

# A Perfect Balance between the Trends of 'Angry Young Man' and 'Dalit Panther' in Jimmy Porter, Albert Pinto and Arun Athawale

Paper Submission: 05/06/2021, Date of Acceptance: 12/06/2021, Date of Publication: 24/06/2021



**Siddhasattwa Banerjee**

Assistant Professor,  
Dept. of English,  
H.B.College, Nalhati,  
Birbhum, West Bengal, India

## Abstract

'Angry Young Man' movement of United Kingdom of 1950s and 1960s and 'Dalit Panther' movement of Maharashtra (India) of 1970s and 1980s have certain common aspects. Both of them are dissatisfied with the prevalent system, they are in and this dissatisfaction is usually vented out through anger. The source of this anger is a persistent feeling of being a misfit in the society one is in. This feeling is somewhat parallel to the feeling of being a social outcast or a 'Dalit'. Though the idea of 'Dalit' originates from ancient *Manusmriti* and Indian caste system being a unique system, rather a notion and a state of mind that prevents one from having a 'Consciousness of kind' as is mentioned by B.R. Ambedkar in his 'Annihilation of caste'. He, in a way invokes the idea of Franklin Giddings, American Sociologist who has traced certain commonness between Indian Caste System and the class distinctions in Western societies. This commonness of feeling oneself a social outcast projects both Jimmy Porter and Albert Pinto as Dalits just as ArunAthawale, a scavenger (Mahar). Jimmy Porter, labourer in a factory and the protagonist of John Osborn play *Look back in Anger* (1956), Albert Pinto, a motor mechanic and the protagonist of Saeed Akhtar Mirza film *Albert Pinto KoGussaKyoonaata Hain* (1980) and ArunAthawale, a scavenger and the villainous character of Vijay Tendulkar play *Kanyadan* (1983) in my opinion are on the same platform having a perfect balance between the trends of 'Angry Young Man' movement and 'Dalit Panther' movement.

**Keywords:** Angry Young Man, Dalit Panther, Kanyadan, Look back in Anger.

## Introduction

'Angry Young Man' movement of United Kingdom of 1950s and 1960s and 'Dalit Panther' movement of Maharashtra (India) of 1970s and 1980s have certain common aspects. Both of them are dissatisfied with the prevalent system, they are in and this dissatisfaction is usually vented out through anger. The source of this anger is a persistent feeling of being a misfit in the society one is in. This feeling is somewhat parallel to the feeling of being a social outcast or a 'Dalit'. Though the idea of 'Dalit' originates from ancient *Manusmriti* and Indian caste system being a unique system, rather a notion and a state of mind that prevents one from having a 'Consciousness of kind' as is mentioned by B.R. Ambedkar in his 'Annihilation of caste'. He, in a way invokes the idea of Franklin Giddings, American Sociologist who has traced certain commonness between Indian Caste System and the class distinctions in Western societies. This commonness of feeling oneself a social outcast projects both Jimmy Porter and Albert Pinto as Dalits just as ArunAthawale, a scavenger (Mahar). Jimmy Porter, labourer in a factory and the protagonist of John Osborn play *Look back in Anger* (1956), Albert Pinto, a motor mechanic and the protagonist of Saeed Akhtar Mirza film *Albert Pinto KoGussaKyoonaata Hain* (1980) and ArunAthawale, a scavenger and the villainous character of Vijay Tendulkar play *Kanyadan* (1983) in my opinion are on the same platform having a perfect balance between the trends of 'Angry Young Man' movement and 'Dalit Panther' movement.

**Aim of the Study**

Analysis of the great economic depression following the World War II which led towards several kinds of social and economic deprivations of the working class and the lower middle class of England as well as of almost entire Europe and America is the primary aim of this study.

Almost all the industries became sick and the workers had to face huge pay-cuts, joblessness and unsuitable working conditions. Hence strikes became almost regular events. Social security measures were almost hurled down to a dead end. In this condition a generation popped up with a gust of anger caused by the entire range of social deprivations thrust upon the lower strata of the society. The term "Angry Young Man" is thought to be derived from the autobiography of Leslie Paul, founder of the 'Woodcraft Folk', whose *Angry Young Man* was published in 1951. "Angry young men" were a group of mostly working- and middle-class British playwrights and novelists who became prominent in the 1950s. The group's leading figures included John Osborne and Kingsley Amis. The phrase was originally coined by the Royal Court Theatre's press officer in order to promote Osborne's 1956 play *Look Back in Anger*. Following the success of the Osborne play, the label "angry young men" was later applied by British media to describe young writers who were characterised by a disillusionment with traditional class-distinction of British society. A quest for the reason behind the immense anger brewing in certain specific societies in certain specific periods through detailed analysis of certain specific trends of literature which I have already mentioned, is the actual aim of this study.

