo type phenomenons constructed around gender violence.

We can see that 'Sakharam Binder' is presented in a naturalistic way; it shows all ugliness and offensiveness of life and it shocks the middle class society. That is why Arundhati Banerjee while commenting about the play 'Sakharam Binder' says:

“In the portrayal of the lower strata of the society, Tendulkar’s plays signify a definite departure from the main stream Marathi drama that mostly dealt with the more privileged section of the society. One of the reasons why there was such reaction against ‘Sakharam Binder’ was its burning naturalism. Here was a raw chunk of life with all its ugliness and crudity which was more than a shock to refined and prudish middle- class audience. Such direct confrontation with “vulgar” reality was difficult for them to bear”³

It is true that Tendulkar introduces the life and characters of lower strata and it is also true that life they live on the stage with all its ugliness and crudity is burning, shocking and unbearable for those who are accustomed to see the lives of privileged section of the society. But one interesting, most remarkable and worth noticing departure made by Tendulkar in this play is the fact that Sakharam, comes from most privileged Brahmin caste of the society, he is Brahmin by caste and lives the life of the binder, rejecting all religious-moral values, including values of previously considered most holiest and significant concepts of sexual marital relationship, family and norms of purity of caste. With opening scene only while bringing 7th deserted and homeless woman Laxmi at his house Sakharam makes violent blast on existing social morality by introducing

him, his notion of house and its codes of conducts with all his newly constructed identity and self dignity. He says:

“May be I am a rascal, a womanizer, a pauper. Why may be? I am all that..... In this bloody world men are all the same. They slink out at night, on the sly. And they put on an act all the time. They would like us to believe that they are an innocent lot! ‘You hold your tongue and I’ll hold mine!’ Damn them all!... What is there to hide? And from whom? From our father?... I know that I am foul-mouthed. I have been like this right from birth. Born naked, I was. My mother used to say, he’s Mahar born in Brahmin home.....” (Pg 126-127)

He further says:

“There you are! Not born a Brahmin and yet you’ve a Brahmin’s ways! And me! Born in a Brahmin family, but I am a Mahar, a dirty scavenger. I call that a bloody joke! I ran away from home when I was eleven. Got fed up with my father’s beatings. Nothing I did ever seemed right. You’d think I was his enemy or something.” (Pg. 127)

This is the first blast he makes on the existing Brahminical stereotypes about caste that Brahmins are good and are responsible for all the morals of society and Dalits are born scavengers, dirty lot. Sakharam tells this is nothing but a bloody joke, he is born in Brahmin family and does all the

dirty deeds, he is rascal, and he is womanizer. He tells Laxmi that you are not Brahmin and yet you are virtuous. There is nothing like born good or bad qualities of human behaviour. They are developed by social construction. In the process of socialization, all these values imposed by those who remained in power to suppress the powerless. More over those who have been oppressed, they themselves internalized these values and think that they are bad, sinful by birth, and oppressors are good, holly and blazed by god.

Sakharam, a book-binder was a Brahmin but rejects all the ‘code of conduct’ of that caste and lives his life according to his own desires.

Tendulkar points out in his article “Muslim and I”:

“Sakharam is unmarried male, unmarried because of his meagre income as a book binder in a printing press and also because of his complex personality which is basically of a loner. He is a man who has always lived outside the established norms of decent society and has learned to challenge them in words as well as in action. He needs a woman in his house for sex as well as for taking care of the household chores. For this he picks up a married woman who is in the dumps, who has been driven out by her husband- lock, stock and barrel. He takes her home to live with him till one of the two decides to end the “contract” and calls it quits. In his relationships he observes a code of conduct and insists that it should be observed by the women till

they cohabit. He makes his code of conduct known to every new woman he brings home before she formally makes her decision to stay.”⁴

“Dhumil” a poet expresses similar satire of hippocratic morality through one of his poetry:

“Hum Dahine Haath Ki Naitikata Se is Kadar Majboor Hai Ki,
Dahina Haath Khata hi Rahe aur Umra Sari bit Jay Par _____
Sirf Bayan Hath hi Dhoya Kare.”⁵

Vijay Tendulkar has explode this right hand morality of the society, by picking Sakharam from upper caste family who openly denounce god, his own caste, and religious he also condemn moralities linked with man-woman sexual relationship. These moral cultural values of society are based on the conservative notions about caste, gender, class, race, religion, literacy so on so forth. These so called conventional notions impose good-bad, superior-inferior values over these social divisions. It says Brahmins are Gods of the earth, good, superior, knowledgeable by birth and all non Brahmin castes are awful, inferior, and ignorant and ill-mannered forever.

The concept of patriarchal society is similar to this perception. Men are superior, strong, brave and rational, protectors, creator of universe and ruler of family and the world. Women are week, inferior, valley of the sin,

meant to be beaten up, guarded by man and so condemnable and meant to remain as slave for eternity. Likewise, Whites are superior, blacks are inferior, literates are superior illiterates are inferior, mental labour is superior manual labour is inferior all goodness-badness, beauty-ugliness, will follow accordingly the conventions.

The qualities imposed upon the social categories have many objective bases but it was conventionalized and constructed by those who are in power. We may call them cultural stereotypes. Vijay Tendulkar makes Sakharam representing the upper caste and portrays as non-religious, anti caste-anti family, and opponent of sexual morality imposed on a human for sexual relations through system of marriage. In the play Sakharam mentions his Brahmanism either sarcastically or simple dialogues. It is sound and clears that Tendulkar want that Sakharam represents Brahmanism and scratch the conservative and conformist values of society.

If Sakharam would have not been Brahmin or privileged by Caste, then perhaps response of the audience would have been different, audience would not been reacted so much aggressive. But when Sakharam, portrayed as Brahmin by birth, and who rejects all the Brahminical morality of caste and asserts his present identity with self-esteem it is not acceptable by

society. Upper caste morality, aesthetic conceptions and gender, Caste and religious stereo typed notions are trembles when Sakharam says

“I am born in Brahmin family, but dirty, Mahar!” (Pg. 127)

More over the way Sakharam ruthlessly demystifies sacredness of family and marriage institution along with his above mentioned rejection of concept of purity- impurity linked with caste by calling them a bloody joke, was also a big blow to religious morality because Sakharam in a way deconstructs Brahminical norms of matrimonial relationship, family and house (Gruhya Sutram), based on Varna Dharma and Ashrams in very rude and derogatory language and tries to reconstruct his own concept of house, man- woman relationship free from marriage, caste, religious moral institution. This was perhaps one of the most important reasons why ‘Sakharam Binder’ was opposed by elites as well as authority.

While acknowledging this as the decisive departure made by Tendulkar one should also acknowledge that it was a time when Dalit Panther came out with the force for radical transformation of caste-class ridden society by uniting with workers, landless labourer and all the oppressed castes and class people. They were the leading force which was strongly opposing caste-class-religious hegemony and power relations.

Namdev Dhasal, Raja Dale Daya Pavar and many other Dalit leaders were powerful writers and poets. But very few main stream upper caste writers ever dared to express their solidarity with their cause. Tendulkar was one among those handful, bold and courageous writers who dared to denounce high castes' morality and cultural hypocrisy through his plays. Sakharam is a glaring example of it.

It should not be forgotten that then mainstream Marathi literature in general was not ready to accept Dalit literature as literature even. Even today in the cultural field the prevalence of Brahmin aesthetic notions and biases against Dalit and Dalit literature are very much visible. Tendulkar being a Brahmin when writes and performs 'Sakharam Binder', though opposed by upper caste moralist, it had a different dynamics. Sakharam uses the language which was identical with Dalit literature, but succeeded in creating a violent opposition and finally getting acceptance from upper caste elitist main stream literature by the main stream theatre. This point needs to be discus separately and it will be a long term discussion so we cannot get into that and hence we focus on the analysis of 'Sakharam Binder'.

The 'Sakharam Binder' constructed and develops in three acts: First Act opens with say Gruh Pravesh of deserted, homeless woman Laxmi in

Sakharam's house. It deals with the relationship between Sakharam and Laxmi. Second Act again opens with Gruh Pravesh of new woman Champa in Sakharam. It deals with the relationship of Sakharam and Champa. Interestingly in both the occasions Sakharam delivered almost same long lectures while welcoming both the women. The 7th woman Laxmi behaves differently than 8th woman Champa. Third scene deals with inter- relations and cohabitation of Sakharam, Laxmi and Champa

Just see the opening scene in contrast to the normal ritualistic notion of marriage, Pani Grahanam, Sapta-padi promises to each other, Gruh - Pravesh, Gruhini, and Gruh Karya. Nothing like that sort of things is happening here. Sakharam enters into his house with his 7th woman Laxmi, children laugh at them that he brought one new woman. For Sakharam this may be ego enhancing since he is increasing his score in rescuing helpless woman but for a woman it is certainly embracing humiliation because as per society's point of view she is not a wife of Sakharam but she is his kept or woman with a loose character. Sakharam sought at them by asking: "You think we're dancing naked round here? Move on; get the hell out of here! I'll shine your bottoms for you, I'm warning you, the whole lot of you! Now, Get out!"(Pg. 125) Then he himself welcomes Laxmi in house with his own dictatorial conditions. The conditions are as follows:

1. This house is like me... If you think it all right put down your bundle and stay otherwise you can clear out.
2. You shall get two square meals.
- 3 You'll get two Saris to start with, then one every year.
- 4 There's a well at back of the house... Well dries up in the summer. Then you'll have to fetch water from the river.
- 5 I won't have you leaving the house unless there is work to be done.
- 6 If someone calls, you're not supposed to look up and talk.
- 7 If it's Stanger, you'll have to cover your head and answer him.
- 8 May be I am rascal, a womanizer, a pauper. Why may be I am all that but I must be respected in my own house.
- 9 I am the master here. What I say goes. Other must obey. No question should be asked.
- 10 you'll be have to be a wife to me.
- 11 If you agree to deal? Right then, go and make some tea.
- 12 If you live here, you don't need to fear anyone

The above mentioned dialogues are of 'Sakharam Binder' – He's a terror. He is a curious case. The study of Sakharam in 'Sakharam Binder' shows how his subjection to violence in his childhood produces in him low

self-esteem, a sense of fear and even self-hatred the feelings he tries to combat through over-projection and assertion of male supremacy by violently trying to subjugate women. Tendulkar's emphasis about Sakharam is on self-introspection to attain the knowledge which is buried in the pains of Sakharam's unforgotten childhood experiences.

Sakharam criticise marriage system, but so far his rules are concern they are no way different then the system of marriage. Only difference in both is that in marital relationship man are tied up with societal rules to take care of his wife and off spring. But here in Sakharam's case woman has to perform all the duty she performs in family including that as wife of Sakharam but Sakharam will not be tied up himself with her as husband. She will have no say in the house. Everything will be decided, govern and ruled by Sakharam only. In a way we can call it as the code of Manu Smruti ⁶ which governs existing upper class Hindu marital relations even today.

Manusmruti says:

“Childhood a female must be subject to her father, in youth to her husband, when her lord is dead to her sons; a woman must never be independent.” ⁷

Tendulkar puts it blatantly as Sakharam's Rules of the House, which believes that women must be protected and guarded right from the child

hood to the death by father, brother, husband and son. No way should she be allowed to enjoy freedom.

Thus Vijay Tendulkar presents here in this play two male dominated spaces, one is of existing family or institution of marriage govern by caste, religion ,traditions and morality another is the anti family space created by Sakharam as his own house which is claimed to be secular space free from the caste, religion, marital bondages. But while looking at the conditions of Sakharam it appears both the places are male dominated only.

Interestingly enough though Sakharam claims in this scene that he doesn't believe in any family, caste, religious norms, morality and customs of society. But the rules he dictates to the women are the Gender stereotypes, socially, culturally, traditionally constructed norms for the women and men.

It is simple biological fact that somebody is woman. It is simple biological fact that somebody is a man. These biological facts do not conceive any superlative or abysmal qualities in them. These biological facts do not determine that man cannot do any domestic work like cleaning the house, cooking, fetching the water, taking care of his wife or feeding her, or woman cannot go outside, read news paper, order her husband to do this and that, or beat him, abuse him, kick him throw him out of the house.

These are things both the sex can do. This is possible there is nothing like manly or womanly quality in any work. Both are capable to perform any of the domestic or other works in the world. Only one thing is there which man cannot do that of producing a child. Woman is ahead of the man in this regard, she is having reproductive capacity.

The process of culturalisation develops the mentality amongst us to believe that cleaning, cooking, fetching water, obeying the orders, etc. are women's work. Violent dominating frame of mind of male dominant society converts men's work into kicking, beating, heating, physically, mentally, and sexually torturing and harassing a woman. These divisions of work and superior inferior qualities imposed upon it are socially constructed gender stereotypes. We can see in even in Bharat Natya Shashtra also that violent or aggressive art forms are considered as Tandav or masculine forms and graceful, tender, delicate forms are considered as Lasya or feminine. But aggressiveness, bravery, or gracefulness, kindness tenderness etc qualities have nothing to do with masculinity or femininity.

We have our own gender stereotypes and because of our Gender stereotypes if we observe an aggressive woman we immediately say she is 'Marad' or categorised her as 'Bhayadachhap'. If we see that a husband

cleans the house or cooks in the kitchen we will immediately brand him feminine, impotent (Bayalo) or not manly. In 'Sakharam Binder' Vijay Tendulkar introduces two types of women. One is polite, obedient, ready to serve man, kind, virtuous, religious, without any say. Another is bold, apparently lustful, not knowing about Gods or religion, not accustomed to do household works, aggressive, capable to beat her husband in front of people, by abusing him in the same space, Sakharam's house. We can call it a play ground of gender violence. Both these women and their response to the norms and life within and without Sakharam's house are the main subject of inquiry.

Sakharam though believes that he is radical and doesn't believe in social taboos, values, stereotypes imposed upon man-woman relationship, but his rules are not free from this Gender stereotyped role model of duties of women and man. These rules equally apply to his male centric schematic house too, as it works in existing family structure.

Let us see again the rules he dictates to Laxmi which he repeats when Chama enters his house. These laws are like testaments, he had already dictated to all earlier women repeatedly. So they serve as the moral or ideal basis of Sakharam's personal or domestic relations. Women will be provided

food. Women will be provided shelter. She will be protected from the rest of the world. Women will be provided minimum required cloths to wear. In exchange of it they should cook, fetch water from the well or from the far way river and fulfil all the requirements of Sakharam. They have to fulfil sexual hunger of Sakharam as her wife. But he will never tie him down with her as husband.

Sakharam criticise husbands that they don't have guts to do things openly. They are all same, womanizer, but they try to make world believe that they are innocent lot. He believes body has its appetite! We are not saint. We're men. He treats women as his appetite husband does in family. He believes that what's there to hide? Sakharam's criticism against these husbands is that they are hypocrites. They all are womanizer but they hide. .Sakharam's opposition is only that they keep silent about each other's sin. He believes that having sexual relation with woman is natural.

Sakharam's case become curious because Sakharam wants free sexual relationship with women then he dictates such terms which are long list of non sexual domestic works for women. Sakharam knows that married woman doesn't have her own house or shelter. If husband kicks her out then there is no place for her to go anywhere in the world accept becoming

prostitute. So he finds this easy and cheaper way to satisfy his sexual hunger. He provides roof and food to deserted woman and in exchange satisfies his needs.

Though Sakharam doesn't believe in marriage he do need woman. He condemns husbands and calls them pig- swine. Reason is simple, he wants everything from woman but he doesn't want to tie down himself. He says, "Its good thing I am not a husband. Things are fine the way they are. You get everything you want and yet you are not tied down." (Pg. 129) This is his way of keeping sexual relation with especially deserted women but without relating himself with any of them. He doesn't want family but want a space called house where he can rule like a king, where he can exercise his power, where his orders must be obeyed. He is or may be a drunkard, womanizer a dirty fallow but he must be respected in his own house. One can say it, self centric but in post modern term one may find there the reflection of self respect and self dignity of a drunkard, womanizer.

When Sakharam says: "I must be respected in my house" (Pg. 156); it implies that in his own intimate space, in his own being, he must be respected by himself. He criticise that family, marriage system and moral taboos about the sex makes husbands hypocrite swine and it is respectful not

for others but for themselves only. It degrades them in their own eyes, in their own house, in their own intimate being. This concept of house is an ideal, say moral construct of Sakharam. In a way he is not free from patriarchal morality. It is same space rather more pernicious space, patriarchal form of male-domination than family which demands everything from woman without binding male in exchange.

Sakharam's hatred towards husbands is having another rational ground also. He talks about his emotional concern towards all earlier women to Laxmi. He says that he gave shelter to six deserted women prior to Laxmi, but he realised that despite treating them well almost all were worshipping their husband as God. Despite keeping them in his possession he was unable to rule over these women at their heart.

In another occasion he remembers earlier woman who died in the hospital. She was also kicked out by her husband Sakharam provided her a shelter. But on her death-bed there was her husband's name only on her lips. It was Sakharam who gave her last drop of water in her mouth, but what she uttered was her husband's name only. Just before Laxmi one woman was there in his house. She was worshipping her husband. That fallow wanted to kill her, but for her he was God! Sakharam expresses his pain: "The fellow

who who's out to kill them- he's god! The chap who saves them- he's just a man! She worshiped his shirt for two full years. She had T.B. I took her to the hospital at Miraj. Last Friday that was. She died there, hugging her husband's shirt to herself..." (Pg. 127-128)

When he asks Laxmi about her husband's name she refuses to utter his name. What Sakharam says to Laxmi is interesting aspect of Gender stereo types internalize by women, which allows males to dominate them. He says: "The whole lot of you! All alike where this one thing's concerned. Mention your husband's name and your eyes begin to brim over with tears. He kicks you out of the house; he is out to squeeze the life out of you. But he's your God. You ought to worship a God like that with shoes and slippers! He should be whipped in public." (Pg. 133)

Tendulkar shows emotional and caring concern of Sakharam towards her women. It apparently looks very progressive but at the same time one can see that internally Sakharam feels himself defeated and helpless to win the hearts of these women in front of their profound devotion towards their 'Husband'- 'Swami'- 'God'. Despite his all beautiful ideas, mission and attempts of rescuing deserted women by providing everything they need in his house, they worship their husbands as God, whom he calls swine...

