

Tribhuvan University

Vijay Tendulkar's *Encounters in Umbugland* as a Political Satire

A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English

In Partial Fulfillment of the requirement for the Degree of

Master of Arts in English

By

Bhimarjun Devkota

University Campus

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

May 2010

Tribhuvan University
Central Department of English
Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Letter of Recommendation

Mr. Bhimarjun Devkota has completed his thesis entitled “Vijay Tendulkar’s *Encounters in Umlugland* as a Political Satire” under my supervision. He carried out his research from 2066/05/01 B.S. to 2067/02/10 B.S. I hereby recommend his thesis be submitted for viva voice.

Mr. Pam Bahadur Gurung

Supervisor

Date: -----

Tribhuvan University
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Approval Letter

This thesis entitled “Vijay Tendulkar’s *Encounters in Umbugland* as a Political Satire” submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University by Mr. Bhimarjun Devkota has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head

Central Department of English

Date: _____

Acknowledgements

I am glad to take this opportunity to thank Mr. Pam Bahadur Gurung, Lecturer at the Central Department of English, T.U., for his supervision to this research work. His wide-ranging knowledge and study have led to many improvements in the substance and helped me give the final shape to this thesis.

I would like to extend my profound gratitude to Prof. Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, Head of the Central Department of English for granting me an opportunity to carry out this research. I am especially grateful to Dr. Amma Raj Joshi for his invaluable suggestions. I would like to thank my friends and those who supported and encouraged me directly or indirectly in this course.

I am heavily indebted to my parents, brothers, and relatives who constantly supported and provided encouragement to carry out this research work. Finally, I am thankful to Sailu Devkota and Sundar Devkota for their help in bringing this research work into this present form.

May 2010

Bhimarjun Devkota

Abstract

The thorough analysis of Vijay Tendulkar's *Encounter in Umbugland* as a political satire shows how Tendulkar builds on satire as a tool to expose the intricate political intrigues practiced by a naïve young Princess Vijaya to attain positions of authority during sixteenth century royalist regime in India. To make his satire effective and subtle, he utilizes the device of political allegory in which Umbugland symbolically represents the post- independent India in the grip of political void after the death of Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru, and the wrangling between the ministers and princess Vijaya stands for the power contest among the politicians of that period. Despite the distance achieved through the creation of a fictitious milieu, it is easy to identify the characters with political figures who held ministerial positions in those years. The so-called political leaders spouting moral platitudes; the ever-smiling statesman; and the strong and determined princess Vijaya, the sole daughter of the autocratic king represent the true nature of the politicians. Any way, princess Vijaya creates favourable situation for herself and refuses to be the puppet and pawn of her advisers. Though she acts in a childish and humorous manner, she becomes successful in turning the table against the powerful ministers – her rivals.

Contents

	Page No.
Acknowledgements	
Abstract	
Chapter I: Socio-political Issues in the Plays of Vijay Tendulkar	1-10
Chapter II: A Critical Study of Satire and Humour	11-25
Chapter III: Political Satire in <i>Encounters in Umbugland</i>	26-41
Chapter IV: Conclusion	42-43
Works Cited	

I. Socio-political Issues in the Plays of Vijay Tendulkar

This study on Vijay's Tendulkar's play *Encounters in Umbugland* (1968), as an allegory set in the sixteenth century royalist regime in India, examines the political satire of that period on the surface, but in deeper level, it symbolically represents some important political bickering and maneuvering of India during post independent period. As in allegory, in the play, the death of the king Vichitravirya represents the death of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru; the chaos in the state of Umbugland represents the post independent political void in India; and the princess Vijaya and other ministers represent the politicians who tried their best to ascertain themselves to be the ruler. So the situation, the setting, and the characters metaphorically represent the political situation, and the power seeking politicians during 60's and 70's of Twentieth century India. To achieve his goal, Tendulkar launches his satire using the frivolity of immature young princess who ultimately turns to be obsessed to the absolute power by hook or crook in the state, Umbugland. What little artistic merit the play possesses arises mostly from the playwright's inventiveness in peopling his imaginary kingdom of *Encounters in Umbugland* with characters whose whimsical activities reflect what other satirists regarded as the increasingly unnatural political condition of the kingdom of India.