This trend is apparent in Indian film and theatre in late 70s and early 80s. Albert Pinto *KoGussaKyonAata Hai* is a 1980 Bollywood film directed by Saeed Akhtar Mirza based on his own story. The film starred Naseeruddin Shah, ShabanaAzmi and SmitaPatil as leads. It won the 1981 Filmfare Critics Award for Best Movie. Mumbai based motor mechanic Albert Pinto's anger is definitely an inheritance from that of London based Jimmy Porter in *Look Back in Anger*. The way Pinto challenges the orthodox class distinction of Indian society and political interventions making it all the more complicated is almost a trendsetter in itself.

The first performance of John Osborne's famous play *Look Back in Anger* at the Royal Court Theatre on 8 May 1956 is commonly regarded as the beginning of a new era in the British Drama. One of the famous critics of its time, John Russell Taylor, calls the play "the beginning of a revolution in the British theatre" (Abeles,1975). Kenneth Tynan from the Observer writes the day after he has seen the play: "I doubt if I could love anyone who did not wish to see *Look Back in Anger*" (Abeles,1975). Emil Roy affirms that "British drama renewed its claim on literary eminence with the premier of John Osborne's *Look Back in Anger*" (Prentice,1962). Arthur Miller calls the play "the only modern, English play" that he

has seen (Prentice,1962). Another critic, George E. Wellwarth claims that "the 'new movement' in the British drama actually began officially on the night of May 8, 1956" (Prentice,1962). Arnold Wesker describes the play as "having opened the doors of theatres for all the succeeding generations of writers" (Abeles,1975). *Look Back in Anger* is called a significant play owing to the fact that it can be considered as a moment of change and also a reaction. Because, since the end of World War II British theatre was believed to have been in rapid decline. Audiences were falling off and theatres were closing all over the country. Some of the theatre companies were restaging Chekhov, Ibsen, Shaw plays and Restoration comedies. Most of the companies were trying to restore Elizabethan theatre by restaging Shakespeare plays over and over. Two of the most successful dramatists in Britain of the time were Noel Coward and Terence Rattigan but unfortunately their celebrated plays dated back to the 1930s, so they could hardly be regarded as rising new and young talents.

Berkowitz claims that anger is a feeling, experienced when a desired goal is blocked. According to the frustration-aggression hypothesis when a negative affect is stimulated it elicits an experience of anger. Therefore, anger is considered as the emotional state that intervenes between the thwarting and expression of angry and aggressive acts. Berkowitz states that when "a person displays violently hostile actions upon being frustrated (and) may do this because he is in an intense emotional state, i.e., his anger level is very high" (Storr, 1968). There can be many reasons for experiencing the emotional state of anger. According to the frustration-aggression hypothesis the main reason that produces anger is frustration. The emotions of isolation, alienation, anxiety, loneliness also trigger frustration therefore angry feelings. This chapter will look into the reasons of Osborne's protagonists' angry feelings particularly the causes that make them frustrated.

*Look Back in Anger* (1956) is commonly credited with being the play in which Osborne expressed a sense of frustration and anger at the depressing circumstances of post-war Britain. Jimmy Porter is regarded as an embodiment of the frustrations of a particular age and class especially the generation of young men who have been expecting to leave behind their lower-class origins by using higher education. Jimmy is educated beyond his social roots; however, he cannot get what he expects from his education. Despite his university degree he has worked as an advertising salesman, a neophyte journalist, and a vacuum-cleaner salesman. Then he starts to run a sweet stall for a living which is also not a proper job for a graduate man. According to Berkowitz "inability to fulfil the anticipations is a frustration" (Mortimer,1997). Jimmy should have been working in a job suitable for his university education. It can be said that Jimmy is not working in a proper job due to his working-class origins. His university degree

does not make him a member of a higher class. Carl Bode suggests that, "Jimmy knows that he is the displaced intellectual and that surely embitters him" (Mortimer,1997). Because he is aware of the fact that he cannot change his social status only by a university degree however hard he tries. Therefore, as Bode claims Jimmy is "a man who has tried and failed to become middle-class" (Mortimer,1997). According to the frustration-aggression hypothesis Jimmy's not having a suitable job despite his university degree can be considered a "frustration produced instigation." Jimmy is frustrated due to the fact that his educational background does not fulfil his anticipations. Therefore, it can be counted as one of the reasons for Jimmy's rage. "His outbreaks of anger derive from this failure to find fulfilment" as Simon Trussler asserts. (Roy,1972) Throughout the play Jimmy rails about politics, religion and other social institutions. Jimmy feels betrayed by the previous generation because his generation is experiencing the disappointment of World War II. However, Jimmy is looking for some enthusiasm instead of exhaustion. Because he had a father who believed that there were still, even after the slaughter of the first World War, causes good enough to fight for and collective actions worthy of individual support. He claims: I suppose people of our generation aren't able to die for good causes any longer. We had all that done for us, in the thirties and the forties, when we were still kids. There aren't any good, brave causes left. If the big bang does come, and we all get killed off, it won't be in aid of the old-fashioned, grand design. It'll just be for the Brave New-nothing-very-much-thank-you etc are as pointless and inglorious as stepping in front of a bus (Roy,1972).