Some Dalit reformist relates Sakharam with the 19th century upper caste reformers' concerns and position on women and widow remarriage. Their argument is that many of them were already having illicit relations with widows, and upper cast reformers wanted to legalize for their own dignity! These arguments are based on auto biographies of Narmad, Maniram Nabhubhai Dvivedi etc. We may agree or we may not agree with the argument. Sakharam Binder's ideas are in one way may correlated with exposure and deconstruction of the image of 19th century upper caste social reform movement. It is another area of research so we are not going deep into this point of view.

But another point is very interesting which can be made here. Sakharam is in one way an idealist. He has his own view about his own house. About Muslims, He believes that Dawood should be invited and allowed at Ganesh Pooja. When Laxmi opposes the idea to allow Dawood in joining the Ganesh Pooja because he is Muslim, Sakharam violently beats Laxmi. This violent act of beating Laxmi by Sakharam can be compared with what Mahatma Gandhi had done to Kasturba when she refused his order to clean toilet as part of his ideas of removal of inequity. Here Tendulkar deals with two things together. One thing he exposes the hypocritical claims of upper castes idealists who shamelessly suppress their

wives' or families differing view in order to protect himself as great idealist. On the other hand he exposes the typical male ego of godfather who thinks that a rescued homeless woman cannot dare to prevent his friend in his own house. Other thing is also noticeable here that though Laxmi thrown out of her cast, family, religion she can still assert that values in her helplessness to regain her power.

Thus here we can see that Tendulkar uses Sakharam against the orthodox upper caste moralist conception of family, marriage, caste etc. And at the same time through the portrayal of Sakharam's own life and double standards, he also tries to expose the so called upper caste social reformation as well as radical anti-family positions prevailing in the society to show that how both though appear opposite but are two sides of the same coin, both the positions are anti- woman and male dominated ideas which is clear example of gender violence.

The Laxmi appears throughout the play as religious, obedient, soft, hard working, and sensitive. Laxmi as described in the play looks passive and her behaviour, her devotion, gesture, expressions, and the way she speaks attracts Sakharam. She appears submissive, docile but she is the

woman who has internalised all the values of male-dominated society, she is capable to perform all the domestic works dictated by Sakharam.

When we look with bioscope to the play we find various forms and dynamics of violence imbibe in theme 'Sakharam Binder'. The play is lengthened in three acts. Each act deals with gender stereo types and various forms of violence exercised by male domination either within existing social institutions like family, marriage, caste, religion or within the House- or the "space" reconstructed by Sakharam which is claimed to be free from bondages of family, caste, religion and morality. Entire play rolls within the anti-family space created by Sakharam, within his space of experimentation with his truth of man- woman relationship.

Entire play, runs within the theatrical Space or house created by 'Sakharam Binder' which is opposed to the prevailing basic social unit called Family or institute of marital sexual relationship. In fact this play is an exploration of Gender violence which takes place within these two male dominated domains or spaces: one is within existing family or in institution like marriage and another is within the experimental ideal space created by Sakharam which claimed to be anti- family, anti-caste, and secular space ruled under despotic power of a Man called Sakharam. Interestingly

Tendulkar triggers violence through this house or space created by Sakharam which unmasks or exposes the real nature of Gender Violence operates in various forms beneath the exterior so called unity of the contemporary lives of society.

If we trace Gender violence in the past lives of Laxmi and Chapa we find Laxmi was abandoned by her husband because she was unable to produce a child; she is victim of patriarchal Gender stereo types constructed about “true womanhood” or femininity. Stereotypes in which a woman who can produce children is considered as blazed and who is unable to produce child (fragile) is considered as cursed, and thus entitled to be discarded from the family, since the family is conceived as basic unit of reproduction of offspring. If woman cannot produce child then she is useless so far family is concern. She can be thrown out by husband and there exist a moral and religious sanctity for it. In case of Laxmi there is no mention of any other physical or sexual violence committed by her husband to her. But abandoning woman on the basis of her being unable to produce chid of course is an unbearable form of mental and psychological form of gender violence, since women themselves internalize these anti-woman values right from their childhood. So this incidence must have a definite violent and

negative stigmatic psychological impact over Laxmi and may be responsible for her low level of self-image and self-esteem and timidity.

In case of Champa, she abandoned her husband because he was impotent and unable to give her a child. In both the cases stigmatic Gender stereotypes connected with impotency are the reasons for abandoning either wife or husband. Catherine Thankamma appropriately comments:

“Laxmi is thrown out of her house by her husband but she still considers him her God. Champa on the other hand is a figure of revolt.”⁸

So, Laxmi is a symbol of surrender and Champa is a symbol of revolt. Common factor of their presence in this house is impotency. But the difference between male impotency and female impotency generates different types of Gender violence.

In case of Faujdar Shinde, husband of Champa impotency lead him to another extreme of inferiority complex. Shinde is Faujdar, already a symbol of power. Moreover he is husband of a beautiful wife and head of the family, so obviously it would have been unbearable for him to accept the simple biological fact of his impotency. How he can declare to the world that he is impotent and that he is unable to satisfy Champa's desire for a child. This is

more pernicious male ego socially constructed around potency and masculinity, According to Gender stereotype strong, powerful man is one who is potent, whom we say 'Viryavan', 'Sarvagunsampanna' capable to produce children within or without his family or community.

While defining masculinity all the virtues like bravery, strength, and physical strength have been condensed and imposed upon this simple biological fact called potency or fertility.

A man, who has internalized such values or Gender stereotyped image of masculinity, will not able to accept this simple biological fact. If he accepts this fact then his entire self-image of being a powerful, strong or brave man will be collapsed. So he tries to prove his potency by taking shelter of religious sanctity to violently suppress the reproductive power of his wife.

Thus when there is no way to satisfy desire of his wife, this violently imbibed gender-stereotypes of masculinity will lead an impotent man to very typical and pernicious kind of inferiority complex which may lead him to alcoholism and violent act of wife beating and sexual tortures. And this is what exactly Shinde has done to Champa. So, Shanta Gokhale appropriately writes:

“His play, ‘Sakharam Binder’ reveals a specific psychopathic attitude of his male protagonist towards women coupled with an erotic interest in Sakharam’s coercive sexual behaviour. He, for instance, compulsively indulges in violently exploitative sexual orgies with his women. Shinde, in the same play, is a man who tries to force his wife, Champa, into whoring and thus violates her sense of honour. He is also the one who derives sadistic pleasure by sexually torturing his wife”⁹

When Shinde goes to Sakharam’s house Champa gives him big fist over his mouth. Blood comes out. She throws him out by kicking and beating him. Sakharam pulls her back by saying that: “Look! What you have done to him! He is your husband. Haven’t you a heart?” (Pg. 167) Chapa’s furious reply is self explanatory: “No! I don’t have heart. He chewed it up long ago. He brought me from my mother, even before I’d become women. He married me when I didn’t even know what marriage really meant. He’d tortured me at night. He branded me, and stuck needles into me and made me do awful, filthy things. I ran away. He brought me back and stuffed chilli powder into that god awful place, where it hurts most. That bloody pimp! What’s left of my heart now? He tore lumps out of it, he did. He drank my blood. Get up you pig. I’ll stuff some chilli powder in to you now!” (Pg. 167)

Champa's violent attack on her husband like a possessed woman is no doubt a logical outcome of what he has done to her. But the fact of his impotency is the main powerful weapon in hand of Champa against him. "Champa calls her husband impotent corpse" then she gets energy to kick him, drive him out. And finally she refuses to consider him as a human being. The usage of weapon of impotency of her husband by Champa works. It turns him in to useless creature in his own eyes. The simple biological fact of his impotency makes him alcoholics. He lost his entire self dignity. He says no, "I want her to beat me. Want to die at her hands. Don't want to live. Why live? No jobs, no wife, no home -- what's left (sobs loudly) What is left?" (Pg. 190)

Here Shinde still tries to get her back so that he can retain his dignity as a potent man. Here Tendulkar with a brilliant insight shows that how socio-cultural stigmatic pigeonhole about masculinity compels an impotent man to neglect his own biological fact or sexual identity and makes him worst than an animal by leading him towards futile attempts to prove or pretend himself to be a potent man. It is important to note down here that impotency or potency both conceive violence within themselves. It is just a diverse manifestation of life. There is nothing great in one's being a potent or there is nothing shameful in one's being impotent. If one accepts this

biological fact without imposing any social stigma, taboos or stereotype over it then only it can be converted in to useful, constructive force.

Otherwise any attempt to suppress this fact may lead this force towards pernicious forms of Gender violence. No doubt, in male dominated society such violence inevitably tries to suppress women's sexuality first but it also perverts male sexuality also. Tendulkar gives here very complex minute details of experiences of Gender violence in the married lives of these two diametrically opposite set of women Laxmi and Champa. Laxmi is unable to give birth to a child. This infertility turns Laxmi into submissive woman, while Champa being a gorgeous and lust full woman. She uses her husband's impotency as a tool of driving force and beats him. While Laxmi shows sympathy towards him. Here Tendulkar deals with very interesting and subtle aspects of Gender violence related with stereo types constructed around impotency, and brings to our notice that how this simple biological facts has been converted in to the something like a shameful stigma, which creates inferiority complex in the minds of impotent man or childless women.

It is interesting to notice that Laxmi being a religious woman believes that any virtuous woman should not behave like the way Champa behaves

with her husband. More over the way Sakharam and Daud both get shock and the way they try to stop Champa by seeing Chapa's vengeance against her husband is an identical male dominated stereotyped behaviour which believes that only man can beat the wife. Women should not beat her husband.

But in case of Sakharam it appears bit surprising because he himself was criticising women that they worship their husbands as god. They worship them as gods, who all time kick them, want to kill them. He was advising Laxmi that these gods you must worship by beating them with slipper in the public. But when Champa kicks, humiliates and abuses her husband by calling him an impotent corpse who was all the time trying to make whore out of her, Sakharam tries to stop Champa by telling her, "He is your husband. Haven't you a heart?" (Pg. 167)

It indicates the double standards of Sakharam who hates husband because his words are "Those fellows—they can't Father a brat and they take it all out on their wives... They'd try to keep up a good reputation in society." (Pg. 129) He also says, "They're an impotent lot! For them the woman is just dirt, that's all" (Pg. 129) We can see that Sakharam has no guts to say Champa openly in public that yes kick him, give him a big blow,

Stuff chilli powder in him, yes you do it these swine, and this impotent lot deserves it! This exposes Sakharam's own double standard as if a civilized hipocratic moralist shows double standards in society. Tendulkar gives space to his characters to live as they want to. Tendulkar asserted in one of his lectures:

“I was never able to begin writing my play only with an idea or a theme in mind. I had to have my characters first with me.”¹⁰

These characters as “living persons,” he further adds, led him “into the thick of their lives”¹¹ Where they would give him the theme. So, it is clear that Sakharam is natural, Laxmi is natural and Champa is also a natural human being and no imposition from writer on their behaviour.

When we are introspect of gender violence within the relationship of Sakharam and Laxmi we find Laxmi a religious, obedient, loyal woman. We have seen that her husband has tortured her as she was unable to produce a child. Now, for her, Sakharam is her husband. Laxmi has internalized all the patriarchal values of patriarchal society. She believes that husband is provider, protector and should be honour as God and all the needs of the husband should be fulfilled by woman without any opposition. So she is capable to perform all the domestic duties very well and readily prepared to

fulfil all the demands of Sakharam including his sexual demands. Sakharam exploits her both physically and psychologically. He also tortures her several times.

Vijay Tendulkar brilliantly shows through Sakharam's character that Gender type casted male's sexual desire cannot be satisfied merely by sexual act. It can only be satisfied by imposition of series of strict laws of domestic duties over woman by not allowing her to freely talk with stranger, to go outside, express her desire and to live according to her wish. But he fails to understand the other side of the coin that when woman like Laxmi, already convinced about these laws of women's subjugation are not the sacred laws decided by the God, where she has to serve the husband as her master and her master has to rule over her as master.

Sakharam expresses his intimate agony about this that so far no women in his life have ever worshiped him as God. They were always worshiping their husband. Many of them were devotees ready to do everything for him. But none ever worshiped him as God. Laxmi realised his crisis. She understood that though Sakharam claims to be the master, he is deficient to understand the status of a husband in the family. Sakharam fails

to identify with the fact that no patriarch can ever rule over his subject woman without accepting religion- God.

Laxmi's loyalty and religiosity, gradually starts turning Sakharam's house into family. She starts with God, then Pooja and thus brings change in Sakharam's life. Sakharam who was deprived of enjoying status of Swami or God of woman unconsciously feels happy about these developments. A man who never bothers about God gradually becomes religious man. He starts taking regular bath, performing Pooja almost like a family man.

Tendulkar indicates indirectly that though Sakharam doesn't believe in family or marriage system, Laxmi's loyalty towards him, transforms him. For Laxmi he is her husband so she wants him to be her real ruler, master. This is other side of the coin where slave herself teaches the master how to become God or how to rule her. Laxmi being a religious woman knows very well how to make God out of patriarch like Sakharam and turn him into a useful and responsible husband. Sakharam comes under her influence and feels some changes in him but does not give any credit to Laxmi for such changes.

Here Tendulkar deconstructs two aspects of Gender Violence. On one hand all the religions of the world are highly patriarchal and they help men

to subjugate women. But at the same time he shows through Laxmi's character, how same stereotype of respecting male patriarch or husband as God can be used by woman a readily available weapon in her hand to domesticate man as a tame animal. Sakharam knows that house or shelter is the prime requirement of women so they can be easily is trapped by providing them the house. But he is unaware of the fact that house or domestication of life was discovered by women long before the emergence of patriarchal society. And though men used house being a women's requirement as a tool to cage her in four walls of this house, women know the dynamics of domestication of wild animals and nomadic, anarchic human lives including that of a man far better than him. Thus here Tendulkar shows that same violent stereotypes of domestication women by religion can easily be used by women as liberating, constructive force in given situation to tame man in same house in her possession.

Laxmi's religiosity, behaviour, gesture, posture etc. attracts Sakharam. We know that Laxmi's sexual appeal is basically of ideal wife. Sakharam's attraction towards her or towards all abandoned house wives also shows that basically he wants such virtuous woman, which he will not be able to find anywhere else but in family only. This shows that despite his all radical claim Sakharam really wants a woman who is already moulded in patriarchal

values of the family but she should replace her husband from the throne and put him on that place.

One more interesting aspect of Gender violence can be noticed in case of Sakharam's sexual relation with Laxmi. Tendulkar has already described that Laxmi is docile or fragile woman. Laxmi is very calm peaceful, kind and soft hearted. Sakharam is very violent, and lustful. For him Laxmi is merely a sex object or appetite of his bodily requirement. While for Laxmi her body is an instrument of serving and worshiping the master. She has already surrendered everything to her master but master fails to satisfy her. He thinks she is docile. She is unable to fulfil his sexual demands. But fact was other way around; he remains blind to her expectations. He thinks that Laxmi cannot have an orgasmic experience, since she is fragile. But one day he hears Laxmi's voice from the kitchen when he comes home. Laxmi was talking to someone with erotic laughter saying:

“You little rascal, you're trying to trick me, are you? I put you out, and you steal it again. You want me to feed you all the time... You're getting spoilt aren't you? No you won't get anything now... Don't look at me like that... Get away. Didn't I tell you to move off? Pawing me all the time... Go on. Don't come anywhere near me. Can't you hear? (Laughs as if

tickled) Oh! Don't? Now watch out! I'll really heat you if you get in to my lap. Go away. .. Get away you leach! I'm not going to give you anything today. You've become a regular pest. Get off me first... Oh dear why are you after my blood, you?" (Pg. 136)

Sakharam suspects her. But when he comes to know that she had a habit of talking with small creatures his doubts removes when she tells Sakharam that the ants, sparrows, crows—they all talk to her. Her words: "Ants, sparrows, crows—they all talk to me. Why do you talk to me? Eh? Why must you talkee—talkee to me? Go on... Tell me... You naughty little fallow... Tell me..." (Pg. 139) But here Tendulkar brings out very subtle and deep psychological aspect of sexual orgasmic experience of Laxmi (woman) and Sakharam's failure to provoke Laxmi upto that extreme.

Sakharam realises that he is unable give her such orgasmic experience in sexual relation with her which he thinks even smallest creature like ant can give to her. He becomes so fanatic and jealous to ant that he forces, he beats Laxmi to laugh in the same way she was laughing while talking with an ant. He asks why can't you laugh for me and express your orgasmic pleasure. He twice beats Laxmi with belt to make such orgasmic laughter. But he was unable to make her laugh. This incidence of Gender violence

discloses inner psychology of Sakharam's feeling of insecurity. He realises that despite doing all aggressive sexual offensives he is not capable to give such an orgasmic experience and make her laugh in her wilderness which even an ant can give it to her. Some where he feels himself impotent. He is competing with an ant.

Here, Sakharam wants the laughter of innocence through his sexual act. But he not come up to scratch to know that that laughter is a rare and he with his cruel act never able to find. So he gets frustrated. The way Laxmi bursts out in agony and resist Sakharam is a clear sign of her assertion that she is not a sex object of Sakharam. Laxmi says: I've never heard a kind word here. Always barking orders. Curses. Oaths. Threatening to throw me out. Kicks and blows. (She wipes her tears with sari). There I was in agony after I'd been belted, and all you wanted me to do was laugh. Laugh and laugh again... Hell must be a better place than this. If I die, I'll be free of this once and for all (Pg. 148).