In the play, the princess Vijaya, daughter of an autocratic king, turns the table on her advisors and refuses to be their pawn. She transforms from a headstrong, self-opinionated but politically inexperienced young princess to a shrewd but whimsical ruler who devises own methods of vanquishing her opponents and enemies that leads to the corruption of power in the state. By exposing the intricate political intrigues designed by the princess Vijaya to attain

positions of authority and power, Tendulkar satirizes the absolute power-seeking tendency of rulers in the South Asian region.

Encounter in Ubugland is a play of power-politics. Arundhati Banerjee describes it as a “political allegory, but not bereft of human dimension” (x). Like Brecht’s *Mother Courage*, in *Encounters Ubugland* he [Tendulkar] exploits a “corrupt system for personal advantage, then discovers that the price of playing the game is everything he hoped to protect. Unlike Brecht, though, Mr. Tendulkar never judges his protagonist but concentrates instead on painting him with unsettling compassion, perceptiveness and thoroughness” (3). All these interpretations about Tendulkar’s plays reflect the social issues of Indian society.

However, this present study on his play *Encounters in Ubugland* examines political satire in India during post independent period, which still exposes the power seeking tendency of Indian leaders. From the above mentioned discussion on Vijaya Tendulkar, it becomes clear that Tendulkar is a social writer and his plays call for detailed research.

Vijay Dhondopant Tendulkar, who was born in 1928 in Kolhapur, India, is a leading contemporary Indian playwright, screen and television writer literary essayist, political journalist and social commentator for the past five decades. He has been the most influential dramatist and theater personality in Marathi. Tendulkar was born in a Bhalavalikar Saraswat Brahmin family in Kolhapur, Maharashtra, where his father held a clerical job and ran a small publication business. The literary environment at home prompted young Vijay to take up writing. He wrote his last story at the age of six. He grew up watching western plays and felt inspired to write plays himself. At the age of eleven he wrote, directed and acted in his last play. At the age of fourteen he participated in the 1942, Indian freedom movement leaving his studies. This later

alienated him from his family and friends writing then became his outlet though most of his early writings were of a personal nature, and intended for publication.

Vijaya Tendulkar is the most prolific writer who has to his credit twenty eight full-length plays, seven collections of one-act plays, six collections of children's plays, four collections of short stories, three of essays besides seventeen film scripts and a novel, all in a span of fifty years. Critics bring our notice to the prismatic quality of his writings and it can be spotted in his writings, especially in the plays -- *Ghasiram Kotwal*, *Gidhade*, *Shantata! Court Chalu Ahe*, *Sakaram Binder*, *Kamala*, *Kanyadaan* to name a few, and his movie, *Nishant*, *Aakrosh*, *Manthan* and *Ardha Satya*. He has been celebrated as the 'Playwright of the Millennium.' His plays which have been perceived by critics as being ahead of their times, are also timeless, because of his accurate and sensitive portrayal of the social issues of the time.

Balwant Bhaneja regards Tendulkar as a prolific writer as he takes him as a giant among these modern Indian playwrights, both in terms of the volume and quality of his dramatic creations – a subtle observer of Indian social reality, a humanist, an innovative playwright who continuously experimented with form and structures. He was known for his “insightful objectification” in the development of multi-layered characters whose existential angst was held up against the social crises of the society (11).