It can be asserted that Jimmy's anger arises from a sense of having missed out the opportunities for idealism, or heroism, or at least for an action which had been provided to the previous generation. Having missed out the chances to take an action can be considered a barrier for Jimmy to do something good for himself or for the welfare of the society which is another reason for him to feel frustration and therefore anger. Christopher Bigsby affirms, "It was not the injustice of his society which angered Jimmy Porter, but the viciousness of his own life. Education had given him articulateness but nothing to be articulate about. The old England was dead but no convincing new one had taken its place. The country seemed like an endless succession of Sunday afternoons. It was its triviality, its pointlessness, which appalled Jimmy Porter, who was in effect an absurd hero rather than a social rebel. His anger was his attempt to simulate life; his violent language an effort to insist on his existence (Demastes,1997).

Many critics have called Jimmy a despot husband for bullying and attacking Alison all the time. Indeed, as Austin E. Quigley suggests, "Jimmy's attacks on Alison repeatedly focus on what he perceives as her lethargy, her timidity, and her readiness to accept whatever comes her way" (Demastes,1997). Jimmy comments on Alison's

passivity from the very beginning of the play. It can be noted that one of the main reasons of Jimmy's anger is Alison's timidity. Jimmy expects Alison to react against him when he taunts her with such words as "sycophantic, phlegmatic and pusillanimous." (Singer,1980) However, the more Jimmy provokes, the more Alison withdraws. When Jimmy goes on calling her 'pusillanimous' and bullies her Alison 'leans against the board, and closes her eyes.'

Jimmy complains about Alison's hypocrisy in refusing to express her anger at betrayal which can also be considered a middle-class manner. Even while leaving Jimmy, she is trying to be polite. However, Jimmy might have much preferred her to have emphasized, rather than suppressed, what she really felt. It might be her lack of response and affection towards Jimmy which causes him to treat her badly. For Luc Gilleman, Jimmy is "a frustrated husband who is brought to despair by his wife's passivity" (Singer,1980). Jimmy is frustrated by Alison's timidity and silence due to the fact that he expects her to have some enthusiasm and energy. However he complains that "that girl there can twist your arm off with her silence" (Pinker,2002).

At one of the rare moments that Alison could openly react against him the stage direction says: "The wild note in her voice has re-assured him. His anger cools and hardens. His voice is quite calm when he speaks" (Singer,1980). Jimmy feels better when Alison expresses her anger openly. Jimmy also wants Alison to take the responsibility of being alive. He thinks that Alison should have stayed at home to fight with himself in order to solve their problems. It might be suggested that, like Strindberg characters, Jimmy expects from women more than he could hope to get from them and when he is disappointed he turns on them with savage resentment. Susan Rusinko claims: Jimmy's anger indiscriminately hits those who cannot share his pain or his real feelings, especially those whom he loves. At one point Jimmy accuses everybody else of wanting "to escape from the pain of being alive." His pain is deep-rooted, going back to a father who came back from the war in Spain when Jimmy was only ten and whom Jimmy watched die for twelve months (Pinker,2002).

It can be suggested that Jimmy is frustrated on account of the fact that he cannot awake the people he cares about. For instance, Alison's inertness can be considered as a barrier for Jimmy, keeping him from fulfilling his expectation to make her more active. As Berkowitz claims; "people become angry and aggressive on being kept from reaching a desired goal to the extent that they think that someone had intentionally and unfairly prevented them." It is called "aggression or anger-provoking situation" (Buss,1961). Jimmy feels that Alison remains silent deliberately in order to make him angry. Her timidity can be regarded as a reaction to Jimmy's aggressive behaviour. According to Berkowitz's frustration-aggression hypothesis, "every frustration increases the instigation to aggression which is anger. Anger is the primary, inborn reaction to thwarting"

(Buss,1961). As a result, Jimmy is angry because he is frustrated. He is frustrated because he is running a candy stall despite his university degree; he is frustrated owing to his middle class wife's passivity; he is frustrated on account of the fact that people whom he loves do not try to share his pain; he is frustrated since the older generation had made a thorough mess of things, and he thinks that there was nothing his generation could do except for talking nostalgically of the good old days.