On another occasion Laxmi prevented Daud to perform Aarti of Ganesha. Sakharam slaps Laxmi for that. Here Sakharam appears as a secular personality but through this scene Tendulkar exposes the hypocritical gesture of an ideal man who claims himself secular and wants to invite his

Muslim friend to establish himself as a secular person. But when a woman opposes he beats her to establish himself in the eyes of world that he is a secular person. This incidence can very well be related with Gandhi's episode where Mahatma Gandhi beats Kasturba when she refused to clean toilet as a part of his program of self purity and removal of Untouchability. This is typical kind of male ego which justifies their violence over woman by saying it is inevitable for the sake of the cause.

In Laxmi's case we don't know about her caste. Sakharam never asks her caste. She is homeless deserted helpless woman. But she knows the caste of Sakharam and she believes that she is a wife of Sakharam-Brahmin. Now Sakharam is following her advice. He has become religious, he has started Pooja and now he is performing Ganesh Pooja. All these changes happened because of her. So she dares to prevent Daud – a Muslim friend of Sakharam from Aarti. The relationship of Sakharam and Laxmi cannot last for a long period. There is no harmony in their relationship. Finally both of them mutually depart in a very good manner. Her departure left a great, deep mark on Sakharam. He says: "There have been many women here, but this one left a mark before she went away." (Pg. 156)

After Laxmi's disappearance, Sakharam brings a new woman Champa in his house. She was a wife of the police Faujdar Shinde. She is younger than Laxmi. Well built, slightly fat and having better body structure... Champa is exact opposite of Laxmi. We have seen earlier that Laxmi was abandoned by her husband because she was unable to give him a child while in Champa's case her husband was impotent and more over torturing her to prove his masculinity, so she left him. When Sakharam talks about rules of house, Champa asks him is it a class room or what? What rules? When Sakharam assures her that she should not get scared about anything this Sakharam is a terror! She counters him by saying: "Scared? Who, me? And Scared of whom? My husband? (Spits) What can he do to me?" (Pg. 157) She says that he is corpse what he can do to her. He keeps her threatening that he will kill her. But he has no guts to do so. What is he going to do her?

This is the difference. Laxmi believed her husband a god even after he deserted her. And Champa calls him a corpse. Laxmi was ready to do all the domestic works ordered by Sakharam, While Champa orders him to prepare tea for her or manage food for dinner. Sakharam follows order and asks Daud to prepare tea. Moreover she made it clear that she has never done any domestic works. There is no such rule that man cannot do such works. She

comes from the family where her father was preparing tea and food for them and mother was sitting on pan shop. She violets the rule of Sakharam of not to talk with stranger but she appreciates Dawood as he is nice. When she says about tea... "Sweet" (Pg. 161) Sakharam gets annoyed and asks her again what is this nice in tea? Sweet? Stop it." (Pg. 161) He thought she appreciates Dawood.

All these incidences are examples deconstruction of violent gender stereotypes inherent in society as well as Sakharam's house and Champa's rebellious nature doesn't allow her to keep mum. She breaks the silence and thus creates conflicts in Sakharam's schematic house. Sakharam was attracted by her too much. She squarely rejected Sakharam sexual advances by telling I am not that type of woman. When again he tries to make love, she snatches bottle from Sakharam and finishes the wine. And then surrenders to him by saying that now she is ready do all what he demands even with dog. Thus Champa doesn't feet in stereotyped ideal model of woman. She is rebellious.

This striking difference between these two women gives shocks to Sakharam and audience both. Because with the entry of Champa in the house, Sakharam's rules looks getting shattered immediately. Moreover she

is capable to retaliate of her husband alone; she doesn't need Sakharam's support. And when Shinde comes Sakharam takes side of her husband. That is the reason V.M. Madge appropriately comments:

“The very words in which Sakharam condemns people's hypocrisy strongly apply to him also.”¹²

All changes made in Sakharam's life by Laxmi come to an end with Champa's arrival. A religious, responsible “household man” carved by Laxmi again transforms himself into an irreligious, sensual, drunkard person. The differences between Laxmi and Champa are noticeable. Laxmi appeared embarrassed when she came. Champa was cool and calm. When Sakharam explains his rules to Champa asks him to prepare tea. This is point where she confronts with the Gender stereo types imposed by Patriarchal society. She smashes Sakharam's norms and rules on several occasions in the play. When Sakharam asks her for anything she never gets shock. She expresses her views openly. Once she said about Daud that he is nice. Sakharam tries to remind her that she is not allowed to talk with a stranger. Sakharam becomes so possessed by Champa that his mind remains occupied in her only.

Though Champa looks very sensual she is very emotional, bold and assertive. She straight forwardly tells Sakharam at first night: "I am not that sort of woman. See? I left him because I had my honour to save... Now you just behave yourself. Don't go around like a dog behind a bitch." (Pg. 162) She orders him: "Now run along and fix some dinner for us, will you?" (Pg. 162) Here again we can see that the Champa's portrayal creates an impression in the mindset of Sakharam as well audience that since she disobeys domestic duties she will be readily prepared for having sex with Sakharam. But she gives jerk to Sakharam as well audience by breaking these gender stereo types constructed by the society.

Her dialogue is also addressed to society: I am not that type of Woman. This is what Champa is. Her mother was sitting on the pan shop and father was making tea and preparing food. They were doing good business. They were selling liquor too. Shinde raided and he raided her too. Champa says she never prepare tea or food in her in-law's house also. Her mother in law was preparing. She refuses to do household work. Champa smashes the laws of Sakharam's house and gives him shocks aftershocks by breaking traditional stereo types about man should not be asked to do household work or woman should appreciate a stranger openly. Etc. Later on

she starts drinking liquor also. She speaks bad words. She beats her husband also.

Champa's physical appearance attracts Sakharam. He became mad after her. Her boldness, courage all these things shocks as well as attracts Sakharam. And as we have seen earlier Sakharam opportunistically doesn't side with her when she gives a big blow, kicks to husband by calling him, corpse, pimp, an impotent lot. Sakharam, the opponent of all husbands surprisingly prevents her by telling that she should not behave with him like this. After all he is her husband.

As we know once he was advising Laxmi that all deserted women must worship their husbands with Chappal and slippers. But after witnessing Champa's wrath it seems he gets frighten and ready to change his earlier position. He observed her as being possessed while kicking, beating and abusing her husband. That shows the double standards and hypocrisy of male gender.

Champa initially strongly opposed Sakharam's sexual advances. She told that she is not that type of woman. But Sakharam compels her. He says: "The woman I bring here has got to be a wife to me. That's all fixed when I decide to keep her here. There were seven and not one said no." (Pg. 168)

Champa replies strongly: “Maybe they were that sort. But not me.” (Pg. 168) Sakharam threatens her. But she continuously refuses. Sakharam angrily goes out and barks: “To hell with you. Damn you.” (Pg. 169)

Champa appears bold and expresses no shock Sakharam talks about his all his rules and fantastic way of radical sex life, Champa gives him a shock by breaking his stereotype notion about bold woman. She had very horrible experience in her married sex life. She condemns all males as corpse. After coming to a decision she drags Sakharam and tells him: “Shut up. I’ll give it to you. All of it. Just hand me the bottle.” (Pg. 169) She grabs the bottle from him. Drinks. Forces him down and tells him: “Just Few minutes more. Then you can take me. Do what you like with me... (Pg. 169)

Champa’s behaviour makes Sakharam speechless. He has never seen such a woman. Champa appears as a stubborn woman with tendencies to assert her freedom rather aggressively. These traits of her temperament and attitude decide her relationship with Sakharam and thus influence the course of events in the play. Her violent clash with strong headed and egotistical Sakharam and its catastrophic consequences, therefore, appear to be perfectly natural.

Sakharam couldn't fix his mind in the work. He thought all day about last night's sex with Champa. He comes home early from the work to have sex with Champa. Champa was eating. She resists again but he again threatens her that she should obey her demand other wise he would he'll thrash life out of her. He threatens her to drive her out. And if so then she will have to live life like bitch. There is no way for Champa. She again surrenders but in order to relieve her pain. In order to desensitise herself she drinks and tells him: "I'll give it to you." Fun for anyone who comes along... A dog... A corpse even..." (Pg. 171)

These are the glaring examples of Gender violence. Though Champa Surrenders under Sakharam's pressure she compares sex with him is like a sex with dog or a corpse. Champa's agony, wrath, everything give shocks to Sakharam. Sakharam though feels insults from She violets each and every imposed rules of Sakharam and even under forced situation she satisfies his sex hunger by telling him a dog, a Corpse...

Sakharam though left Laxmi inside him still has impact of her. He becomes religious. He looks religious. When Laxmi starts drinking from the morning on the occasion of Dashera he tells Champa that she should not drink on the day like Dashera and he wants to perform Pooja. On holly day

the woman of the house should look all clean and tidy. He says: “Drunk so early in the morning?... Champa, you should not drink on a holy day like Dashera... On holy day the woman of the house should look all clean and tidy. What will people say?” (Pg. 174)

In first scene he is telling that the married males are hiding from whom they have to hide. They pretend themselves in front of people as if they are innocent. He says: “But—no dishonesty allowed. If you sin—you must be ready to slap your face and say, 'Yes, I sinned. You must be ready to take the rap.” (Pg. 130) But now dirty man wants to become gentleman on Dashera. Champa is drunk and she pollutes his Pooja. He is worried. What people will say?

Here again Tendulkar shows the limits of so-called Sexual Radicalism of Sakharam. Though he does not bother about God or rituals he is justifying all his sin by his dialogues: “God knows. Body has its appetites.” (Pg. 126) But when on Dashera Champa appears in drunken condition in the morning and she climbs to him in kitchen and wants to provoke him Sakharam tells about Pooja and asks to go away. She laughs. Now situation has become curious. Sakharam cannot beat her, cannot kick her out. Because he is completely under control of Champa and Champa knows his limits. She is

very well acquainted with how these corpses, wild animals, dogs can be handled.

In the third scene Laxmi comes back. Sakharam beats her. But she refuses to go back. She expresses her desire to die as Sakharam's wife. She wears Mangal sutra of Sakharam. When Laxmi comes back Sakharam severely beats her and kicks her. She says that she wanted to die in his lap. Champa persuades Sakharam and she prevents Sakharam not to kick her out she asks him to give her shelter. Laxmi remains under Champa's protection for some time. Tendulkar beautifully narrates sharing between Champa and Laxmi. Champa looks generous to Laxmi. Same thought is expressed by Arundhati Banerjee in her previous writing, she observes that:

“Champa shows kindness and generosity when she convinces Sakharam to give shelter to Laxmi, a potential rival.”¹³

Sakharam's turmoil increases. In presence of both the women he is unable to decide where to go. This split in Sakharam's psychology is the sign of defeat of his rule over these women. Gradually he becomes impotent. Laxmi had amazed him by her orgasmic laughter when she was talking with an ant. Sakharam had realized to that Laxmi does have an orgasmic pleasure.

Even a small creature like ant can give her such an extreme pleasure and make her laugh. But he cannot give such orgasmic experience to Laxmi.

On the other hand Champa's relation with him makes him feel that he is no better than a dog or a corpse for her. And in presence of Laxmi, in his own house he further gets unable to have a sex with Champa. Champa in her drunken condition goes on abusing Sakharam. Her behaviour, her violation of his rules results into his impotency. He realises his failure to give Laxmi an orgasmic experience. And here Champa's sexual abusive utterances that in Laxmi's presence he has become impotent, makes him wild. He goes to Laxmi and asks her to leave the house in order to prove before Champa that he is not scared of any body. Laxmi informs him about Champa's relation with Daud. Here again the same stereotype of potency masculinity plays its role. He kills Champa.

The dramatic twist comes here. It is Laxmi who gives him solace that what he has done is not a sin. He has killed a sinner. She helps him to dig the grave and hide and burry Champa's dead body. Laxmi, who appears as calm, generous and soft hearted personality, at last we found in her a cold blooded violent planner. Laxmi succeeds in making Sakharam "A husband". Sakharam's realization of his own growing impotency had already created

turmoil in his sexual identity. He lived a life as womanizer. Through his ideal house he tried to prove himself as a true potent man. But now Champa's sexual relation with his close friend Dawood hurts Sakharam's ego. So he murders Champa. Here we can assert that the violence in its pure and vigorous form is preserved in Laxmi's mind it is deeply rooted with the notion of morality. Tendulkar says:

“We are living in a country, which has strong rigid conventions of ‘Dharma’ and hence violence is deeply rooted within the society.”¹⁴

The minor character of Dawood is also a complex character. He does not appear as an ideal friend from the point of view of his relationship with Champa. He is a regular visitor and companion to Sakharam who knows more about Sakharam than Sakharam's knowledge about himself. He stands by Sakharam in his crisis. Tendulkar in his article “Muslim and I” writes:

“Dawood is a local poor Muslim who earns his living doing odd jobs and is a bachelor. Dawood is a frequent visitor to Sakharam's house and is familiar with Sakharam's non-conformist, odd and colourful life-style.”¹⁵

Watching a new female in Sakharam's house every often comes as no surprise to him. Both are smoking chillum as is their routine at the end of the

day. Sakharam dryly and casually describes the plight of Laxmi after she was thrown out by her husband. That Laxmi can hear what he is being told makes Dawood self-conscious and he gestures to Sakharam to stop. But he goes on. The difference between the sensibility of Sakharam and Dawood, as expressed here is significant. As Tendulkar says:

“Dawood is shown as more “human” and caring, more circumspect in such respect than his rebel Hindu Brahmin friend Sakharam.”¹⁶

But the arrival of Champa makes him to go off course. He cannot restrain her charm and forgets his long cherished friendship with Sakharam. Driven by his fancy for Champa, he comes frequently to Sakharam’s house. But suddenly he stops coming. He crosses the limits and develops physical relations with Champa. This very depiction of his personality proves that sometimes physical lust conquers over the pious bond like friendship and love.

Sakharam’s ego tries to manifest itself in a challenging way. He is not ready to be tied down to anything. The influence of Laxmi triggers an inner conflict between the existential ego and the metaphysical I. In effect we see that Sakharam, ‘a curious case of gender violence’ who has lost his self, has become pitiable because of his spinelessness. When he realizes that he is

losing himself, he is frightened and finally this living corpse gets pacified after lifeless and senseless activities. Sakharam is unpolished and hence the play 'Sakharam Binder' appears to be rough. Nevertheless, the play does make its appearance with existentialist traits. Dr. Chandrasekhar Barve suitably quotes:

“The existentialist tendencies are openly manifest in ‘Sakharam Binder’.”¹⁷

At closing stage, we can say that Tendulkar was the pioneer who changed not only the external framework of Marathi drama but also the limits of the picture of life at the core and gave 'A Curious Case of Gender Violence' – 'Sakharam Binder'.

References:

1. Vijay Tendulkar quoted by Samik Bandyopadhyay: "Introduction, Vijay Tendulkar's Collected Plays in Translation", OUP, New Delhi, 2002, Pg. 21.
2. Vijay Tendulkar, "Tendulkar and Violence: Then and Now", Dir. Atul Pethe, ICCA, Documentary, 2010.
3. Arundhati Banerjee, introduction, five plays of Vijay Tendulkar, Bombay; OUP, 1992.
4. Tendulkar Vijay, "Muslim and I" article in "Vijay Tendulkar", Katha, 2001. Pg. 59
5. Dhumil, Sudama Pandey,

<http://crpfacademy.gov.in/VOL4%20%20%20OUTDOOR%20SUBJECTS%20FOR%20CT.pdf>
6. Manusmriti: The Laws of Manu, V: 148,

<http://www.hindubooks.org/scriptures/manusmriti/ch5/ch5_141_150.htm>
7. Ibid.
8. Catherine Thankamma, "Women that Patriarchy Created: The Plays of Vijay Tendulkar, Mahesh Dattani and Mahasweta Devi," Vijay Tendulkar's Plays: An Anthology of Recent Criticism, ed. V.M. Madge (New Delhi: Pencraft International, 2009), p. 81.

9. Vijay Tendulkar, “‘Sakharam Binder’,” Collected Plays in Translation, trans. Kumud Mehta and Shanta Gokhale (New Delhi: OUP, 2004), Pg.136-198
10. Vijay Tendulkar, “The Play is the Thing: Sri Ram Memorial Lecture I,” Vijay Tendulkar: Collected Plays in Translation, ed. Samik Bandyopadhyay, New Delhi: OUP, 2005, Pg.21.
11. Ibid. Pg. 21
12. Madge V. M, “Vijay Tendulkar’s Plays An Anthology of Recent Criticism”, New Delhi: Pencraft International. 2007. p. 126.
13. Banerjee, Arundhati. Note on Kamala, Silence! The Court is in Session, ‘Sakharam Binder’, The Vultures, Encounter in Umbugland. Vijay Tendulkar. “Collected Plays in Translation. New Delhi: OUP, 2003, Pg. 578.
14. Vijay Tendulkar, “Tendulkar and Violence: Then and Now”, Dir. Atul Pethe, ICCA, Documentary, 2010.
15. Tendulkar Vijay, “Muslim and I” article in “Vijay Tendulkar”, Katha, 2001. Pg. 63
16. Vijay Tendulkar, “Tendulkar and Violence: Then and Now”, Dir. Atul Pethe, ICCA, Documentary, 2010.
17. Barve, Chandrasekhar, “Tendulkaranchi Natake” (Marathi), (Plays of Tendulkar), Rajhans Prakashan Gruh, Poona, 1993.

All the textual references are taken from – “Vijay Tendulkar, Collected Plays in Translation”, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2006.

Chapter 6
“A Violent Oppressive Transformation of Power”
‘Ghashiram Kotwal’.