Tendulkar is a realist writer as he does not write about fictitious subjects. He himself has said in an interview with Sumit Saxena:

I have not written about hypothetical pain or created an imaginary world of sorrow. I am from a middle class family and I have seen the brutal ways of life by keeping my eyes open. My work has

come from within me, as an outcome of my observation of the world in which I live. If they want to entertain and make merry, fine go ahead, but I can't do it, I have to speak the truth. (A *Conversation with Sir Vijay Tendulkar* 8)

So, Tendulkar's plays have dealt with themes that unravel the exploitation of power and latent violence in human relationships. As he noted: “[T]he basic urge (to write) has always been to let out my concerns vis-à-vis my reality: the human condition as I perceive it” (x).

Tendulkar began his career writing for newspapers. He had already written a play *Amchyavar Kon Prem Kamar* (*Who Will Love Us*) and he also wrote a play *Gruhastha* (*The Householder*) in the early 20's; the later did not receive much recognition from the audience. In 1956, he wrote *Shrimant* which established him a good writer. In 1961, Tendulkar wrote the play, *Gidhade* (*The Vultures*) but it was not produced until 1970. *Gidhade* proved to be a turning point in Tendulkar's writing with regard to establishment of his own unique writing style.

Tendulkar's *Silence: The Court is in Session* (1967) is a milestone not only in his career but in the history of whole Marathi drama. He was now marked out as a rebel against the establishment values of a fundamentally orthodox society. In his next play *Sakharam Binder* (1972) Tendulkar has dealt with the issue of domination of the male gender over the female. For many decades no play created such a sensation in a theatre world of Maharashtra as this play *Sakharam Binder*. It is probably the most intense naturalistic play. In 1972, Tendulkar wrote a musical play, *Ghashiram Kotwal* (*Ghashiram the Constable*), which dealt with political violence. The play is a political satire created as a musical drama set in 18th century Pune. It combined traditional Marathi folk music and drama with contemporary theater technique, creating a new

paradigm for Marathi Theater. It brought him a “Jawaharlal Nehru fellowship”, (1974-75) for a project titled, “An Enquiry into the Pattern of Growing Violence in Society and its Relevance to Contemporize Theatre”.

Ghashiram Kotwal remains one of the longest running plays in the history of Indian theater. *Ghashiram* rose to such a furore, that there came international recognition, although the play received fierce opposition from the local Marathi audience. By its admixture of melody in the Aristotelian sense with prose dialogues *Ghashiram*, created a new form of drama on the Marathi stage. Such a mode of drama received not only national but global acceptance. Tendulkar wrote screen-plays for the movies *Nishant* (1974), *Akrosh* (the Cry) (1980), and *Ardhsatya* (The Half Truth) (1984), which established him as an important “chronicler of violence of the present time” (Bharan 19). He has written eleven movies in Hindi and eight movies in Marathi. In 1990's Tendulkar wrote an acclaimed TV-series *Swayamsiddha* in which his daughter, Priya Tendulkar performed in the lead role. His son Raja and wife Nirmala both died in 2001, and were shortly followed by his daughter, actress Priya Tendulkar in 2002. In his writing career spanning more than five decades Tendulkar has written 27 full length plays and 25 one act plays. Tendulkar, by providing insight into major social events and political upheavals in his adult life, has become one of the “strongest radical political voices” in Maharashtra in recent times (Gokhle 81).

Tendulkar’s plays give an insight into major social events and political upheavals during his adult life, the way he courageously exposed the hypocrisies in the Indian social mindset is the actual point to be noted. He used powerful expression to reveal the orthodox society. Although highly criticized, he was far ahead of his times to give wings to his flights of imagination with its solid heels on earth. The best thing about his plays is that they can be related to the real life of a middle class man.

Many of Tendulkar's plays derived inspiration from real-life incidents or social upheavals. The way he galvanized theatre through his provocative explorations of morality, power, and violence, deserves a great applause. The reason behind his huge success was the accurate and sensitive portrayal of the social issues of the time.