Vijay Tendulkar's seminal play 'Kanyadaan' is a ruthless criticism of this caste ridden Indian society. But what is interesting is that Tendulkar highlights here caste system, rather he pinpoints how all attempts of social amelioration prove fruitless in our progressive post independent society. This article shows the predicament of NathDevalikar, the protagonist of this drama when he confronts hazards in real life in his effort to abolish caste system. Side by side with this 'dalit' and 'elite' issue, this play also shows foolishness of a theorist who keeps his daughter's life at stake to prove the supremacy of his theory. The play also obliquely hints at the pathetic condition of women in a patriarchal society. Vijay Tendulkar belongs to those avant- garde group of dramatists who can represent reality as it is. His plays become sharp criticism of Indian society and the condition of women in such patriarchal society. They also deal with the complexity of human relationships. Each of his plays contains a subtle critique of modern Indian society, and a distinct character and message. 'Kanyadaan' explores the texture of modernity and social change in India through marriage between two people of different castes and backgrounds. It shows that what we assume as social and cultural progress in modern India, is nothing but a big hoax the play entitled 'Kanyadaan' alludes to the traditional hindu custom of marriage in our society-to give a marrigable daughter by one's guardian to an eligible young man who will give her safety and security in life. It is also desired that the young man will prove himself a constant companion of this woman Naturally it concerns much to the bride's father about her daughter's post-marriage life. The play 'Kanyadaan' is also about marriage, marriage between two persons belonging to different cultures. the dramatist shows that to obliterate caste system, to uplift dalit community, such an inter-caste marriage can never be a solution.

The play opens in NathDevalikar's house where we meet Nath, an idealist Gandhi supporter and an active social worker as well as an MLA is rebuking the irregular transport system of post-independent India. From the beginning, it becomes clear that Nath is very much idealistic. He is the father of Jyoti and Jayaprakash-who are also nurtured by Nath's idealistic philosophy. His philosophy is also based on democracy-both in thought and deeds. This progressive person hates casteism and he takes an active part to eradicate this social evil and to cause dalitupliftment. Nath's wife Seva is also an active social worker who works for the upliftment of women's

causes in society. Nurtured in this situation, when Jyoti expresses her desire to marry ArunAthavale, a dalit boy whom she has known for three months, Nath's happy family gets a sudden jolt. The family becomes divided in two opposite groups-one comprising NathDevalikar the idealist-reformist who dreams of changing this caste- ridden society with his daughter Jyoti as a soldier. Nath is naturally very elated as he declares in act scene II, "Seva, until today, 'Break the caste system was a mere slogan for us. I've attended many inter caste marriages and made speeches. But today I have broken the caste barrier in the real sense....Today I have changed.'" Nath's fervent zeal gets a jolt from his wife Seva and son Jayaprakash who feel apprehended of Jyoti's disastrous future after her marriage with that dalit boy. Actually Nath, in the halo of romantic illusion overlooks his concern and responsibility as a father. To quote the critic, "By encouraging his daughter to be an experimental guinea-pig in the dalit uplift experiments Nath betrays his monumental ego and sense of superiority as an intervener in the fate of the dalits as represented by Arun and women as represented by his daughter. Almost all the speeches concerning Jyoti's marriage made by NathDevalikar in act I is steeped in irony, which reveals that he is a dreamer to whom his daughter becomes a scapegoat. Seva as an active worker engaged in women - upliftment, is very realistic and for this she strongly opposes Jyoti's marriage outside the territory of her cultural periphery". (Loomba,2013) She bursts out, 'I will oppose this marriage .In your words I shall break party discipline and revolt. Does Jyoti's revolt seem sensible to you. Tell me as a father, hand on heart.' (Ramnarayan,1996) In spite of repeated warnings from his family Nath describes Arun 'as a human being he has potential. He has intelligence, drive and creativity.....He is like unrefined gold, he needs to be melted and moulded. This is the need of the hour. Who can perform this task if not girls like Jyoti'. (Ramnarayan,1996) He gives courage and support, "I stand by you. Go ahead my child, let us see what happens." (Ramnarayan,1996) Nath's lack of foresightedness ultimately recoils back him. From here also begins his journey from ignorance to experience. ArunAthavale, as projected from the beginning is a strong fellow both in body and mind. As a dalit boy having a poor financial and so-called backward 'cultural 'background, he is supra sensuously conscious about his existence, about his being a 'Dalit'. (Mahida,2013) He is a stubborn fellow who refuses culture and nurture. He is direct as he has no cultural pretensions.

His poetic self is also the product of his spontaneity. When his proposed wife's mother asks him about his financial condition in their very first meeting, he quickly understands her pricks and retorts her by talking about their traditional livelihood of illicit liquor-selling only to hurt Seva's culture. His manners and conversation with Seva, Jayaprakash and Nath prove his deep-rooted abhorrence for elite society and their culture. At the end of act I, virtually it becomes a

confrontation of two cultures, one elite and dignified, another dalit and neglected. The dramatist neatly divides the drama in two acts. If the act I is the representation of Nath Devalikar's deep-rooted idealism, his dream of social upliftment and his ignorance, act II shows the disastrous result of his ignorance. It depicts his excruciating pain and it becomes a saga of his failure. (Loomba, 2013) In act II, scene I, we see Jyoti no longer a joyous, happy married girl; but an experienced, older woman who bears the burden of his marriage submissively.