In the age of primitive man, when human beings were living in the forest, they need the violence for securing food or for protection of their own lives or their beloved one's lives. The basic instincts are gone mild outwardly due to the education and civilization process. But the basic instinct of violence and sexual urge remained as they were in the heart suppressed. Under certain unavoidable situations and pressures these two basic instincts of human being come out from the bottom of the heart violently. Naturally these two elements become the important constituents in power game.

Vijay Tendulkar makes a clever use of both the above constituents in his play ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’. The character of Ghashiram is portrayed as an embodiment of the instinct of violence. The other important character, Nana Phadnavis, processing power in his hands, is portrayed as an embodiment of libido of sexual urge.

‘Ghashiram Kotwal’ is a two-act play which consist powerful components of song, dance and music. Tendulkar uses the elements of the folk forms like Dashavatar, Khel, Tamasha, Kirtan and Bharud. In this play Tendulkar depicts the rise of a poor North Indian Brahmin, Ghashiram to the position of Kotwal of Poona and his death at the hands of mob. Tendulkar skillfully portrays the transformation of an oppressed person into a cruel oppressor. The playwright shows the negative influence of power by depicting the deterioration in Ghashiram’s character after coming to power. The first act portrays the journey of Ghashiram from being a servant of a prostitute to becoming the Kotwal of Poona. When Ghashiram has humiliated several times, he has decided to be a ruler. When Ghashiram knows about weakness of Nana, he blackmails Nana and urges him to make him the Kotwal of Poona. He uses his daughter in exchange of Kotwalship. Nana issues the order making Ghashiram the Kotwal of Poona. The second act depicts Ghashiram’s inhuman torture of innocent people under the intoxication of power and its resultant violent reaction by people in which he is stoned to death.

Tendulkar has used the human curtain for presenting different situations in the play in a very skilful manner. Tendulkar skillfully uses the

combination of the device of human curtain, music and actions of the characters produces a spectacular effect in this scene.

‘Ghashiram Kotwal’ is appreciated as Tendulkar’s “Best work today”.¹ Though it is based on history, the focus is on the contemporary political scene rather than history. It is set in the late eighteenth century history of Maharashtra when Balaji Janardan Bhanu (12 February 1742 – 13 March 1800) through heredity became chief administrator (Nana Phadnavis) after his father’s death when he was fourteen years old. He married nine women and had not any children. He participated in the conspiracy against Raghunath the Peshwa after the defeat in the third Panipat battle and sudden death of Madhavrao the Peshwa. He lost his power temporarily owing to his losing good will of the Peshwa. He regained it in 1778 and continued it till his death. He was known as the Marathi Machiavelli of the late eighteenth century.

‘Ghashiram Kotwal’ was first produced by the Progressive Dramatic Association of Poona under the guidance of Dr. Jabbar Patel and the assistance of Satish Alekar on 12th December 1972 in Poona. It was followed by eighteen more performances in Bombay and Poona. Five thousand people witnessed these performances. The play won several

awards at the Maharashtra State Drama Competition during 1972-73. The success was due to rigorous endeavour of the members of the Progressive Dramatic Association of Poona. The troupe did rehearsals from 9-30 p.m. till 2-30 a.m. rigorously every day for three months. Only young people were chosen for this since it demands a great deal of physical strain. The rehearsal divided in to five parts: (1) Learning to do every pace in the rhythm (2) Learning to sing in tune (3) Learning to sing a tune (4) Blending all these to set the pace for the production and (5) Doing the costumes. All these scrupulous planning and hard work paid rich dividends in the form of the great success of the play and also winning several awards.

But after nineteen performances, the Progressive Dramatic Association of Poona together with the president banned the play. They were afraid that there would be a violent reaction against the play as it had been criticized as 'Anti-Brahmin' play and also as a play of historical distortion on the role of Nana, a Marathi cult-hero. Then most of the members of the association quit the association and formed Theatre Academy on 27th March 1973. They revived the production of the play on 11th January 1974, and the play completed 300 shows successfully.

It is very true that the play was controversial but charges against the play was only due to misunderstanding. It is neither anti-Brahmin nor intended to distort history. Its sole focus is on the contemporary political scene. In an author's note Tendulkar says:

“This is not a historical play. It is a story, in prose, verse, music and dance set in historical era. Ghashirams are creations of socio-political forces which know no barriers of time and place. Although based on a historical legend, I have no intention of commentary on the morals or lack of them of the Peshwa, Nana Phadnavis or Ghashiram.”²

It is very sound and clear, after the long period of time passed to first performance of this play that, it depicts a power game. So many critiques have written about this aspect of the play. The form and techniques were unique and modern at that time, so many discussions and comments were made by scholars. There is no doubt about contemporariness of the play. Famous writer and scholar Girish Karnad explains the contemporary relevance of ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’ in an introduction to his three plays. In his own words:

“In his ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’, Tendulkar uses Dashavatar, a traditional semi-classical form, to investigate a contemporary political problem, the emergence of ‘demons’ in public. These

demons are initially created by political leaders for the purpose of their own power games but ultimately go out of control and threaten to destroy their own creators. It is a theme recurrent in Indian mythology. The demon made indestructible by the boon of gods and then turning on the gods themselves.³

Therefore unless we understand the power game in the play, we are likely to miss the theme and process of transformation of power. If we understand the power game and the process we totally disagree with what Veena Noble Das says. She says “The central weakness of the play is that Ghashiram has been provided with too explicit reason for his conversion from man to monster,” but in our world no one provides reasons to become a monster. It is a necessity of a political person to work out ways to find power in an unconventional manner and then a man becomes monster, through back up of that politically ambitious person. It is a constant process and Tendulkar skillfully illustrated it in ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’.

The play begins with the prayer to Lord Ganesha (God of Success), Saraswati (Goddess of Wisdom) and Laxmi (Goddess of Wealth). The actors praying to the deities exit and the Sutradhar asks them to stop the prayer song. He learns about the professions of Brahmans that make the human wall. Each one of them tries to sneak one after the other. He questions them where they are going. They try to avoid telling the truth but he cleverly traps

them into telling the truth. They curse him for it and go to Bavannakhani, the red light area. The beginning of the play juxtaposes the holy prayer and the unholy lust of the Brahmans and thus betrays the hypocrisy of the society. While Brahmans enjoy erotic pleasure at Bavannakhani, their wives are condemned to solitary confinement at home. This shows oppressive patriarchal culture of Hindu society. As Sudhir Kakar says: “No sex in marriage please, we are Indian”,⁴ which reflects the theme of Hindu culture. Men are allowed to get pleasure from courtesans or from other supply, because men has the power to rule, men has power to explore, and men are the pillar of the patriarchal society. The power transforms into action, it transforms in heredity.

Ghashiram Savaldas, a poor Brahman from Kanauj, comes with his wife and daughter to Poona for livelihood. He becomes a servant in famous courtesan, Gulabi's house. In addition to the housework that he does for her, he also accompanies her in her erotic songs and dances. Once, Nana Phadnavis visits Gulabi. He sprains his ankle during his dance. Then Ghashiram holds his hurt foot in his hands and says: “In my hands has fallen—grace! All here envy me my place. This is a gift to last me all my days. (Pg. 370)

His smooth talk clearly shows that he accepts the hierarchy of power. And through it, he tries to get power from Nana who feels flattered and pleased. So he offers him a necklace of pearls and leaves. This is the first encounter between Ghashiram and Nana Phadnavis. It is obvious that one person who is near to the ground level always wants to please the people of superior level. With the praise to superior person, people get the power and way towards higher position. Here in this scene Tendulkar shows the reality in a dramatic way.

When Nana leaves the place, an interesting scene happens. Gulabi snatches the necklace from Ghashiram and sends him out with the help of her thugs. As we know Gulabi is a courtesan and knowingly oppressed by power of money and position. But, here at her place she has the power and she oppresses and insults Ghashiram. The 'power' transforms and hence, Ghashiram loses both his employment and necklace. He feels hurt and humiliated. Here we can see that Gulabi who once rescues Ghashiram persecutes him later. And Ghashiram who remains in the position of the victim feels helpless and powerless.

This is the first humiliation for him. He then goes out. He feels tired and hungry. When the Peshwa arranges a great feast in honour of Brahmans,

he also goes there. But the soldiers do not let him in. Meanwhile, a Brahman whose money given by the Peshwa, is stolen yells that some thief has stolen his money. The soldiers beat Ghashiram severely, mistaking him for the thief. He not only misses the feast and the alms but also receives blows and bad name as thief. This is the second humiliation he suffers. Then, Nana comes and says that the actual thief is gone. Brahmans go running after Nana who gives them coins. Though Nana says that he is not the thief, the soldiers put Ghashiram in prison on the charge of theft. After sometime, a soldier throws him out and says to him: “Get lost. Hey! Thief, monkey. If you so much as put a foot in the holy city of Poona, you’ll lose your head. Go away. Take your ugly face far away. Don’t come back to Poona. Not even your shadow should fall on the city of Poona. Get lost. Go... (Pg. 376)

Here Dramatic composition takes place. The chorus, Brahmans, Brahman women, Gulabi, the Marathi lovers and others look down upon Ghashiram who feels horribly hurt for damaging his reputation for no fault of his. This is the third oppressive situation he suffers. He becomes revengeful and angry. He cannot bear the humiliation with his poverty and hunger. In his fury, he says: “But I will come back. I’ll come back to Poona. I’ll show my strength. I’ll cost you! Your good days are gone! I am a Kanauj Brahman but I’ve become a Shudra, a criminal, a useless animal. There is no

one to stop me now, to mock me, to make me bend, to cheat me. Now I am a devil. You've made me an animal. I'll be a devil inside. I'll come back like a boar and I'll stay as a devil. I'll make pigs of all of you. I'll make this Poona a kingdom of pigs. Then I'll be Ghashiram again, the son of Savaldas once more. (Pg. 376-377)

Music was an integral part of the drama, and some directorial treatment was applied to 'Ghashiram Kotwal'. Indication of mental status of character was specifically choreographed according to rhythm by director. Vijaya Mehta a great director of the prevailing era says:

"I didn't find any special or different thing in this play; I never felt that it was a humiliation of Brahmans, but the treatment by Jabbar is great and the play is a result of the entire artiste including Tendulkar and Bhaskar Chandavarkar the music director. In fact music was the great element to gain success of the 'Ghashiram Kotwal'." ⁵

For example, after a fury by Ghashiram drum beats forcefully and Ghashiram dances a war dance.

Now Ghashiram looks for the best way to get enough power to persecute the people of Poona. Next scene is about the Ganesha temple. Some people go to the temple of Ganesha. A Story teller tells a religious tale

through song and dance. Meanwhile Nana comes and people pay their reverence to him. They listen to the tale while Nana ogles the woman. At last, at the time of prayer to Ganesha gets all door closed. Nana puts his hand on that girl and lustfully says: “All your dreams this Nana will fulfill.” (Pg. 378) She expresses her fear of being seen and steals away. He runs after her and in his lusty haste holds Ghashiram who is in the guise of a servant. Then he urges the servant to go and find her: “If she is not found, no one will keep his head! Our grandeur’s gone if she’s not had. We tell you. If she is found, then this Nine Court Nana will conquer Hindustan! What a bosom! Buds just blossoming....We’ll squeeze them like this! (Pg. 380)

At that time people know that even the Peshwa obeys whatever Nana says. Nana is very powerful and the fear of Nana grows day by day. Ghashiram, in the guise of the servant gets angry at Nana’s lecherous description of his daughter but suppresses it. He acts with humility and promises to secure the fled girl for him the following day. Here, Ghashiram exactly knows the weakness of Nana, and his oppressive mind is in the process of getting profit from that weakness. The next day, he brings the girl, none other but his own daughter, Gauri, and sends her to serve Nana Phadnavis. He seeks power through a tool that is his daughter. As he speaks:

“Now he is in my hands..... I’ve given my beloved daughter in the jaws of that wolf!” (Pg. 381) Ghashiram exactly knows what he is doing.

Ghashiram on the one hand, feels guilty about sacrificing his daughter and on the other hand, feels urges to avenge the immense humiliation on the people of Poona who brought him to this state. The words put into his mouth by Tendulkar are significant: “Now he is in my hands... Oh, my daughter.... The beast (then yells at audience) Oh you people. Look! I’ve given my beloved daughter into the jaws of that wolf! Look. Look at this father putting his heart’s child for sale. Look at my innocent daughter—a whore. That old overripe bastard! Look at him, eating her like a peach.... Spit on me. Stone me. Look, Look, but I will not quit. I’ll make this Poona a kingdom of pigs” (Pg. 381) Now Ghashiram blackmails Nana and urges him to make him the Kotwal of Poona. Nana issues the order making Ghashiram the Kotwal of Poona.

Transformation of power always needs two elements, one who gives the power, the authority and second who seeks power. Both are essential for the transformation of power, so here Ghashiram needs Nana and Nana needs Ghashiram. Samik Bandyopadhyay appropriately remarks:

“Tendulkar suggests the sexuality implicit in power in the brilliant innuendo... Nana needs Ghashiram and Ghashiram needs Nana”⁶

That's why the Nanas Find Ghashirams and Ghashirams rescue Nanas. Here in this play Nana uses his power to get enjoyment of sex with the girl of his choice and Ghashiram uses his asset, his daughter to enjoy power. It is a give and take process and this is the way how power transforms. In this case, Sex, for Nana, is not only a source of enjoyment but also an effective way of displaying his ultimate power. While Ghashiram needs an official title, the Kotwalship, to be the Persecutor, in order to feel powerful and thus overcomes his powerlessness. Now, Ghashiram has the power to get revenge of his insults. He starts hunting people who had humiliated him and harasses them. Nana is happy about actions of Ghashiram because those people are also enemies of Nana Phadnavis. When Ghashiram leaves the place, Nana delivers a soliloquy: “Go, Ghashya, Go, old bastard. We made you. We made you Kotwal. Raise hell if you wish. But you don't know the way of this Nana. This time, there are two bullets in this gun. With the first one, we'll fell your luscious daughter. But with the second we'll make the city of Poona dance. Ghashya, child, you are a foreigner. I have put you on Poona's back. Why? As a counter check to all

those conspirators. You will not be able to join them; they will never trust you even if you do... What'll happen is that our misdeeds will be credited to your account. We do; our Kotwal pays. (Pg. 384-385)

Transformation of power itself is an ugly game. Even both receiver and philanthropist know the bitter truth they transform. It is a necessity of every human being. Authority always wanted to exercise its power safely and test the supremacy in society. People like Ghashiram always wanted power because they never tested it. They just observed the power outside of the system and a strong desire to get powerful is a basic desire of a human being. We can see its reflection in contemporary political scene in India. Samik Bandyopadhyay writes similar to this:

“Like ceremony, both religious and secular, the deceptions of deputation constitute yet another device of power. The real power uses the masks of deputation to mediate the exercise of power, to hide from victims the real face of power so that all resistance is effectively deflected. Intermediate democratic institutions, are the paraphernalia of bureaucracy, too often regarded as repositories of at least executive, are more often than not masks or mediations that veil the actual exercise of power and hide the perpetrator from the eyes of the victim.”⁷

Oswald Summerton, a transactional Analyst focuses on another point. He explains the role of Nana through 'Game Pantagone' he adds two more roles, the spectator and the stage manager, to the three roles of drama triangle.⁸ While the Peshwa remains spectator, Nana becomes the stage manager, and manages the power game. He implants Ghashiram as manger and becomes a spectator. As a result Ghashiram persecutes the people of Poona ruthlessly and finally ends up murdered by the People of Poona. That is the reason why Samik Bandyopadhyay expresses:

“In the shifting game of power, it is only a temporary adjustment that Nana exploits as long as necessary and can drop unceremoniously the moment it has served its purpose.”⁹

Once upon a time who is oppressed now becomes oppressor. Ghashiram the oppressor feels that he is superior to his victims – the people of Poona, so he can't tolerate being victimized by the inferior people whom he calls pigs. The Brahmans of Poona once upon a time enjoyed courtesan like Gulabi are forcefully stopped by an order by Ghashiram with immediate effect. Everybody has to take permission of Ghashiram to do anything out of routine. The Sutradhar says: “‘Ghashiram Kotwal’ says to kill a pig, to do an abortion, to be pimp, to commit a misdemeanor, to steal, to live with one's divorced wife, to remarry if one's husband is alive, to hide one's caste, to

use counterfeit coins, to commit suicide, without a permit, is a sin. A good woman may not prostitute herself; a Brahman may not sin, without a permit. (Pg. 387) then he adds that whosoever does wrong will be punished severely.

Ghashiram started patrolling alone the streets of Poona at night after eleven o'clock. He confronts anyone that he meets in the street. He whips the people. He arrests and imprisons them. The prisons are full. He harasses and punishes the people on mere suspicion. He arrests a man who goes out without a permit to fetch a midwife at midnight. He punishes a wife and her husband on the suspicion that they have committed adultery. He gets them tortured inhumanly when they do not confess. People try to complain about this to Nana but he does not listen to them. The dialogues are as follows which explain negligence of Nana towards these complaints.

Woman: Sir, listen to my complaint. My husband and his brothers have been arrested by the Kotwal's soldiers. My father-in-law died. They won't let them hold the funeral. The permit is real but they call it counterfeit. Sir—the corpse has been lying in the cremation ground since morning. The dogs are gathering. Sir—please —give us justice.... (Pg. 393)

Nana: (As if his fun has been spoiled) Where are the guards?
 Take this woman away at once. Who let her in without a
 permit? Complaints and all that go to the Kotwal. Go. Don't
 let anyone in. (servants take the woman away. To the Lavani dancer)

All right, go on, go on! O you are a sweetheart! Wah! Wah! (Pg. 393)

Nana enjoys erotic dance and pays deaf ear to the complaints of the people. Ghashiram goes on with his inhuman persecution of the people. He becomes more oppressive. Sutradhar narrates: "Behind 'Ghashiram Kotwal' is Nana's power. If you lay a hand on Ghashiram, Nana will smash you. If you don't then Ghashiram will get you any way. (Pg. 392) It is an irony. In ideal context who has suffered from an oppressive behavior in past must be a good and kind authority, if he gets power. But in reality anyone who gets power always forgets past and as an authority he becomes oppressive. This process of transformation is violent and we can call it violent transformation of power.