The 'middle class', an emotion-ridden if ultimately elusive concept, has been redefined by Tendulkar as those fighting privilege to escape the economic insecurity (not to mention the indignity). In a country characterized by poverty and inequality, the complex interplay of these factors can have favorable or adverse effects on different regions and on different classes of society. Tendulkar has untapped this group's position in the class hierarchy and in the overall power structure, as well as its environmental vulnerability. Generally, people from the middle strata are likely to be the greatest sufferers in this process. What he has portrayed gives a great matter for Tendulkar's ideas to flourish and ripen.

Not only class but gender is an important dimension of patterns of the class division which drew the attention of Tendulkar. In this regard, A.N. Prasad and Saryug Yadav note, "In his feminist research on the effects of development on women Tendulkar has clearly revealed that in many areas of the country the rights of women are infringed and women are exploited emotionally, socially, and physically" (21). Tendulkar's *Kamala* (1981) is a play inspired by a real-life incident, in which Ashwin Sarin, who actually bought a girl from a rural flesh market and presented her at a press conference. At the center of the play is a self-seeking journalist, Jaisingh Jadav, who treats the woman he has purchased from the flesh market as an object that can buy him a promotion in his job and a reputation in his professional life. Tendulkar raises certain "cardinal questions regarding the value system of a modern success-oriented generation which is ready to sacrifice human values even in the name of

humanity itself” (Tandon 159). The innate self-deception of this standpoint is exposed dramatically by the playwright.

Tendulkar successfully gives the readers a clear insight into the lives of his individual characters and evokes empathy for them all, as they seem to be victims of their own trappings. His portrayal of women characters ranges from the socially depraved characters who are so close to the real life. Tendulkar’s strength is evident and there is tenderness and realism in his depiction of the central character he focused upon. Vijay Tendulkar happens to be one of the most prolific Indian playwrights who have enriched the Indian drama and theatre by picturing the varied problems of native life in Maharashtra. The main reason for our attraction for him is that he does not copy from or imitate the Western dramatists and thrust it on the native audience. Tendulkar successfully ventures in unveiling the social turpitude and the holocaust in which the fair interests of the fairer sex are almost strangled. His iconoclastic endeavors shake the very ground of the established values of a fundamentally orthodox Indian society. Tendulkar won “Maharashtra State Awards” in 1956, 1969 and Maharashtra “Gauruv Puraskar” in 1999. He was honoured with the “Sangeet Natak Academy Award” in 1970, and again in 1998 with the Academy’s highest award for “Life time Contribution”. In 1998 he won the “Sangeet Natak Academy” fellowship.

Thus, Tendulkar is a creative writer with a fine sensibility and at the same time a contemplative and controversial dramatist. He has made a mark in the field of journalism too. So, because of his highly individual outlook on his vision of life, and personal style of writing, he has made a mark in the field of literature. By doing so, he has put Marathi drama on the national and international map. Tendulkar has contributed to the laying of the foundation of a

[D]istinctive tradition in the history of Indian drama by reinvestigating history, legend, myth, religion and folk love with context to contemporary socio-political issues. A cumulative theatrical tradition evolved by Vijay Tendulkar and other contemporary dramatists prepared the background of contemporary Indian English theatre. (Sharma 10)

This proves that Tendulkar is a multifaceted creative genius, who experimented and explored the potentials of the dramatic genre. Tendulkar's plays have a massive impact on the tender and fresh minds of the worldwide avid readers.

Tendulkar is a towering and glowering Indian dramatist and all his plays are sharply focused and illuminating. Through his writings, he attacks upon the society and hypocrisies. Thematically, his plays have ranged from the alienation of the modern individual to contemporary politics from social-individual tensions to the complexities of human character, from the exploration of man woman relationship to reinterpretations of historical episodes and so on. The themes of gender relation, sexual norms, institution of marriage and issues of conventional morality have been featured prominently in his plays. In *Silence! The Court is in Session*, Tendulkar has combined social criticism with the tragedy of an individual victimized by society. *Sakharam Binder* explores with great objectivity the complication of two necessary components in human nature: sex and violence. His *Ghashiram Kotwal* deals with political violence.