Seva, as a mother is totally despaired of his consequence and tries to move his daughter against this unhappy marriage. She repeatedly bursts out against Jyoti's submissiveness to Arun, but Jyoti refuses to give in to her mother. Nath, Jyoti's father is also worried about Jyoti's present situation, but the dreamer in him cannot cast off his long-cherished idealism. Nath, the father cannot separate himself from Nath the progressive party-worker, from Nath the democrat who believes in equality as he says, "The values I uphold in my public I live by in my personal life." (Ramnarayan, 1996) Like a responsible father, he offers Jyoti to stay in his home with Arun, only to prevent abuses and physical tortures done to his darling daughter. But Jyoti refuses to stay and in spite of her decision to leave Arun forever, when Arun comes to her house and shows love theatrically before her parents, Jyoti leaves her father's house with Arun. It is not for Arun's love, but to give riddance to her family of this uncouth, dalit Arun. Jyoti takes this decision. Here also Nath fails to understand his own daughter ignorantly shows her happiness because he thinks that his social experiment of breaking cultural barriers is not going to be failed. This is the reason why elated Nath cries out in joy, "I feel so proud of you. The training I gave you has not been in vain." (Ramnarayan, 1996)

In scene II of act II we see Nath reading and praising the autobiographical work written by Arun Athavale. To Nath it is a good specimen of dalit literature written in living language. Nath's enthusiastic praise stands out almost as an indecency against his wife's anxiety and anger at Arun's growing crime against pregnant Jyoti. In the previous act it has been made obvious how Jyoti is being physically and mentally harassed by a sadistic dalit husband. Already Nath's high idealistic notions about social upliftment have begun to get crumbled. Jyoti's pain and suffering makes Nath annoyed and distressed as a father. Meanwhile Jayaprakash, Nath's son informs his father about the Palestinian guerillas and attack continued on them by Israeli forces. These Israelists who were once beaten down is now launching fresh attacks on others. This is an eye opening incident because even the tortured people do not discard evil and violence. Rather they want to take revenge done to them by attacking others. If Arun- Jyoti incident and their unhappy marriage, Arun's violence and torture is microcosmic; attack of Israeli forces against the Palestinian guerillas are macrocosmic. Actually, there is no progress and cultural upliftment in our

civilization. Very soon, Arun Athavale comes to invite his father-in-law in his book launching ceremony. The way he invites his father-in-law in boastful manners is highly indicative of Arun's selfishness, his bestiality, who wants to aggrandize on elite sympathy to cater his personal needs. His language is that of a first-rate blackmailer with potential threatening. Arun's arrival makes Nath 'tense' and in disgust, he avoids eye contact with him. After Arun's departure, Nath becomes enraged and he bursts out against Arun's hypocrisy. What seemed to him true in act I, turned false before his own eyes. His hysterical cry "I was nauseated by his overweening arrogance. And he's the same man who wrote that autobiography...his visit has polluted this drawing room, this house, and this day...It stinks....This furniture, this floor...all this ...he has made them filthy, dirty, polluted! Why did I have to come into contact with a man like this?" (Ramnarayan, 1996) Arun, far from being a representative character of dalit community 'emerges as a 'Machiavellian character eager to capitalize on the high tide of Dalit sympathy both in personal and intellectual fronts.' (Mahida, 2013)

Seva Devalikar though never supports Jyoti for marrying Arun and bearing all pains silently still requests Nath to preside Arun's book-publishing ceremony. Her desire as a mother to see Jyoti as a happily wedded girl drives her here, because she is more practical. Her active participation in women's causes has made her mature. Following her advice, Nath attends the inaugural ceremony of Arun's autobiography and delivers speech which is nothing but hollow, rhetorical outburst. Nath confesses before her wife and son that what he has done, done only to save her daughter's life. He knows well '...this kind of hypocrisy marks a rank opportunist. That book is no autobiography; it is pulp fiction based on half truths. [Taking a deep breath.] No. Not all dalits can be like that. Nath goes through tremendous mental anxiety and a hopeless, disillusioned father, makes his son cautious not to follow his father's idealism' Jayaprakash, do me a favour. Reject your father. Learn to see through his naiveté and idiocy. Don't ever rely on his wisdom.'

Tendulkar identifies the character of Nath Devalikar with himself. 'Nath Devalikar 'the protagonist of 'Kanyadaan' is me and many other liberals of my generation whom I understand completely. The pain of these people today, the defeat they have suffered, the fundamental mental confusion and naiveté that had led to their pain and defeat, these form the theme of 'Kanyadaan', and I wrote about it because it came so close to me.' (Loomba, 2013).