After this scene one scene is very significant, Tendulkar writes a replicated scene of what had happened with Ghashiram in the past. There is a tradition of the Peshwa to honour the scholars and Brahmans with gifts and a feast once in a year. Next scene is the gathering of the scholars and

Brahmans. People have gathered in the special garden again for that year. One of the Brahman yells that his money is stolen. Ghashiram becomes alert and arrests a Brahman on the charge of theft. He says to him: “You are born Brahman and you steal?” (Pg. 394) This dialogue shows us that Ghashiram still remembers his earlier days when he was accused and nobody considered his explanation. So, Ghashiram makes him undergo the torment of holding a red-hot iron ball in his hands. The poor Brahman groans in agony. He is frightened and forced by another ordeal to accept the allegation. Thus, Ghashiram avenges his insult on poor Brahman. Once oppressed person now becomes a true oppressor.

The state revenue has increased and crime rate has decreased but the city of Poona trembles at the name of Ghashiram. Ghashiram feels satisfied with his effective use of power. Now he thinks that he can use his power to get his daughter married to a suitable man. He says: “I have got Kotwali and I have got Poona straightened out. All these hard, proud Brahmans are as soft as cotton now. No one dares to look at Ghashiram straight in the eyes! Now, once I find a fitting husband for my darling daughter—that piece of my heart named Lalita Gauri and get her married, then everything will be the way I want it. I’ll make such a show of the wedding that no one’s tongue will move to utter one bad word about my daughter. (Pg. 398)

Above mentioned dialogues depict that though he has become an oppressor, he has tender emotions in his heart. At the people of Poona, he is a cruel person but as a father he has softness. Here he wants a reputed husband for his daughter, shows that though he gets power he is still working in the frame of society and the marriage of his daughter is a way of exercising his power. Unless he is very powerful, no one will accept his daughter who sleeps with Nana Phadnavis. Gauri is an innocent soul, who becomes scapegoat of the power game. Nana enjoys sex with her and she becomes pregnant. So he employs a midwife to effect abortion and Gauri dies in the midwife's crude attempt of abortion. Nana does not wait any longer and he marries another teenage girl secretly and she becomes his seventh wife. Ghashiram hears this and his heart is broken. Ghashiram approaches furiously to Nana. Nana gets frightened internally but calmly and cunningly says: "Ghashya how much more will you grieve? Now be calm. Whatever happened, protocol should not be forgotten. Don't forget that. Whom do you stand before? First you must bow. Now—bow. (Pg. 404)

As if a circus tiger obeys his master, Ghashiram obeys Nana and bows but he is still angry. Nana praises his work as Kotwal. Then, he threatens him indirectly and reminds him that he is the Chief Minister. Ghashiram is still angry. Finally Nana quotes from Vedas and advices Ghashiram to forget

past. As he says: “The Vedas have said that. After all, Ghashya, will we live forever? (Sighs) We too, every one of us, will leave. Ghashya... This body is earth, just dirt. You cannot rely upon it. What comes, goes. Four handfuls of ash remain. (Pg. 405)

Thus, Nana uses religious ideology to justify the hierarchy of power and the unjust oppression and exploitation. Ghashiram is still in trauma of his beloved daughter’s death. Nana describes the Indian philosophy in detail and advises Ghashiram, to use his power to shut the mouths of the people trying to talk about his daughter badly. Ghashiram in his speech explains that Nana has agreed to give full authority to him. Nana allows Ghashiram to cut off heads of people who dare to gossip about the Kotwal.

Additional power mesmerizes Ghashiram and due to the impact of power transformation, he seems to be convinced now. He accepts his beloved daughter’s death and settles for continuing to exercise power. Here Nana, the authority, cleverly manages the power play and settles down Ghashiram. Ghashiram in his internal thought process somehow knows his position. He internally realizes that though he is powerful to city of Poona, he is powerless in front of Nana. He can’t accept his position in the hierarchy of power. This feeling of powerlessness haunts him and he starts

murdering people. He tortures people on the slightest reason, or suspicion. Hence, he looses reasons to justify his cruel acts. People of the town are murmuring that “The Kotwal has acquired a penchant for human blood” (Pg. 407) People of Poona are greatly terrified. The prisons are overcrowded and some of the victims die due to suffocation.

In the next scene we see that there are twenty two Brahmans died of suffocation and no one is there to help them. When guards of the jail are in deep sleep and unconscious due to consumption of opium, Sardar Phadake grabs the chance to settle the score with Ghashiram as he is his strong enemy. Sardar Phadake gets doors open and takes the dead bodies to the Peshwa and demands justice. Peshwa becomes angry and sends a call for Nana but Nana is busy. The Brahmans of Poona can't wait so mob goes to Nana's place. Nana understands the psychology of mob and issues the order for the death of Ghashiram without any hesitation. Nana tells mob to do whatever they want to do with Ghashiram. As he says: “Use a thorn to take out a thorn. That's great. The disease has stopped. Anyway, he was no use anymore.” (Pg. 413)

Cruelty and moral corruption are the two characteristics which differentiate politics from other professions, and these were not the features

of the Peshwa regime alone, but a universal phenomenon. The above mentioned scene depicts that the politicians have tremendous potentiality for doing the impossible. It shows the authority's ability for cruelty and manipulations. Hence Nana orders the mob to do whatever they want to do.

Angry mob surrounds Ghashiram. They beat him, shave his head, paint saffron on it, ride him on camel, tie him to the leg of an elephant and finally tie his hands behind his back. Ghashiram overcome by remorse says to them: "I danced on your chests but I wasted the life of my little daughter. Beat me. Beat me. Hit me. Cut off my hands and feet. Crack my skull..." (Pg. 415)

People shout around him. He succumbs to the injuries and dies. Nana, stage-manager in the Game Pentagon of Power, comes and addresses the people. Here, Tendulkar puts words in epilogue of Nana very precisely. Nana says: "Ladies and gentlemen. Citizens of Poona. A threat to the great city of Poona has been ended today. (The crowd cheers) A disease has been controlled. The demon Ghashya Kotwal, who plagued all of us, has met his death. Everything has happened according to the wishes of the gods. The mercy of gods is with us always." (Pg. 415) It clearly shows us the tremendous potentiality of politicians to do impossible things. They

(politicians) can make a deal with anybody, even with Gods. Nana Phadnavis is prepared to bribe even Gods for cooling down mob's anger. He says: "Do a special pooja. Pray to the Gods. Make a deal with the Gods. Promise them anything." (Pg. 412) This remark shows the politician's capability for cruelty and manipulations.

Nana bans the funeral rights for Ghashiram and orders to banish Ghashiram's all relatives. People shout and cheer. Now Gulabi comes dancing. All people dance together happily and Nana joins them. Nanas and Ghashirams will be there in every society as long as power politics exist and hence a society itself has hierarchy of power and alienation power politics remains infinite. So Ghashiram and Nana exist forever. The people of Poona think that Ghashiram is dead. But Ghashiram is dead only as a person while his role is very much alive and somebody will play the same role. Name of Kotwal changes from time to time but position and characteristic remain the same in the game of violent oppressive transformation. That's why Tendulkar says:

"Broadly speaking, I had in mind the emergence, the growth and the inevitable end of the Ghashirams; also those who create, and help Ghashirams to grow; and the irony of stoning to death a person pretending that it is the end of Ghashirams"¹⁰

The transformation process is very interesting. Role played by Nanas, role played by Ghashirams, and role played by the people are alive forever. The people, the victim, they give away their power by accepting the hierarchy of power and by obeying the authorities. Tendulkar mentioned in his interview that he felt the need to treat the people as a single character. That is the reason why Tendulkar searched for a theatrical form that suited this play named 'Ghashiram Kotwal' as he says:

“The urgency was of finding a form in which a class or a multitude could become the central character.” (He adds that “The present title “‘Ghashiram Kotwal’ represents the incident of ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’ and not the character of ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’.) De-glamorization of historical incidents accidentally happened because of the form and I liked it. I meant it.”¹¹

The victim has to surrender in front of power because other people never support him. This is because of two situations, one they are also afraid to rebel and second they want to watch and enjoy sensational experience of oppression. So, people are prevented by themselves to realize their hidden power. M. Sarat Babu quotes:

“The people perhaps play underdog power games.”¹²

Ghashiram is a typical tormenter while Nana is the stage manager, the Peshwa is the spectator and the people are the victims. Like Nana, Gulabi rescues Ghashiram in the beginning and oppresses him later. When Ghashiram tries to own the necklace granted by Nana for his sycophantic poetry, Gulabi snatches the necklace from him and throws him out with the help of thugs. So Ghashiram loses the job. Nana manages the entire show. Ghashiram becomes a pawn in his power game. Ghashiram persecutes Nana's enemies without knowing it and acquires a bad name. Thus, not only his daughter but also his Kotwali is used cleverly by Nana. That is why Samik Bandyopadhyay points out,

“The real power uses the mask of deputation to mediate the exercise of power, to hide from the victims the real face of power, so that all resistance is effectively deflected.” It is Nana who exercised the power through Ghashiram to subdue his enemies but it is Ghashiram who received the wrath of the people. This throws light rather on the contemporary political scene than on the past history of Poona.”¹³

Women characters remain invisible except Gulabi and they are silent in the play. This sets the aura of patriarchal power. Ghashiram who is the victim of oppression fails to understand the powerlessness of women. He has no consideration for them. His love for his daughter is smaller than power

ambition and it seems like possessive inclination. He surrenders her to the lust of Nana for power. He does not consult his wife in this regard. He suspects a housewife and her husband to be adulterous and arrests them. His passion to overcome his powerlessness makes him mindless and loveless. He shows kindness to anyone and as a result he loses his humanity and logical reasons for justification. So he oppresses people like a power maniac. So, he fails to perceive the cunning moves of Nana as he proud of his cleverness as a Kotwal. Nana exercises power in sexual exploitation and Ghashiram exercises power for the aggressive revenge.

Tendulkar, in his social criticism, is more concerned with the mechanism of power operating within society than with the economic and political implications and sources of that power. Tendulkar, in 'Ghashiram Kotwal' observes the operations of religiosity, sexuality, deputation and politics as devices of power. In Modern India the political leaders in order to get their aims fulfilled depute on the top position their so called near ones. As long as their aims are served, the officials enjoy the life with all its charms but as soon as the aims are fulfilled, the officials become useless and even danger to the political leaders so they do not hesitate even to eliminate them from life. The politicians are even worse than the underworld dons. The tradition of "Use and Throw" has become synonymous with political

leaders and Tendulkar tries to focus on this scenario through the plight of Ghashiram.

N. S. Dharan states in the following words:

“The inescapable reality is that as long as politics remains a power game Phadnavis, Ghashirams, and Lalita Gauris are bound to emerge. Not only in India but also the world over, we witness, Ghashiram being played on real political theatres. This universal political reality in fact accounts for the abiding popularity of the play”.¹⁴

It is a well known truth that how ‘Shivsena’ arose in this scenario. Balasaheb Thackeray was emerging as a strong violent leader of Maharashtra. In his interview Tendulkar says about the whole incident. He had gone through a novel on Ghashiram by Moroba Kanhoba in the past and had correlated it with the rise of ‘Shivsena’.

As he says:

“I have read ‘Ghashiram’ written by Moroba Kanhoba few years back. When I seen the violence created by Shivsena at Mumbai. I was very close to that incidents and chaos created all around Mumbai. I have worked with Balasaheb Thackeray in a news paper while I was journalist and he was a cartoonist. The riots show me the true transformation process of to be demon

from an innocent and kind person. After some months I am able to watch a folk theatre performance in a slum area of Mumbai and I got the form suitable for the play. The process of creating ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’ is a lengthy one but I must have to mention that three major points are most important to generate the play within me are, one was the riots, Second was the story and third was the form.”¹⁵

We can analyze Tendulkar with help of all of his writing and it is sound and clear that he is interested in shaking the bases of conventional system. He is more concern about social and political scenario. In other words we find his plays having strong socio-political concern. Rise of Shivsena is a result of power politics of the prevailing situation. We can understand the process of Tendulkar’s writing of “‘Ghashiram Kotwal’” through definition of power politics, ethics and the incidents of Indian Politics.

Definition of Power politics is,

“On the level of international politics, power can take many forms from moral suasion to the carrot of economic benefits to the stick of sanctions or military force.”¹⁶

“Power politics” is one of the most equivocal terms in the lexicon of international affairs. In common usage it often is value-laden, usually in a

negative sense. It implies using coercion – force or threats of force – to impose one’s will upon others. Thus one can define power politics both as a term commonly used in political rhetoric and a theoretical description of how states interact in pursuit of their interests in the international arena. In American English it usually means politics based primarily on coercion rather than on cooperation, whether that coercion is military or economic.”So, those who are attached with the government or the rulers know or learn the game of power of politics in order to be on the throne. Even the people never raise their voice if their interests are served and the world goes on. Consciously or unconsciously the people also become the part of power politics.

Longman dictionary of contemporary English defines “politics” as the art or science of government and “power politics” as the system of gaining an advantage for one’s country in international politics by the use or show of armed force instead of by peaceful argument. To indulge in politics is inborn instinct of man. And as the Hindu scriptures “Mahabharata” and “Ramayana” also display the game of shrewd power politics. In “Ramayana” Kaikaiyi and Manthara symbolize the game of power politics. In Mahabharata, Duryodhan and Shakuni with their shrewd mind immortalize the word power politics. And even lord Krishna had to play power politics in

order to defeat “Adharma”. So power politics is associated with the race of man.

Vijay Tendulkar as a true theatre person wanted to make a strong political statement through this play. As Smita Mishra says:

“It is a dramatic exposure of the latent violence, treachery, sexuality and immorality and it characterizes politics. ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’, the play shows a man who, caught in the matrix of opportunistic ethics of modern world, feels alienated. It shows how a common man, seeking power, confronts the people who were already in power and undergoes an organic change.”¹⁷

The period from 1761 to 1818 was critical for the Maratha Empire. But in such a critical period one brain shines and when it fades the Maratha Empire starts declining. And the name of that man is Nana Phadnavis. His whole life is like an interesting novel. ‘Nana Phadnavis’, Balaji Janardan Bhanu (12 February 1742–13 March 1800) became Phadnavis (Administrator) at the age of fourteen by hereditary right at the death of his father. He did not have any experience of war nor physical strong body. But, yes in the game of intellect he used to defeat everyone. His intellectual capacity can be compared with Chanakya. Through shrewd strategies he was able to defeat Britishers.

In the reign of Madhavrao two young men came on the surface. They were – Mahadaji Shinde and Nana Phadnavis. Nana was a true patriot as per Maratha history. Madhavrao, Peshwa died in 1772 and a period of struggle started for Nana. Madhavrao's brother Narayanarao became the Peshwa but Raghunath killed him by treachery and became the Peshwa. Nana's devotion towards Peshwa made him restless and he fought with Raghunath and made Narayanarao son Savaii Madhavrao the Peshwa. In his life career Nana Phadnavis Fought & defeated the Britishers, Defeated Haider Ali, Controlled selfish landlords & Maratha officials, Fought with Tipu Sultan, The war between Britishers & Marathas and treaty at Salbai. He achieved Great victory in making Savaii Madhavrao as the new Peshwa and that too without shedding a single drop of blood through his sharp intellect, political strategy and statesmanship. He was a shrewd statesman and he retained his power till his death. He had nine wives and no children. Nana was a cult hero, who was worshipped as hero by Marathas. His flaws were ignored by the people, being blind to their hero's treachery; they were only too ready to stone to death their Kotwal when their Phadnavis asked them to do so. However, it was this aspect of Phadnavis' character that Tendulkar chose to highlight. He even made Ghashiram, the Kotwal of Poona in exchange of his daughter.

According to history, Ghashiram was a North Indian Brahmin, a resident of Aurangabad, who was appointed as the police prefect of Poona on 8th Feb, 1777 and continued to hold office till his death which took place on 31st August 1791 under violent circumstances. He had earned Nana's confidence by his faithful service during the critical times that followed the Peshwa Narayanrao's murder. He enjoyed the full trust of Nana Phadnavis and his administration was notoriously worse than that of his predecessors. He was the man who had been appointed to watch the movements and plans of Raghunathrao and his family and he reported to Nana whatever suited his purpose. He had under him a large body of unscrupulous spies, everyone possessing ample means of harassing innocent people and as a consequence the word 'Ghashiram' has become a permanent synonym for oppression and tyranny.

Ghashiram's carving for power may be compared with Dr. Faustus' carving of power. In order to conquer the world, just as Dr. Faustus sells his soul to the devil Mephistopheles, here also Ghashiram sells his soul – his own daughter Gauri to enjoy the power. Ghashiram rightly deserves our pity for the punishment is greater than he deserved. There is a tragic sense of waste illustrated by the death of Ghashiram. Tendulkar has presented a very striking picture of a tragic figure like Ghashiram. Ghashiram Savaldas

belongs not only to the late eighteenth century Peshwa Empire, but also to all phases of human history. His rise and growth from a Savaldas to the most controversial Kotwal of Poona is symbolic of the multifaceted growth of corruption in our society. Through the shrewd and opportunistic character of Ghashiram, Tendulkar has tried to bring out the truth that sycophancy not only flourishes but also prospers under the patronage of the rulers.