Tendulkar, through his writings, has exposed the theme of man's existential loneliness. There is a streak of naturalism and humanism in all his plays. All his plays convey a social message that is oriented to make society a better place to live in.

Tendulkar exposes alienation of modern individual to contemporary politics. Ram Sharma writes:

He also exposed men's dominance over women, his portraiture of overt and covert violence in human-beings and above all his deep and abiding consciousness of women's vulnerability in Indian social hierarchy. Tendulkar's central concern is the relationship between individual and society. In play after play he has made effective presentation of the latent violence and lust in middle class life, the consequent devastation and the essential loneliness of man. He has depicted the indomitable and grit of human spirit. (9)

We find the idea of the social and aesthetic concerns in all plays. His primary compulsion is and has always been humanistic. Man's fight for survival, the various moralities by which we live, the social position of women, these are his binding concern.

In his plays, he portrays the human live which is stagnated in the mire of personal frustrations and sexual innuendoes. He tried to expose the essential artificiality of the society. All his plays have a direct, one to one relationship with society. This prolific writer has also exposed the patriarchal set up of marriage- a means of not only regulating sexual and reproductive behavior but also a means of upholding male dominance.

The work has been divided into four chapters. The first chapter presents an introductory outline of the work – a short elaboration on the hypothesis, a glimpse of Vijay Tendulkar, his writing and a short critical response. Moreover, it gives a bird's eye view of this entire work. The second chapter tries to explain the theoretical modality briefly that is applied in this research work. It basically

discusses Satire with its origin, form and practice as a theoretical tool to analyze the text.

On the basis of the theoretical framework established in the second chapter, the third chapter analyzes the text at a considerable length. It analyzes how Tendulkar satirizes the power hungry nature of politicians in India. It tries to prove the hypothesis of the study – by exposing the intricate political intrigues designed by the Princess Vijaya to attain positions of authority and power, Tendulkar satirizes the absolute power-seeking tendency of rulers in the South Asian region. Finally, the fourth or the last chapter sums up the main points of the present research work and the findings of the research work.

II. Satire as a Tool for Political Criticism

As a literary tool, “satire” originated in the second century B.C. It was first used with reference to a poetic form by the Roman satirist, Lucile. Later it was practiced with distinction by his successors: Horace, Persius, and best described by Quintilian in his *Institutio Oratoria* (500 A. D.). This formal verse satire written in Latin hexameters was dramatic, with the satirist, through a dialogue with an adversary, exposition of vice and folly but means of critical analysis. Alexander Pope’s *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot* is an eighteenth century English example.

A satire is both a specific literary genre and literary manner though in practice it is also found in the graphic and performing arts. In satire, human or individual vices, follies, abuses, or shortcomings are held up to censure by means of ridicule, derision, burlesque, irony, or other methods, ideally with the intent to bring about improvement. Although satire is usually meant to be funny, the purpose of satire is not primarily humour in itself so much as an attack on something of which the author strongly disapproves, using the weapon of wit. A very common, almost defining feature of satire is its strong vein of irony or sarcasm, but parody, burlesque, exaggeration, juxtaposition, comparison, analogy, and double entendre are all frequently used in satirical speech and writing.

The word “satire” comes from Latin word *satura lanx* and means “medley, dish of colourful fruits” – it was held by Quintilian to be a “wholly Roman phenomenon” (Ullman 173). By implication, it means a hotchpotch in literature. But its origin often has been confused with the Greek satyr play- the fourth play in the dramatic bill, with a chorus of ‘goat men’ and coarse comic manner. According to Gilbert Highet, “The essence of the original name was variety -- plus a certain down-to-earth naturalness, or coarseness, or unsophisticated heartiness” (231). Therefore, to

be true to its original derivation and first conception, a satire must be varied, it must be large enough to fill the bowl, and finally it must be coarse and hearty.