But it is not only Nath's mental confusion, his ignorance about dalit mentality and his naiveté which are responsible for his tragedy; rather he has some inherent drawbacks also. Nath is an enthusiast, a detached reformist who feels and boasts of his superiority of being a Brahmin and takes it as a social duty to uplift dalit community. His social experimentation as a reformist brings ruin to his

family. Even his daughter who has hero-worshipped him turns against her father and finally denounces his naïve, impractical wisdom. Jyoti demands straight answer from his father for delivering such a hypocritical speech. Nath tries to patch up the matter by saying, "You are making a mistake. I don't hate Arun, I hate only those tendencies..." Angry Jyoti retorts "Tendencies! I grew up listening to such talk day in and day out. All false, vicious claptrap." (Ramnarayan,1996)

She makes his father face to face with open reality. She further accuses her father of making them crippled from childhood by his ineffective theory. Raw experiences with reality make her acutely conscious of the fact that divinity and bestiality are inseparable. Putting man's beastliness to sleep and awakening the godhead within is an absurd notion. You make me waste twenty years of my life before I could discover it." (Loomba,2013) Jyoti accuses her father also as a hypocrite and brings him in the same line as ArunAthavale, her hypocrite dalit husband. (Mahida,2013) Jyoti's final breakdown reminds us of Louisa in Dickens' 'Hard Times', because in both cases, their father's wrong philosophical attitude to life have destroyed their lives.

A shoe was hurled at Tendulkar in 1988. Following is an excerpt from his prize acceptance speech after receiving 'SaraswatiSamman' award, that appears as an Afterword in GowriRamnarayan's edition (Delhi: OUP), 1996: "The work which has been selected for the SaraswatiSamman is not the story of a victory, it is the admission of defeat and intellectual confusion. It gives expression to a deep-rooted malaise and its pains..... I have written about my own experiences and what I have seen in others around me. I have been true to all this and have not cheated my generation. I did not attempt to simplify matters and issues for the audience when presenting my plays though that would have been an easier option. Sometimes my play jolted the society out of its stupor and I was punished. I faced this without regrets. You are honouring me with the SaraswatiSamman today for a play for which I once had a slipper hurled at me." (Ramnarayan,1996)

Albert Pinto in Saeed A. Mirza film is placed in post emergency Mumbai and represents the angst of the common man with a spotlight on the strikes by mill workers in Mumbai. He loves to drive around in expensive cars owned by his clients and at first dismissive of his father's idea to join a labourers strike at the mill he works in. But gradually he is made to realize the difference between the class he belongs to and the class his clients belong to. The kind of rejection he faces from different segments of the society he belongs to seems somewhat similar to the rejection faced by his sister for being lame footed. His identity itself works as a source of his anger just as it is apparent in case of Jimmy and Arun. His relationship with Stella is as turbulent as Jimmy's relationship with Alison and Arun's relationship with Jyoti. All the three want the ladies they are in relationship with to mould their philosophy of life in the

track they are in. If they can not be angry with everything and everybody around them they should share the dissatisfaction and desperation their men are having. All the three treat their ladies abusively and Jyoti had to bear repeated physical abuses too. All the three ladies initially plan to quit these relationships and then they actually move away from their men but ultimately they realize the justification of the anger of their men and get back to their relationships in spite of all the turbulences of their lives. While dealing with the anger of all the three characters we can trace certain commonness both in case of the source and the expression of it. The feeling of otherness is the most significant and common aspect of it. Hatred for the middle class is another common aspect especially for certain hypocritical practices and values overburdened with prevalent practice of inaction. Jimmy used to use Alison as a hostage while visiting the residences of the relatives of Alison. These visits for him were battles rather class struggle. Pinto insults Stella's boss by using the benefit of his middle class values leading towards restraining the reactions in different shocking situations. Alison's mother and Jyoti's mother behave almost in the same way while responding to their sons in law. Both are unable to appreciate the choice of their daughters and attempt to stop their daughters to marry their counterparts. Alison's mother even employs a private detective to monitor the behavioural practices and acquaintances of Jimmy whereas Seva repeatedly argues with Nath to stop Jyoti to marry Arun. But Nath fails to overcome his weakness for Gandhian idealism related to the probable upward movement of the so called lower castes by arranging inter-caste marriages. Arun uses the same weakness of Nath for using him as the introducer of his autobiography. Tendulkar in the same way had to introduce Mallika Shaikh's autobiography, I Want to get Ruined (1983) following her separation with *Namdeo Dhasal* whose *Golpitha* (1972) was also introduced by him. Both these works bear definite trends of Dalit Panther Movement which traces its legacies from Heera Dom's 'AchutkiSikayat' (1914) and DrarikaBharati's 'Sailab'.

### Conclusion

Progressive Dalit Literature Circle led by Hamneer Rao Kamle uses Tendulkar to acquire a wide range of reception in the 70s but does hardly hesitate to bring Anti-Dalit charge against him following the success of Kanyadan. Osborn in the same way charged for presenting a sexist story through Look Back. On the contrary Mirza's depiction of post emergency reality was appreciated by the critics whereas the film became flop. Anger in all these cases emerge as the key response towards each and every undesired aspect of life and work as the connecting link among them.

### Reference

1. Abeles, Ronald P., Claude S. Fischer and Klaus R. Scherer. *Human Aggression and Conflict*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1975. Print. P. 67.