As Shanta Gokhale writes:

“Tendulkar wanted to make a serious political statement in ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’. That was why he wrote the play, not to vent his spleen against Brahmins, as many Brahmins thought, nor to desecrate the sanctity of the stage with lurid depiction of lasciviousness, nor rake in money by entertaining audiences with song and dance and a scandalous legend about a historical figure. Its reception by many as a brilliantly mounted entertaining spectacle upset the liberal social moralist. This, more than anything else, links Tendulkar with most significant of his predecessors on the Marathi stage – playwrights who wanted to force their society to look at and judge itself in all its aspects, socio, political, moral and personal.”¹⁸

In depicting the rise and growth of Ghashiram in our society, Tendulkar seems to have suggested that the purpose of the drama is not to produce catharsis i.e. “Peace of mind; all passion spent” but to encourage,

stimulate and provoke the audience\reader to think over the issues affecting the normal and balanced growth of human society. By showing the fatal end of Ghashiram in the play, Tendulkar does not want to suggest that Ghashiram has ended forever. He rather wants to draw our attention to the socio-political factors responsible for the growth of such a crisis in our society. There are certain questions that keep haunting our minds. What led to the emergence of Ghashiram? Who is responsible for the rise and growth of Ghashiram? And what are the fatal consequences arising out of the creation of Ghashiram? The contemporary relevance of the play lies in the answer to these questions, and here Tendulkar stands firmly as a class by himself.

Tendulkar throughout the play has used female sexuality to represent the loss and destruction caused by the struggle for power. The corruption that power brings about is projected through the sexual laxity of the Brahmin dominated society of Poona. The play was attacked by those who perceived the play as an attack on the character of Nana Phadnavis, the finest administrator and one of the greatest patriots of the Maratha Empire. Tendulkar responded to this criticism by pointing out that 'Ghashiram Kotwal' was not meant to be a historically accurate account of Nana or Ghashiram's character or the rule over Poona. The most important thing is

that he has examined the very modern issue of the relationship between power and gender in a patriarchal society in a historical setting with historically recognizable characters. Tendulkar has underlined both the dark ambiguity of the cardboard figures of power which the male dominated society holds in high esteem and the dangers of this struggle for power in which gender has always played an important part. Meaning of gender in patriarchy is not just “difference” but division, oppression, inequity and inferiority for women and thus for all those without access to power. Tendulkar in ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’ suggests that the social construction of gender is effectively a useful tool in the hands of the powerful and will lead inevitably to the dehumanizing of both the powerful and the powerless alike, the Nanas and the Ghashirams as much as the Gauris, and also brought the destruction of meaningful human relationships and social and moral values.

Antonin Artaud in a letter says:

“ It seems to me creation , Life itself can only be defined by a kind of strictness, the fundamental cruelty guiding things towards their inexorable goal , whatever the cost .” ¹⁹

Artaud ‘s philosophy of the theatre rests on the perception of cruelty at the heart of nature and man Human nature has a taste for crime, Sexuality and savageness. He feels that a play must disturb our peace of mind and

release our repressed subconsciousness. He maintains that theatre should provide the spectator with the true essence of dreams in which his fondness for crime, his erotic obsessions, his savagery, his neurotic fantasies, his utopian sense of life and things and even his cannibalism gush forth not on a theoretical and illusory level but on an inner plane.

Same as Artaud, Tendulkar also believes that the theatre has to disturb our peace and our pent –up emotions. His plays not only disturb us but even shock us. His plays are documents on the inborn cruelty of man. ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’ is a landmark in Indian theatre. The play focuses on the corruption, cruelty and inhuman strategies embedded in the power and revenge and hands him over to the Brahmans of Poona who stone him to death. Ghashiram makes his daughter a victim in the game of power. Nana dares to corrupt even Gods.

Tendulkar uses Marathi history for his play ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’. Nana is portrayed as a lecher with an overpowering weakness for women. The play has been attacked for showing Nana Phadnavis, a cult hero, in an unsavoury light. But the play is not really about Nana. It is about a deputy who “no longer owes his position so much to solid popular or military

backing as to the diplomatic address with which he can play one party off against another.”²⁰ In an interview to Makarand Sathe Tendulkar says:

“This is not a historical play. It is a story, in prose, verse, music and dance set in a historical era. Ghashirams are creations of socio-political forces which know no barriers of time and place.”²¹

The play exposes the failure of human relations owing to man’s inherent cruelty to his fellow man. There is an innate urge for cruelty in man whether he is a ruler or subject.

Dhyaneshwar Nadkarni also finds contemporary elements in Tendulkar’s ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’. He defines transformation of power in terms of political roots in independent India. As he says about the play:

“Its theme is a searching comment on the power politics of the type of oligarchy which we see increasingly taking root in Maharashtra’s politics. Tendulkar achieves this without deviation from the artistic propriety of his characters or situation: but it is foolish to imagine that we are witnessing a good old historical with nothing pertinent to our times.”²²

The play is carved in the Peshwa period of Marathi history. But it exposes the cruelty of the decadent rules of all times.

Regarding the other aspects of the plays, the song, dance, music, thought and emotion, though they look physically separate, are organically related with the theme of the play. The treatment of human curtain in this play is a new experiment. The play is not divided into acts and scenes. Episode divisions are made cleverly by using the human curtain. The human curtain is used so intelligently as to avoid acts and scenes by the author. This can be illustrated through the speech of Ghashiram: "I'll straighten out this adulterous city in six months! (Suddenly) What's that noise? Again! Again! What are they doing in their homes at this hour of the night? (Knocks on the back of the seventh Brahman as if he were a door.) Open the door! (That man turns around and 'comes out' rubbing his eyes.)" (Pg. 390) Thus the human curtain is unified with the play.

When Ghashiram is tormented by the soldiers on the charge of theft, he denies it emotionally. Here, the 'Mrudanga' gives a forceful beat. Ghashiram dances to that beat, a war dance, banging his fist in the dust. He storms out through the audience. This gives a momentum to the force of emotion without using words. The theatrical devices-song, dance, music, thought and emotion-are unified to bring out the desired effect. The human curtain is cleverly used to avoid the interrupting division of scenes and acts.

The basic elements of transforming power are sex and violence; these two elements are basic motive to a violent act. It is a well known truth of mankind from the beginning of the primitive age. In 'Ghashiram Kotwal' the dramatist has succeeded in representing violence and sex, the basic instincts of human beings through Ghashiram and Nana. The basic instincts must have an outlet. They cannot be suppressed and when they are suppressed, they will burst out and disturb the peace of the society. Thus, the dramatist presents both violence and sex simultaneously in the play. Ghashiram's suppressed violence erupts and upsets his balance of mind whereas Nana does not lose his balance of mind as his sexual urge is never suppressed and is able to exercise power over Ghashiram.

The form of the play is always in discussion amongst theatre practitioners. Some critic says that the musical form blunts the edge of satire in the play. Point made by critiques is the musical does to a certain extent weaken the thrust of satire, and the sting is dulled. Tendulkar himself admitted while talking to Samik Bandyopadhyay:

“The criticism has point. Even then the sting was felt in Maharashtra. The Delhi production (done by Abhiyan in Hindi) had a somewhat different impact. It has less “entertainment values.” i.e., less music, and more impact as a serious play. The

musical form has its advantages and disadvantages, like all forms. I could not think of an alternative when I had to write the play. The form had certain inevitability.”²³

Tendulkar uses elements of different traditional folk forms of Maharashtra. Most of the critiques say that there are more influence of “Tamasha” on ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’ but as Tendulkar says he was not precisely thinking about any specific forms while writing the play. It is definitely accepted by him that a couple of forms spinning in his mind for long time. We can also find elements of “Dashavatar” and “Bharud” in the play. Music was very impactful and so many theatre artistes acclaim it. The rich musical quality of the play makes musicians like Vasanttrao Deshpande call the play “ The first ‘Sangeet Natak’ in the real sense of term”²⁴ even music is used to express changing moods and detailed characterization of characters. Thought process and physical gesture and postures are also synchronized with the rhythm of table. The songs sometimes provide dramatic relief in between tense situation and sometimes they serve to reinforce the tense atmosphere. The juxtaposition of the ‘Lavani’ and ‘Abhanga’ used to bring out the contradiction in social values and norms. It is an interesting thing that the ‘Abhanga’ which contains ‘Bhakti Rasa’ transforms in to ‘Lavani’ which is an expression of ‘Shringaar rasa’ it is

enormously proper to pronounce that “Ghashiram Kotwal” is a play performed through transformation of music, transformation of rhythm, and transformation of human wall- physically and psychologically.

In short, power transformation is constant, violence is constant and through a violent oppressive transformation process we can find Ghashirams infinitely in our society and civilization exist. And this scenario gave us a tremendous, mind blowing play, ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’ – a violent oppressive transformation of power, Written by Vijay Tendulkar.

References:

1. C. Coelho, "The Cult of Violence and Cruelty in Modern Theatre: A Study of Athol Fugard and Vijay Tendulkar," *Indian Literature Today*, ed. R.K.Dhawan, Prestige, Delhi, 1994 (vol. I, Pg. 34)
2. Tendulkar, Vijay, "interview," *India Today*, Dec. 16-31, 1980, Pg. 157.
3. Karnad, Girish, "Author's introduction," *Three Plays*, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1994, Pg. 15
4. Kakar, Sudhir, "Marriage: War between Sexes," *The Indian Express, Weekend Magazine*, 7th June 1987, Pg. 1.
5. Mehta, Vijaya, interview, A documentary film "Tendulkar & violence Then and Now" California arts Production, 2009
6. Bandyopadhyay, Samik, 'Introduction', *Collected Plays in Translation*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, (2004), Pg. V.
7. *Ibid.*, Pg. VI
8. Summerton, Oswald, *Transactional Game analysis* (Delhi; Manohar, 1979) Pg. 153.
9. Bandyopadhyay Samik, 'Introduction', *Collected Plays in Translation*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, (2004), Pg. v.-vi.
10. Ramnarayan, Gowri, "A new myth of Sisyphus!" (Vijay Tendulkar and Girish Karnad in conversation with Gowri Ramnarayan), *The Hindu Folio on theatre*, Feb. 1998, Pg. 16

11. Bandyopadhyay, Samik, 'Introduction', Collected Plays in Translation, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, (2004), Pg. v.-vi.
12. M. Sarat Babu, Vijay Tendulkar's 'Ghashiram Kotwal' "Introduction" by M. Sarat Babu, Asia Book Club, New Delhi, 2003. Pg. 76
13. Bandyopadhyay, Samik, 'Introduction', Collected Plays in Translation, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, (2004), Pg. vi.
14. Dharan, N. S., "The Plays of Vijay Tendulkar", Creative Books, New Delhi, 1999.
15. Interview of Tendulkar with Dr. Makarand Sathe in a documentary "Tendulkar and violence – Then and Now", Dir. Atul Pethe, ICCA, 2010.
16. www.southindpress.org
17. Mishra, Smita, "'Ghashiram Kotwal' as a Political Play", ZENITH, Vol. XI, (2005-2006), Pg. 23-33
18. Gokhale, Shanta, "Playwright at the centre! Marathi Drama from 1843 to Present", Seagull Books, Calcutta.
19. Artaud, Antonin, "The Theatre of Cruelty and its Dubble", trans. Victor Corti (London: Calder's and Boyars, 1974), Pg. 79.
20. Percival Spear, The Oxford History of India (Delhi: Oxford UP, 1978), Pg. 54.
21. Interview of Tendulkar to Dr. Makarand Sathe in a documentary "Tendulkar and violence – Then and Now" on Vijay Tendulkar.

22. Nadkarni, Dhyaneshwar, “‘Ghashiram Kotwal’,” Enact, No. 74-74 Jan-Feb 1973.
23. Bandyopadhyay, Samik, “introduction to ‘Ghashiram Kotwal’”, An Article publish in Katha, New Delhi, 2001
24. Bhave, Pushpa, Contemporary Indian Theatre, interviews with Playwrights and Directors, Sangeet Natak Akademi, 1989, Pg. 47.

All the textual references are taken from – “Vijay Tendulkar, Collected Plays in Translation”, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2006.

Conclusion

As discussed in the preface the present research is mainly focused on ‘Depiction of Sex and Violence in Vijay Tendulkar’s Plays’ and the entire thesis is divided into six chapters and seventh is conclusion. Each chapter aims at distinct aspect to explore and find the above mentioned subject. The first chapter dealt with the life and works of Vijay Tendulkar which brings out some vital facts of about Tendulkar’s personal life—his upbringing, his family background, education, traumatic incidences experienced in the early stage of his life. The chapter concludes with different factors affected and influenced him as a creative writer. His research on growing violence, his career as a journalist, his reading, and writing have made him socially committed democratic citizen and realistic and rebellious playwright.

Second chapter dealt with the ‘violence’ as defined by Tendulkar. In this chapter, with the help of the views of the established biologists, psychologists and social scientists it is derived that violence has always remained central in the entire history of mankind. Tendulkar’s conception of inherent predominance of violence in human life has been reinterpreted here with substantial arguments. As it has been argued in the chapter it is not necessary that violence is always destructive. Like atomic energy violence

can also be used as vital, virulent, constructive force and better results can be arrived.

Third chapter dealt with interplay of contradictions as exhibited in Tendulkar's plays. Tendulkar's views on violence lead him to understand the patterns of growing violence in the post independent India and his subsequent plays also explored the very nature of violence operating in forms of caste, class, gender and sexual relationship at family level, social level and at political level. This chapter mainly explained how Tendulkar had applied his theory of violence in his plays with help of his dialectical understanding of conflicts and unity of opposite forces. It was found that he displays and dissects the inbuilt contradictions of human life and presents its violent nature either in the form of character's personal dilemmas, interpersonal relationship or in the form of conflicts of all the characters with the central idea of the play.

Chapter, 4, 5 and 6 were the specific case studies of Vijay Tendulkar's plays to show how he dealt with his theory of violence in this particular plays.

Chapter four has thrown light on the double standards of male dominated society regarding motherhood, nationalism, honour, social

responsibilities to subjugate women's desire. It was derived in the chapter by analysing the play that women's desire has been moulded in such a way that she has to get sanctity of male dominant society. The judgment of the society is pre-decided and women's desire does not allow to be fulfilled. She is enforced to remain silent in past, present and future.

Chapter five, dealt with gender violence as depicted in the play 'Sakharam Binder'. Here we found that Tendulkar shows us desirable, vital and useful end of reconstruction of Man- Woman relationship on more equalitarian ground by deconstructing all stereo type phenomenons constructed around gender violence. In The chapter it was derived that the main causative factors of men-women, gender relationship are the cultural and social stereotypes constructed by the male dominated society which subjugate women and at the same time pervert and deform men's sexuality. And ultimately lead these relationships into violent explosions.

Chapter six, dealt with violent oppressive transformation of political power. In the chapter it was derived that inherent hierarchical power structure creates an unavoidable violent force within oppressed which ultimately leads him to achieve power to become an oppressor. It is the same

ideology of oppression internalized by oppressed and he can never be able to liberate himself.

It has been concluded in first chapter by Tendulkar's own exposure to the harsh reality through his apprenticeship in the open university of life that there is definite impact of all these experiences on his career, his activism, his world views and his works. It has been seen in this chapter that Vijay Tendulkar's upbringing, life experience, his immediate environment and gradual change occurred in social, economical, cultural and political realities from Colonial to post- colonial Indian society, has played a definite role in making Vijay Tendulkar a most controversial and rebellious playwright. Examination of this chapter throws a light on various events and factors which influenced him the most, such as--

- 1 Family background and its shifting values, tragic experiences with brother, uncles, unmarried sister, death of wife and daughter Priya.
- 2 Childhood memory of communal violence, stabbings.
3. School-life experiences, political and social upheaval of nationalist movements, and exposure to Nationalist Forces (Gandhian and R.S.S.) and communists.
4. Education, reading, and writing

5. His career as journalist and his research on violence sponsored by Nehru Foundation.

The cumulative effects of all these factors and his individual thinking about them shaped Vijay Tendulkar as one of the most renowned as well as controversial playwrights of India.

The first chapter fruitfully aimed to trace out the main events in Tendulkar's life as well as the development of his career as a playwright. It is also successfully dealt with the various influences on him. As argued in the chapter upper caste liberal Brahmin family background helped Tendulkar in getting education. It was derived in the chapter that warm, affectionate, liberal and literature friendly atmosphere of his family helped him in cultivating his liberal views. The profound finding of this chapter proves Tendulkar to be a fearless, torch bearer playwright, social activist and courageous commentator of the society.

It has been concluded in the second chapter two that Tendulkar's views on violence confirms with the views and derivations of established biologists, psychologists, and social scientists that violence has always remained central in the entire history of mankind. His argument is quite logical that man is part of the animal kingdom so the basic animal instincts

are integrally linked with human being. It has been derived that Vijay Tendulkar considers violence as a basic need of human life. According to him sex and violence are the two sides of the same coin. At the same time we find Tendulkar's characters are free enough to live and behave the way they like. Tendulkar doesn't impose his ideology over his characters.

It has been further concluded that Tendulkar's writing reveals two aspects of his ideology as a playwright. One is his keen sense of conflict in life and the other is his deep faith in life. Conflict in his plays has many dimensions. Conflicts between two individuals, conflicts between the individual and his family, and conflicts between the individual and the social circumstances are skilfully depicted in Tendulkar's plays. However the subtle and significant conflict in his plays is within the individual himself.

His thinking about society, human life and individual's conflicts are reflected in his writings. He wrote about the defeated individual's struggle against antagonistic circumstances.

The chapter gives an account of different types of violence depicted in his plays. He depicted verbalized violence with the images of violent relationship, torture, abuse, obsessive love, sexual desire, betrayal, humiliation, atrocity, pain and death. It has been found that Tendulkar's

plays often explore the acts of physical, sexual and verbal dimensions of violence. For Tendulkar 'Violence' is a basic human instinct, so it has to be expressed in one form or the other. Violent behaviour can be seen as a mask which protects 'the self' from pain and memories of traumatic experiences. It has been found that Tendulkar exposed the different forms of anger in his major plays and he got the title of 'Angry young man of Marathi theatre'.

Tendulkar also showed how violence can be expressed through aggression. A verbal attack--insults, threats, sarcasm, attributing nasty motives and a physical punishment or restrictions exist in Tendulkar's Plays. Tendulkar believed that 'Violence' among middle classes is quite often psychological in the nature.

The chapter showed that for Tendulkar violent relationship does not mean simply physical violence or torture. It also means interpersonal relationship of dominance, not only male dominance over female but also vice-versa. For Tendulkar human relations are power relationships and therefore are based on in-built violence. Tendulkar believes that when circumstances arrive in a form of a rough exam, the mask of culture will be removed with a big blast and human will become animal. In that situation

human reacts exactly like an animal. Tendulkar in his plays depicts such a theory of violence with psychological implications.

Another form of psychological abusive behaviour with which Tendulkar deals is fear resulting in terror. It has been derived that fear converted into violence is depicted everywhere in Tendulkar's writings. A new point of view has been concluded that when Tendulkar accepts violent behaviour as natural phenomenon it does not mean that according to him the violent characters are necessary in our society. Actually Tendulkar wanted to say that violence is an essential living fluid in terms of triggering force.

As it has been argued in the chapter it is not necessary that violence is always destructive. Like atomic energy violence can also be used as vital, virulent, constructive force and better results can be arrived. Vijay Tendulkar's plays focus on violence as the single most significant aspect of history. Vijay Tendulkar always has a specific purpose for using violence in his plays. He uses violence as a shock tactic to inspire his audiences not to sit idly by and to take action against the atrocities of life. According to Tendulkar there is no reason for human violence against human in the world. He believes that violence is a natural phenomenon for human as species in the same way as animals. But, In the light of this idea he uses theatre as a

think tank arena where he criticizes and discusses the cycle of meaningless violence and the crimes of humanity. It has been concluded that he thinks that violence is the basic instinct of mankind and till today we can't able to eliminate it from our society but he was not support the 'violence'. Tendulkar accepts and portrays his characters violent behaviour as a nature of human being. He deals with gender inequality, social inequality, power games, false consciousness, with the devices of sex and violence in his plays.

As argued in the chapter three, Tendulkar is interested in contradictory opposite forces inherent in human being. Tendulkar believes that violence inherent in the human relationship though it looks cruel, violent, but it is the heart core of human life. He uses the human being as "symbols adequate to our dilemma."

Tendulkar uses plot as departure point which triggers violent interaction or interplay between characters and between stage situations. Vijay Tendulkar's characters have diversity. Some are oppressed and some of them rebel against the situation. Some of them surrender to the situation and some of them fight against the situation. Sometime we find his characters are interchangeable in their nature.

It has been derived that family relationship is complex in Tendulkar's different plays. Family relationship is portrayed as a violent interplay of contradiction and it reflects the crisis. It is further found that Tendulkar has also explored sexual relationship and put a question mark to the marriage system as well as live in relationship.

He contradicts the mentality that the marriage gives social respect as well as security to a woman. Before Tendulkar, the Marathi theatre was involved in presenting family as ideal, holy, divine and stable social unit. It has been concluded that Vijay Tendulkar changed this picture by showing inherent process of chaos and order within family in relation to changing situations.

It was found that Tendulkar beautifully depicts the interplays of contradictions of male-female egoism, domination, selfishness and hypocrisy of the modern success-oriented generation. Tendulkar brings out the dark side of human nature and finds an indirect method of removing the social evils by creating hatred into spectator's mind. It has been concluded that Tendulkar ruthlessly dissects human nature and exposes its basic aspects such as lust, greed and violence. Tendulkar uses violent interplay of contradiction in terms of self contradiction, person to person contradiction,

group contradiction and contradiction within the society. For Tendulkar human beings are admixture of entire contradictions of existence.

Chapter four brought forth physical, psychological and sexual suppression of women in 'Silence the court is in session'. Here it was found that Tendulkar portrays the intricacies and nuances of characterization very well in the play. He plays simultaneously with the reasoning and emotions of the spectator. The usages of silence in between the dialogues, silence in between physical actions strikingly indicates the internal turmoil of characters and it disturbs the spectator. He shows society's prejudices against a woman who wishes to be free, who chooses the way to fulfil her sexual-emotional desire.

Chapter four has further thrown light on the double standards of male dominated society in regard to motherhood, nationalism, honour, social responsibilities to subjugate women's desire. It has been derived by analysing the play that women's desire has been moulded in such a way that she has to get sanctity of male dominant society. The judgment of the society is pre-decided and women's desire is not allowed to be fulfilled. She is enforced to remain silent for eternity. It has been derived that the violence

is deep rooted within as silence and the form of violence is changed as 'accepted internalized violence'.

Here, we found that Tendulkar portrays Benare as a victim of an imbalanced and distorted man-woman relationship which places woman in subjugation to man and society. Tendulkar skilfully presents the mentality of so called moral values. The meaning between the lines presented in the play applies to our lives which cherish the illusion of freedom, illusionistic liberalism and idealism.

The chapter concludes that Tendulkar reveals the fact that both patriarchy and individualism play an important role in the construction of woman's desire. Patriarchy oppresses and tames a woman into subjugation; the discourse of individualism makes her to challenge and to defy patriarchal norms. The play exposes the inhuman violence in its verbal form of the patriarchal society against woman.

It was also found that the play, "The silence court is in session" reflects everlasting battle between masculine and feminine gender. This play's focal point of interest lies is the struggle between women like Benare and her antagonists headed by the orthodox Kashikar and his associates. Though Benare desperately fights her battle and clamours that her life and

her choices are her own; her voice is silenced by the destructive agencies of patriarchal institution.

We found that 'Benare' remains completely silent during the dissection of her personal life by her fellow actors during mock-trial. Even if she tries to speak, she is silenced by them. She is given a chance of defending herself at the end of the trial. Tendulkar mentions that all the characters remain in a frozen state during her long reply. It has been concluded that Tendulkar wants to contradict two symbols. One is Benare who wants acceptance of her freedom and second symbol is deaf ears of society which never accepts her freedom. Tendulkar suggests that her reply falls on deaf ears. Benare has to accept the Court's verdict and she has to live in accepted social structure. Tendulkar cleverly create an internal expression made by Benare as a statement. Tendulkar's Benare will never able to express her vibrant speech as in reality but expressed as internal thought expressed through a monologue. A woman remains silent as a result of an infinite cruel game of suppression.

Chapter five has been focused on 'Sakharam Binder' which is one of the most violent theatrical act of Tendulkar which had consciously hurt the religious moralist sentiments and psyche of the society at large including

authority- Censor board. It has been concluded that Vijay Tendulkar had given a powerful detonation to all the previously established religious and moralist values, norms, artistic and aesthetic notions of culture and arts prevailing in the society. The Gender violence depicted by Tendulkar in the play and lived by the characters like Sakharam, Laxmi, Champa and Dawood on the stage invited violent attacks from the society. It has been further derived that Tendulkar succeeded in generating very vital, progressive and constructive social- cultural energy out of theatrical usage of violence – particularly gender violence through this play.

Tendulkar showed us desirable, vital and useful end of reconstruction of Man- Woman relationship on more equalitarian ground by deconstructing all cultural and social stereotypes constructed around gender violence. By portraying the lower strata of the society, the desire, the lust for life, Tendulkar made a significant departure from the prevailing main stream Marathi drama. Tendulkar has for the first time introduced the life and characters of lower strata with all its ugliness and crudity which has been burning, shocking and unbearable for those who are accustomed to see the lives of privileged section of the society.

The chapter concluded that Tendulkar makes violent blast on existing social morality by introducing 'Sakharam', his notion of house and its codes of conducts with all his newly constructed identity and self dignity. Tendulkar's 'Sakharam' represents Brahmanism and scratch the conservative and conformist values of society. The chapter further concluded that Vijay Tendulkar presents two male dominated spaces, one is of existing family or institution of marriage governed by caste, religion, traditions and morality another is the anti family space created by Sakharam. Tendulkar gives very complex minute details of experiences of Gender violence in the married lives of these two diametrically opposite set of women Laxmi and Champa.

Tendulkar has deals with the interesting and subtle aspects of Gender violence related with stereotypes constructed around impotency. He shows inferiority complex in the minds of impotent man or childless women. It has been concluded that Tendulkar articulates the existentialist tendencies are openly manifest in 'Sakharam Binder' and the play has become a curious case of gender violence.

As concluded in chapter six 'Ghashiram Kotwal' is appreciated as Tendulkar's best work. It has been further derived that 'Ghashiram Kotwal'

is creation of socio-political forces which goes beyond the barriers of time and place. Tendulkar depicts that the real power uses the masks of deputation to mediate the exercise of power, to hide the real face of power from victims so that all resistance is effectively deflected. Tendulkar shows that anyone who gets power always forgets past and as an authority he becomes oppressive. It has been concluded that through the portrayal of 'Ghashiram Kotwal' Tendulkar reveals the fact that oppressed and oppressor are not the constant phenomenon but interchangeable. This vicious circle of power game creates the violent rise and falls of the characters. The violent transformation of power of oppressed into the power of oppressor is very well established in the chapter.

Tendulkar had in mind the emergence, the growth and the inevitable end of the Ghashirams; also those who create, and help Ghashirams to grow; and the irony of stoning to death a person pretending that it is the end of Ghashirams.

It has been derived that Tendulkar's main concern in this play is to expose sharply the mechanism of power operating within society rather than the economic and political implications and sources of power. Tendulkar, in 'Ghashiram Kotwal' observes the operations of religiosity, sexuality,

deputation and politics as devices of power. In the chapter it has been concluded that these power devices are brilliantly depicted in the play and 'Ghashiram' has become the icon of present state of affair. Vijay Tendulkar as a true theatre persona wanted to make a strong political statement through this play.

It has been derived in this chapter that Tendulkar sharply exposed the exercise of power trade in terms of women as metaphor of exchange. It has been concluded that the play has depicted the loss and gains in the struggle for power which inevitably used female sexuality as a powerful weapon in the hands of looser and gainer. The chapter further concluded that Tendulkar brings forth the very modern issue of the relationship between power and gender in a patriarchal society in a historical setting with historically recognizable characters.

Finally we can say that, Tendulkar is genius in arts of characterisation, in theatrical devices and presenting the play. He is creative writer with social, political and psychological point of view. He deals with the elements of sex and violence as theatrical device. He articulates Sex and Violence in his major plays with reference to social, economical and political structure of Indian society. Tendulkar not only theorised the 'sex' and 'violence' but

also successfully used as an essential theatrical device to express the inner soul of human relations.

Bibliography

1. Ambedkar, Babasaheb, "Writings and Speeches", Bombay: Government of Maharashtra, 1987.
2. Artaud, Antonin, "The Theatre of Cruelty and its Dubble", trans. Victor Corti (London: Calder's and Boyars, 1974).
3. Avachat, Anil, "Sakharam Tu Kon Ahes?" ('Sakharam' who are you?), Sadhana, Poona, 1972.
4. Banahatti, S. N., "Marathi Natya Kala Ani Natya Vangmay", Poona, 1959.
5. Bandyopadhyay Samik, "Introduction", Collected Plays in Translation, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, (2004).
6. Bandyopadhyay, Samik, "introduction to Ghashiram Kotwal", An Article publish in Katha, New Delhi, 2001
7. Banerjee, Arundhati, "Introduction-five plays of Vijay Tendulkar", Bombay, OUP, 1992.
8. Banerjee, Arundhati, "Note on Kamala, Silence! The Court is in Session, Sakharam Binder, The Vultures, Encounter in Umbugland." Vijay Tendulkar. "Collected Plays in Translation." "Introduction" by Samik Bandyopadhyay. New Delhi: OUP, 2003.
9. Barve, Chandrasekhar, "Tendulkaranchi Natake" (Plays of Tendulkar), Rajhans Prakashan Gruh, Poona, 1993.
10. Barve, Chandrasekhar, "Vijay Tendulkar: The Man Who Explores The Depths of Life". Contemporary Indian Drama. Ed. Sudhakar Pande and Freya Taraporwala, New Delhi, Prestige, 1990.
11. Batliwala, Srilata, "Why do women oppress women?" The Hindu, Sunday Magazine, 2 May 1992.
12. Bedekar, D., K., "Astitva-vada Chi Olakh"(Introduction to Existentialism), Poona, 1972.

13. Bhagavat, Durga, "Interview" by Subhash Bhende, Sakal, Poona, 1975.
14. Bhatanagar, Vinita, "Dramatics theory and Practice: Indian and western" ed. M.S.Kushwaha, Creative, New Delhi, 2000.
15. Bhatanagar, Vinita, "Theatre as Translation: A Performance based reading of Ghashiram Kotwal", Creative, New Delhi, 2000.
16. Bhate, Rohini, "Nritya Ani Sahitya" Vinas Prakashan, Poona, 1964.
17. Bhavalkar Tara, (1997), "Marathi Natak: Navya Disha Navi Valne" Mehta Publishing House, Pune.
18. Bhave, Pushpa, "Contemporary Indian Theatre--Interviews with Playwrights and Directors", Sangeet Natak Akademi, 1989.
19. Bhave, Pushpa, "Shokatmikecha Upayogit Abhyas-Kamala chya Sandarbhat", Anushtup, Diwali Issue, 1985.
20. Bhonsale, D, T, "'Gidhade' Ani 'Sakharam Binder'- Kahi Vichar" ('Gidhade' and 'Sakharam'- Some thoughts)", Navabharat, Vai, Jan., 1973.
21. Brerton, Jofree, "Principle of Tragedy", London, 1968.
22. C. Coelho, "The Cult of Violence and Cruelty in Modern Theatre: A Study of Athol Fugard and Vijay Tendulkar," Indian Literature Today, (vol. I). ed. R.K.Dhawan, Prestige, Delhi, 1994.
23. Catherine Thankamma, "Women that Patriarchy Created: The Plays of Vijay Tendulkar, Mahesh Dattani and Mahasweta Devi," Vijay Tendulkar's Plays: An Anthology of Recent Criticism, ed. V.M. Madge (New Delhi: Pencraft International,2009).
24. Dani, A.P. Vijay Tendulkar's Gidhade (The Vultures) and John Webster's The Duchess of Malfi. Ed. Madge V.M. Vijay Tendulkar's Plays An Anthology of Recent Criticism. New Delhi: Pencraft International. 2007.
25. Davatar, Vasant, "Ek Hatti Mulagi", Alochana, May, 1991.
26. Davatar, Vasant, "Madhalya Bhinti", Alochana, Feb-Mar, 1990.
27. Davatar, Vasant, "Natakkar Vijay Tendulkar" Alochana, June-July, 1990.
28. Davatar, Vasant, "Shrimant" Alochana, Jan, 1990.

29. Davatar, Vasant, "Tendulakaranchi Natya Pratibha", Lokvangmay Griha, Mumbai, 2003
30. Desai, Hemang, "Polarity in Female Psyche: Burrowing into the Mystery in Vijay Tendulkar's plays" - A research paper.
31. Deshpande Kalindi. "Capitulation to Conservatism: Vijay Tendulkar's Women Characters", Madge V.M. Vijay Tendulkar's Plays An Anthology of Recent Criticism. New Delhi: Pencraft International. 2007.
32. Deshpande, G., P., "Gidhade ani Ashwatthama", Satyakatha, June, 1972.
33. Deshpande, G., V., "Mala Disalele 'Sakharam Binder'" ('Sakharam Binder' as I visualized), Satyakatha, Mumbai, July, 1972.
34. Deshpande, G. V., "Natya Sahitya Sammelanat 'Sakharam Binder'-reported by Sahshikant Narvekar, Gomantak, Panaji, May, 1972.
35. Deshpande, G., V., "Sakharam Binder", Samaj Prabhodan PtriKa, Poona, Jan-Feb, 1974.
36. Deshpande, Sudhakar, "Kamala", Alochana, Mar, 1985.
37. Deshpande, V., B., "1950-1984 Madhil Natak-Rangabhumi Alekh" ed. Rangayatra, 1988.
38. Deshpande, V., B., "Arambha Pasun Prayogshil Rahilela Natakkar-Vijay Tendulkar", Vishakha, April, 1987.
39. Dharan, N. S., "The Plays of Vijay Tendulkar", Creative Books, New Delhi, 1999.
40. Dharan, N.S. "Vijay Tendulkar's Silence! The Court is in Session as a Gynocentric Play", Indian English Drama Critical Perspectives. eds. Jaidipsinh Dodiya and K.V. Surendran, New Delhi: Sarup and Sons, 2000.
41. Dhare, Dipak, "Ghashiram Ek Vadal", Granthali Prakashan, Mumbai, 1996.
42. Dhongade, Ramesh, "Kanyadan-Apayashachya Maliket Ek Bhar" Natyadarpan, 1983.
43. Dhongade, Ramesh, "Maharashtra Sahitya Patrika", 1972.