2. Abraham, Janaki, "Contingent Caste Endogamy and Patriarchy", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol – XLIX No. 2, January 11, 2014. Print. P. 14.
3. Ambedkar, B. R.; 'Castes in India', BAWs, Vol. 1. Frances W. Pritchett (Ed.) Bombay: Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, 1979. Print. P.P. 3-22.
4. Ambedkar, B. R.' *Annihilation of Caste: The Annotated Critical Edition*, New Delhi: Navayana Publication: 2014. Print. P.P. 18-24.
5. Ananth, M. K., "Educated caste Hindu youth campaign against inter-caste marriages"; *The Hindu*, 16July2012. : Web.<http://www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-national/tp-tamilnadu/educated-caste-hindu-youth-campaign-against-intercaste-marriages/article3644332.ece>. 13January2019. Web.
6. "Arundhati Roy's interview with Amit Sengupta", *Tehelka*, 5 November, 2005. [http://archive.tehelka.com/story\\_main14.asp?filename=hub110505\\_In\\_India\\_CS.asp](http://archive.tehelka.com/story_main14.asp?filename=hub110505_In_India_CS.asp). 13January2019. Web.
7. Arundhati Roy's reply to 'Dalit Camera'; [http://roundtableindia.co.in/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=7284:arundhati-roy-replies-to-dalit-camera&catid=119&Itemid=132](http://roundtableindia.co.in/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=7284:arundhati-roy-replies-to-dalit-camera&catid=119&Itemid=132). 13January2019. Web.
8. Austin E. "The Personal, the Political, and the Postmodern in Osborne's Look Back in Anger and Dejavu." *John Osborne: A Casebook*. Ed. Patricia D. Denison. New York: Garland, 1997. Print. P. 32.
9. Billington, Michael. *One Night Stands*. London: Nick Hern Books, 1994. Print. P. 23.
10. Bode, Carl. "The Redbrick Cindrellas." *College English*. Vol. 20; 1959. Print. P.P. 331-37. Brill, A.A. *Basic Principles of Psychoanalysis*. New York: University Press of America, 1985. Print. P.51.
11. Brown, John Russell. 'Introduction'. *Modern British Dramatists*. Ed. John Russell Brown. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1968. Print. P.P. 2-16.
12. Buss, Arnold, H. *The Psychology of Aggression*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1961. Print. P.P. 31-63.
13. Chowdhary, Prem; 'Enforcing Cultural Codes: Gender and Violence in Northern India', *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol – XXXII, No. 19, 1997. Print. P. 33.
14. D. Karthikeyan, "Survey of inter-caste marriages tells different tale"; <http://www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-national/tp-tamilnadu/survey-of-intercaste-marriages-tells-different-tale/article4473409.ece>. 15January2019. Web.
15. Das, Kumudin; Roy, T. K. "Dynamics of inter-religious and inter-caste marriages in India"; <http://paa2011.princeton.edu/papers/111281>, 15January2019. Web.
16. 'Dalit Camera' to Arundhati Roy; [http://roundtableindia.co.in/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=7283:an-open-letter-to-ms-arundhati-roy&catid=119:feature&Itemid=132](http://roundtableindia.co.in/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=7283:an-open-letter-to-ms-arundhati-roy&catid=119:feature&Itemid=132). 13January2019. Web.
17. Deshpande, Ashwini: *Affirmative Action in India*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press: 2013. Print. P. 19.
18. Demastes, William W. "Osborne on the Fault Line Jimmy Porter on the Postmodern Verge." *John Osborne: A Casebook*. Ed. Patricia D. Denison. New York: Garland, 1997. P.P. 21-22.
19. French, Patrick; *India, A portrait*. New Delhi: Penguin Books, 2011. Print. P. 11.
20. Gale, Steven H. "John Osborne: Look Forward in Fear." *Essays on Contemporary British Drama*. Eds. Hedwig Bock and Albert Wertheim. München: Hueber, 1981. Print. P. 24.
21. Gillemann, Luc. M. "The Logic of Anger and Despair." *John Osborne: A Casebook*. Ed. Patricia D. Denison. New York: Garland, 1997. Print. P.P. 13-18.
22. Goldstone, Herbert. *The Achievement of John Osborne*. Lanham, New York, London: University Press of America, 1982. Print. P. 10.
23. Hawkings-Dady, Mark. "From Out of the Shadow of Nicol Williamson." *John Osborne: A Casebook*. Ed. Patricia D. Denison. New York: Garland, 1997. Print. P. 31.
24. Hinchliffe, Arnold P. "Whatever Happened to John Osborne?" *Contemporary English Drama*. Ed. C.W.E Bigsby. London: Edward Arnold, 1981. Print. P.P. 3-11.
25. Hodgson, Terry. *Modern Drama*. London: B.T. Batsford, 1992. Print. P. 7.
26. Hoon, Ruchira, "Playing God in caste-crazy Bihar", <http://www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/playing-god-in-caste-crazy-bihar/article1-397250.aspx>. 15January2019. Web.
27. Khole, Vilas; *Tendulkar naavachevaadal (A storm named Tendulkar)*; Dr.Prahlad Vader (Ed.), Pune: PratimaPrakashan, 2012. Print. P. 20.
28. Loomba, Ania, 'Vijay Tendulkar's Kanyadaan'; *Economic and Political Weekly*, Volume XLVII No 43, October 26, 2013. Print. P.P. 61-69.
29. Margaret, Swathy, "Cultural Gandhism", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol – XLVIII No. 18, May 04, 2013. Print. P.P. 14-22.
30. Manu, Manusmriti, Chapter X. [http://infidels.org/library/modern/ramendra\\_nath/hindu.html](http://infidels.org/library/modern/ramendra_nath/hindu.html). 15January2019. Web.
31. Mimroth, P. L. *A Memorandum to Justice Sayed Sagir Ahmed, Chairperson, RSHRC*. <http://www.hindu.com/2003/09/28/stories/2003092802010500.htm>. 15January2019. Web.
32. Osborne, John. *Look Back in Anger*. London: Faber and Faber, 1971. Print. P.P. 2,7,8,13,14,16,22,26,29,30,32,38,41.
33. Pinker, Steven: *The Blank Slate*. England: Published by Viking Penguin, 2002. Print. P.77.
34. Prentice, Berkowitz, Leonard. *Aggression: A Social Psychological Analysis*. New York,