44. Dhongde Ramesh, (1979), "Tendulkaranche Natak: Pathya Va Prayog", Dilipraj Prakashan, Pune.
45. Dr Punde Dattatraya, Dr Tawre Snehal (Ed), (1995), "Aajche Natakkar", Snehwardhan Publishing House, Pune.
46. Dubey, Satyadev, "Shantata... Jalajalit vastavachi Kleshdayak Janiv", Maratha, Mumbai, Dec, 1968.
47. G. Mallikarjuna. "Ghashiram Kotwal: A Study", Vijay Tendulkar's Ghashiram Kotwal A Reader's Companion ed. M. Sarat Babu. New Delhi: Asia book club. 2003.
48. Gadgil, Gangadhar, "Aaj-kal che Sahityik", Samaj Prabodhan Patrika, Jan., 1971.
49. Gokhale Shanta, (2001), "Vijay Tendulkar" 'An Article written on "Tendulkar on his own terms', Katha, New Delhi, 2001
50. Gokhale, M. V, "Lalit Lekhak-Vijay Tendulkar", Vishakha, April, 1977.
51. Gokhale, Shanta, "Playwright at the center! Marathi Drama from 1843 to Present", Seagull Books, Calcutta.
52. Gokhale, Shanta, "Tendulkar on his own Terms" (Madge V.M. Vijay Tendulkar's Plays An Anthology of Recent Criticism), New Delhi: Pencraft International. 2007.
53. Gosavi, Nutan, "Kanyadaan: An Expose of Political Progressives" Madge, V.M., Vijay Tendulkar's Plays An Anthology of Recent Criticism. New Delhi: Pencraft International. 2007.
54. Gupte, Prakash, "Shantata Tendulkar Chalu Ahet", Natyabbhumi, Mumbai, Dec, 1968.
55. Hogan Patrick and Lalita Pandit (Ed), "An article on Tendulkar", Literary India, Rawat Publishing , New Delhi, 2001.
56. Hogie Wyckoff, "Sex role scripting in men and women," Scripts people live, Claude M. Steiner (New York: Bantam, 1980).

57. Ingemar Düring, "Aristoteles: Darstellung und Interpretation seines", Denkens, Winter, Heidelberg, 1966.
58. Jignyasu (1963) "Interview – Vijay Tendulkar" Manohar Magazine, Pune (Diwali Special)
59. Jog, L. G., "Ghashiram Kotwal", Alochana, May, 1983.
60. Joshi, P. N., "Marathi Vangmayacha Vivechak Itihas-Arvachin kal"1979.
61. Joshi, Usha, "Ekanki Cha Vikas Ani Vijay Tendulkar", Navabharat, June, 1968
62. Kadam, Nilkanth, "Balnatya-Vijay Tendulkar", Alochana, Jan, 1980.
63. Kakar, Sudhir, "Marriage: War between Sexes," The Indian Express, Weekend Magazine, 7th June 1987.
64. Kale, K. Narayan (1961), "Natyavimarsh", Akshay Prakashan, Pune.
65. Kanetkar, Vasant (1974), "Natak Ek Chintan", Nilkanth Prakashan, Pune.
66. Karnad, Girish, "Author's introduction," Three Plays, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1994.
67. Kasture, P., S., "Ghashiram Kotwal: Some Problems", Asia Book Club, New Delhi, 2001.
68. Kolhe, Avinash. "The Doyen", Gentleman (April 2001).
69. Krug, Etienne G., Dahlberg, Linda L., Mercy, James A., Zwi, Anthony B. and Lozano Rafael, "World report on violence and health", World Health Organization, 2002.
70. Kulkarni, A. V. (1976), "Marathi Natya Lekhana Cha Vikas", Pune University, Pune
71. Kulkarni, D., B., "Tendulkaranchi Tin Natake" (Three Plays of Tendulkar), Samaj Prabhodan Ptriaka, Poona, Nov-Dec., 1972
72. Kulkarni, G., M., "Natakkar Vijay Tendulkar : Ek Jinkane-Harane", Satyakatha, Mumbai, Dec., 1971.
73. Kulkarni, G., M., "Sad-Padsad", Satyakatha, Mumbai, 1975.

74. Kulkarni, V.L., "Shatata Court Chalu Ahe", Pratishtan, Aurangabad, April, 1971.
75. Lagoo, Shreeram. "Introduction to silence court is in session" Dipawali, (Magazine) Poona, 1970.
76. Lagoo, Shriram, "Cheers Tendulkar" (Shantata Court Chalu Ahe), Manus, Jan, 1970.
77. Late, Dinanath, "Gruhastha Te Gidhade", Natyabhumi, Mumbai, Aug, 1970.
78. Luktuke, Ulhas, "Maf Kara Tendulkar (Foot Payari cha Samrat Vishayi)", Manus, May, 1970.
79. M. Sarat, Babu, "Indian Drama Today A Study in the Theme of Cultural Deformity", New Delhi, Prestige, 2003.
80. M. Sarat, Babu, "Vijay Tendulkar's 'Ghashiram Kotwal' "Introduction" by M. Sarat Babu", Asia Book Club, New Delhi, 2003.
81. Madge, V. M, "Vijay Tendulkar's Plays an Anthology of Recent Criticism", New Delhi: Pencraft International. 2007.
82. Maheshari, Uma, "Tendulkar qtd. In R. Uma Maheshari", "Vijay's World of Words," The Hindu, Saturday 20 Jan. 2007, Metro plus Hyderabad.
83. Manohar, Madhav, " Vijay Tendulkar Yanchya Spashtikaranachya Nimittane", Sobat, Poona, July, 1969.
84. Manohar, Madhav, "Marathi Natak Thitte Ka?", Natak, Mumbai, April, 1960.
85. Manohar, Madhav, "Pashchtya Natyakar Ani Marathi Anuvadak", Sobat, Poona, June, 1969.
86. Manohar, Madhav, "Shantata.....", Sobat, Poona, Jan, 1968.
87. Marathe H., M., "Ek Hatti Natakkar", Anushtup, Diwali Issue, 1985.
88. Marx, K. Engels, F. (1848) "The Communist Manifesto" Source: Marx/Engels Selected Works, Moscow: Progress Publishers, (1) 1969.
89. Matkari, Ratnakar, "Introduction-Seven One Acts" 1961.

90. Mehta, Vijaya, interview, A documentary film “Tendulkar & violence Then and Now” California arts Production, 2009
91. Mishra, Smita, “‘Ghashiram Kotwal’ as a Political Play”, ZENITH, Vol. XI, (2005-2006).
92. Mule, Pradip, “Te Ani Amhi” Ed. Rajiv Naik, Tapas Vijay, Mumbai, 1992.
93. Nadkarni, Dhyaneshwar, “Ghashiram Kotwal,” Enact, No. 74-74 Jan-Feb 1973.
94. Nadkarni, Gnyaneshwar, (1963), ‘Marathi Natak Ani Rangbhoomi’ Samiksha (critical analysis -1)
95. Nerurkar, P., S., “Sakharam Ahe Tari Kon?”(Who the hell is Sakharam?), Sadhana, Poona, May, 1972.
96. Nerurkar, P., S., “Shabdatun Sapadalele va na Sapadalele- Vijay Tendulkar” Uttam, Diwali Issue, 1970.
97. Nile, Bhagawan, “Tendulkar Navache Vadai”, Navashakti, Mar, 1991.
98. Padhye, Bhau, “Vijay Tendulkaranchi Vijayshri” Navashakti, Feb, 1970.
99. Padhye, Prabhakar, “An Article”, Kesari, Dec, 1971.
100. Paranjape, P., N., “Ashi Pakhare Yeti”, SatyaKatha, Mumbai, Feb, 1972.
101. Paranjape, P., N., “Shantata.. chya nimittane” Maratha, Mumbai, July, 1968.
102. Paranjape, P., N., “Tendulkar Jinkale”, Vasudha, Aug, 1974.
103. Paranjape, P., N., “Tendulkaranche anakhi Thode Vastraharan” Sobat, Poona, Aug, 1969.
104. Parankar, R., B., “An Article on Tendulkar” Alochana, Jan, 1969.
105. Patel, Jabbar,
<http://www.rangashankara.org/home/rangatest//jabbarpatel.php>
106. Patil, Vishvas, “Astitva-vad” Navi Kshitije, Mumbai, July-Aug-Sept, 1973.
107. Patki, Vilas, “Gidhade, Gidhade, Gidhade” Manus, June, 1970.
108. Paul, Smita. “Theatre of Power”, Books Way Publishers & Distributors. Kolkata (2010).

109. Percival, Spear, "The Oxford History of India", Oxford UP, Delhi, 1978.
110. Prasad, Amar Nath and Barbuddhe, Satish, eds. "The Plays of Vijay Tendulkar Critical Explorations", New Delhi: Sarup and Sons, 2008.
111. Rahman, L, "Tendulkar's Silence! The Court is in Session: A Study in Perspectives", Kolkata: Books Way Publishers & Distributors, 2010.
112. Ramnarayan, Gowri, "A new myth of Sisyphus!" (Vijay Tendulkar and Girish Karnad in conversation with Gowri Ramnarayan), The Hindu Folio on theatre, Feb. 1998.
113. Ramnarayan, Gowri, "Interview: Vijay Tendulkar in Conversation with Gowri Ramnarayan", (Madge V.M., Vijay Tendulkar's Plays An Anthology of Recent Criticism) New Delhi: Pencraft International. 2007.
114. Ramnarayan, Gowri, "View From The Balcony". Vijay Tendulkar in conversation with Gauri Ramnarayan", Katha publication, New Delhi, 2001.
115. Rasal, Sudhir, "Natakkar Tendulkar Ani 'Sakharam Binder'", Pratishtan, Aurangabad, June-July, 1972.
116. Sadhu, Arun, "Jabardast Laxmi va Akheris Kosalalela Sakharam" Mnus, Poona, May, 1972.
117. Sadock, Benjamin, "K. Lorenz qtd. In Benjamin James Sadock and Virginia Alcott Sadock".
118. Sahastrabuddhe, G., P., "Shakespeare Jivanacha Bhasyakar?", Rajvidhya, Poona, 1959.
119. Samuel, Horace, Barnett, "The Genealogy of Morals" translated by Horace Barnett Samuel, New York: Courier Dover Publications, 2003.
120. Sapre, Avinash, "Vatchal Vadagrasta Natakkarachi", Kesari, Jan, 1980.
121. Sarada, Shankar (1962), "Dwandwa-Parichay" Maharashtra Times, Feb 02
122. Sarang, Kamalakar, "Binderche Divas", Granthali Prakashan, Mumbai, 1984.
123. Semin, Gun. R, "K. Lorenz qtd. In Gun R. Semin and Klaus Fiedler".

124. Sillo David, "International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences" The Macmillan Co. & The Free Press, 1968.
125. Simon, Shibu, "Man-Woman Relationship in the Plays of Vijay Tendulkar. The Plays of Vijay Tendulkar Critical Explorations" eds. Amar Nath Prasad, Satish Barbuddhe. New Delhi: Sarup & Sons, 2008.
126. Subanis, Vasant, "Ekanki che Kahre Swarup", Vinas Prakashak, Poona, 1964.
127. Summerton, Oswald, "Transactional Game analysis", Manohar, Delhi, 1979.
128. Tendulkar, Priya, "Na Lihalelya Natakache Smaran", Maharashtra Times, Diwali Special Issue, 1994.
129. Tendulkar, Vijay (1960), "Shreemant", Joshi Brothers Booksellers and Publishers, Pune.
130. Tendulkar, Vijay (1971), "Ratra and other one act", Popular Prakashan, Mumbai, 1998.
131. Tendulkar, Vijay (1972), "Bhalyakaka", Amey Prakashan, Nagpur.
132. Tendulkar, Vijay (1975), "Baby", Neelkanth Prakashan, Pune.
133. Tendulkar, Vijay (1975), "Bhau Murarrao", Neelkanth Prakashan, Pune.
134. Tendulkar, Vijay (2006), "The Cyclist and His Fifth Woman Two Plays", Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
135. Tendulkar, Vijay (2008), "Five Plays", Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
136. Tendulkar, Vijay, " 'S' urf Badal Sircar" Manus, July, 1970.
137. Tendulkar, Vijay, " "Tisare Tendulkar" an interview by Avadhut Paralkar, abakadaee, Diwali Special Issues, 1992.
138. Tendulkar, Vijay, " Maze Ntyashikshan", Spandan, Diwali, 1982.
139. Tendulkar, Vijay, " Mi Ani Maze Lekhan, Mazi Natake.", Kesari, Diwali Issue, June, 1971.

140. Tendulkar, Vijay, “ Na Natya-Samanya Prekshak vagire”, Manohar, Diwali, 1963.
141. Tendulkar, Vijay, “ Sultan-Ekankika-Mahesh Elkunchvar”, Manus, June, 1970.
142. Tendulkar, Vijay, “..... Ek Spashtikaran”, Sobat, Poona, July, 1969.
143. Tendulkar, Vijay, “Ghashiram Kotwal Chya Nimmittane Vijat Tendulkaranchi Khas Mulakat” by Meena Deshpande, Natya Darpan, July, 1976.
144. Tendulkar, Vijay, “Hatya” (Based on Gujatarti & English), Manus, Sept., 1970.
145. Tendulkar, Vijay, “Heera Kolhatkarin” (Tamasha Vishayak), Manus, Aug, 1970.
146. Tendulkar, Vijay, “Hinsachar Va Maze Natak” – a lecture, S.P.University, Poona, Sept, 1976.
147. Tendulkar, Vijay, “Holy-Ekankika-Mahesh Elkunchvar”, Manus, June, 1970.
148. Tendulkar, Vijay, “Interview by H.M.Marathe”, Kirloskar, Poona, Feb, 1973.
149. Tendulkar, Vijay, “Interview by Ravindra Pinge”, Nishad, Mumbai, 1972.
150. Tendulkar, Vijay, “Interview by Sandeep Pendse”, Falakram, Mumbai, Nov-Dec, 1975.
151. Tendulkar, Vijay, “Interview by Vijay Tapas” Maharashtra Times, 1984
152. Tendulkar, Vijay, “Interview by Vishvanath More”, Maratha, Mumbai, March, 1969.
153. Tendulkar, Vijay, “Interview,” India Today, Dec. 16-31, 1980, pg. 157.
154. Tendulkar, Vijay, “Interview” Lalit, Mumbai, May, 1976.
155. Tendulkar, Vijay, “Interview”, Kirloskar, Poona, Feb., 1973.
156. Tendulkar, Vijay, “Interview”, Lalit, Poona, May, 1977.
157. Tendulkar, Vijay, “Interview”, Manohar, Diwali Special Issue, 1963.

158. Tendulkar, Vijay, "Interview", Navashakti, Mumbai, April, 1972.
159. Tendulkar, Vijay, "Interview", Uttam, Mumbai, Diwali special Issue, 1970.
160. Tendulkar, Vijay, "Kal Purush Bolto Ahe", Manus, 1970.
161. Tendulkar, Vijay, "Maze Pahile Natak- 'Gruhashta'"(My First Play- 'Gruhashta'), Natyabhumi, Mumbai, Nov., 1968.
162. Tendulkar, Vijay, "Mi Ani Mazi Natake", Sahityasuchi, July, 1983.
163. Tendulkar, Vijay, "Muslim and I" article by "Vijay Tendulkar", Katha, 2001.
164. Tendulkar, Vijay, "Nataka cha Janma—Shatata... Chya Nimitthane Mukalkhat" Amrut, April, 1970.
165. Tendulkar, Vijay, "Navya Marathi nataka Sathi Navi Disha", Manohar, June 1962.
166. Tendulkar, Vijay, "Pagala Ghoda" (Badal Sirkar), Manus, Aug, 1970.
167. Tendulkar, Vijay, "Saraswati Samman Speech" Katha publication, New Delhi, 2001.
168. Tendulkar, Vijay, "Scare Crow" Manus, April, 1970.
169. Tendulkar, Vijay, "Seminar", Kirloskar, Poona, May, 1972.
170. Tendulkar, Vijay, "Seminar", Manohar, Poona, Feb., 1973.
171. Tendulkar, Vijay, "Seminar", Pratishthan, Aurangabad, Feb., 1974.
172. Tendulkar, Vijay, "Shantata Tikakar Chalu Ahet" Maratha, Mumbai, Aug, 1968.
173. Tendulkar, Vijay, "Tendulkar and Violence: Then and Now", Dir. Atul Pethe, ICCA, Documentary, 2010.
174. Tendulkar, Vijay, "The Play is the Thing: Sri Ram Memorial Lecture I," Vijay Tendulkar: Collected Plays in Translation, ed. Samik Bandyopadhyay (New Delhi: OUP, 2005).
175. Tendulkar, Vijay, "Tugalakh (Girish Karnad), Manus, 1970
176. Tendulkar, Vijay, introduction, 'Shantata Court Chalu Ahe' Mauj Prakashan Gruh, 1971

177. Tendulkar, Vijay, Introduction, "Collected Play in Translation" Vol II. New Delhi: Penguin, 2005.
178. Tendulkar, Vijay, "The Vultures", trans. Priya Adharkar, Five Plays.
179. Tendulkar, Vijay. "Afterward", Kanyadaan, Delhi, OUP. 1996.
180. Thankamma, Catherine, "Women that Patriarchy Created: The Plays of Vijay Tendulkar, Mahesh Dattani and Mahasweta Devi" (Vijay Tendulkar's Plays An Anthology of Recent Criticism. ed. Madge V.M.) New Delhi: Pencraft International. 2007.
181. Tung, Mao-Tse, "Selected works of Mao-Tse Tung", Vol.2, people's publishing house ltd, Bombay-4, 1954.
182. Vasadikar, Lata, "Tendulkaranchya Ekaankika", Pratishtan, Aurangabad, July-Aug, 1965.
183. Vasadikar, Lata, "Vijay Tendulkarchya Ekankika", Pratishtan, July-Sept, 1965.
184. Wadikar Shailaja B, "Vijay Tendulkar A Pioneer Playwright", New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers & Distributors (P) Ltd. 2008.
185. Wadikar, Shailaja B., "Face to Face with Vijay Tendulkar," Vijay Tendulkar: A Pioneer Playwright (New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 2008).
186. Wadikar, Shailaja B., "Face to Face with Vijay Tendulkar - Vijay Tendulkar: A Pioneer Playwright", Atlantic Publishers, New Delhi, 2008.