- Toronto, London, San Francisco: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962. Print. P.P. 12-19.
35. Lacey, Stephen. *British Realist Theatre*. New York, London: Routledge, 1995. Print. P.42.
  36. Leon, Ruth and Sheridan Morley. *A Century of Theatre*. Oxford: Alden Press, 2000. Print. P.4.
  37. Mahida, Beena; "A critical study of Vijay Tendulkar's major plays", PhD Dissertation, Department of English, Sardar Patel University Library, 5 March 2013. P.8.
  38. Mander, John. "The Writer and Commitment." *John Osborne Anger Looks Back in* . Ed. John Russell Taylor. London: Macmillan, 1968. Print. P.22.
  39. McCarthy, Mary. "A New Word." *John Osborne Look Back in Anger Russell Taylor*. London: Macmillan, 1968. Print. P. 5.
  40. Mortimer, John; "The Angry Young Man Who Stayed that Way." *John Osborne: A Casebook* . Ed. Patricia, D. Denison. New York: Garland, 1997. Print. P.P. 16-22.
  41. Rege, Sharmila: *Against the Madness of Manu*, New Delhi: Navayana Publication, 2013. Print. P. 12.
  42. Rao, Goparaju, Ramachandra; "An Atheist with Gandhi", [http://www.positiveatheism.org/india/gora13.htm#CHAP\\_VIII](http://www.positiveatheism.org/india/gora13.htm#CHAP_VIII). 13January2019. Web. P. 6.
  43. Roy, Arundhati; 'Introduction'; *Annihilation of Caste: The Annotated Critical Edition*, New Delhi: Navayana Publication: 2014. Print. P.P. 6-8.
  44. King, Kimball. "John Osborne, Summer 1993." *John Osborne: A Casebook* . Ed. Patricia D. Denison. New York: Garland, 1997. Print. P.26.
  45. Ramnarayan, Gowri; Ed. Tendulkar, Vijay; *Kanyadan*. Delhi: OUP. 1996. Print. P.P. viii, xxvi, 9, 12,17,26,31.
  46. Roy, Emil. *British Drama Since Shaw*. London: Feffer& Simmons Inc.,1972. Print. P. 331.
  47. Rusinko, Susan. *British Drama 1950 to the Present*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1989. Print. P. 13.
  48. Salgado, Gamini. *English Drama: A Critical Introduction* . London: Edward Arnold, 1980. Storr, Anthony. *Human Aggression* . New York: Atheneum, 1968. Print. P.35.
  49. Singer, Peter: *Practical Ethics*. New Delhi: Cambridge University Press, 1980. Print. P. 42.
  50. Taylor, John Russell. *John Osborne 'Look Back in Anger'*. London: Macmillan, Tedeschi, 1968. Print. P.7.
  51. T. James. "Social Influence Theory and Aggression." *Aggression: Theoretical and Empirical Reviews* . Eds. Edward I. Donnerstein and Russell G. Geen.Vol.1. New York: Academic Press, 1983. Print. P.P. 17-19.
  52. Trussler, Simon. *The Plays of John Osborne* . London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1969. Print. P.34.
  53. Wandor, Michelene. *Understudies: Theatre and Sexual Politics*. London: Methuen, 1988. Print. P. Vii.
  54. Wellwarth, George. "John Osborne: 'Angry Young Man'?" *John Osborne Back in Anger Look*. Ed. John Russell Taylor. London: Macmillan, 1968. Print. P.P. 31-38.
  55. Williams, Raymond. "New English Drama." *Modern British Dramatists*. Ed. John Russell Brown. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1968. Print. P.20.