A satire, generally speaking, is an attack on foolish or wicked behaviour by making fun of it often by using humor, sarcasm and parody. C. High Holman defines satire “as a literary manner in which the follies and foibles or vices and crimes of a person, humankind, or an institution are held up to ridicule or scorn, which the intention of correcting them” (293). This manner may be present in various art forms and may employ many methods. Satire is also applied in magic songs and ritualistic invective in Greek, old Irish and Arabic literatures, where the ritual curse was believed to have powerful effects.

Satire has usually been justified as a corrective of human vice and folly. Satires are the jokes about serious things. So, although satire is often comic, its object is to evoke not mere laughter but laughter for a corrective purpose. It always has a target such as pretense, falsity, deception, arrogance- which is held up to ridicule by the satirist’s unmaking of it. The satirist usually cannot speak openly or does not wish to do as he chooses means that allow him to utter the unspeakable with impunity.

With regard to a satirist, C. High Holeman comments:

His viewpoint is ultimately that of the cold eyed reality, why penetrates sham and pretense for a didactics purpose. The portrayals generally are at variance with outward appearances, but they contain recognizable truth, and it is this truth that gives the satirist his license to attack.

(293)

However, satire differs from the ‘comic’ though both use laughter. Comedy evokes laughter mainly as an end in itself, while satire derides; that is, it uses laughter as a “weapon and against a butt that exists outside the work itself” (Abrams 275).

That butt may be an individual, or a type of person, a class as institution, a nation, or even the entire human race.

A satirist thus attacks them with a motive of correcting human vice and folly. In this regard, Alexander Pope remarked, “those who are ashamed of nothing else are so of being ridiculous” (qtd. in Abrams 276). Its frequent claim has been corrigible faults, excluding those for which a person is not responsible. As Swift said speaking of himself in his ironic, “Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift” (1739):

Yet malice never was his aim;
 He lashed the vice, but spared the name
 His satire points at no defect,
 But what all mortals may correct
 He spared a hump, or crooked nose,
 Whose owners set not up for beaux? (qtd. in Abrams (276)

Satirists like ironists say one thing and mean another. Wayne C. Booth introduces the term ‘stable irony’, by which he means that once a reconstruction of meaning has been made, the readers are not then invited to undermine it with further demolitions and reconstructions. But irony to D.C Muecke is:

A way of writing designed to leave open the question of what the literal meaning might signify: there is a perpetual deferment of significances. The old definition of irony-saying one thing and giving to understand the contrary- is superseded; irony is saying something in a way that activates not one but an endless series of subversive interpretations. (31)

Satirists present one thing or situation under the grab of another, which may appear ridiculous on the surface. The combination of just and earnest is a permanent

mark of satiric writing- the central method of device. A satirist, though he jokes and makes readers laugh, tries to reveal human vice and folly, which (to him) is the truth. Satirists declare that their truth is what people do not want to hear. While tracing the history of satire back to the ancient time, we find two main conceptions of its purpose: one is to wonder, to punish, to destroy, and the other is to warn and cure. The first types of satirists believe that the rascality is triumphant in the world, and are pessimistic. Jonathan Swift says that though he loves individual, he detests mankind. These misanthropic satirists look at life and find it, neither tragic nor comic, but ridiculously contemptible and nauseatingly hateful. Gilbert Highet draws the distinctions between pessimistic and optimistic satirists and their writings:

The misanthropic believes it (evil) is rooted in man's nature and the structure of society. Nothing can eliminate or cure it. Man, or the particular gang of miserable mankind who are under his scrutiny, deserves only scorn and hatred. The satirist is close to the tragedian. He believes that folly and evil are not innate in humanity, or, if they are, they are eradicable. They are disease which can be cured. They are mistakes which can be corrected. Sinners are not devils, fallen forever. They are men self-blinded, and they can open their eyes. (236)

The two most important Roman satirists were Juvenal and Horace, who represent pessimist and optimist respectively. Juvenal illustrates rhetorical or tragic satire of which he is at once the inventor and the most distinguished master. His satire attacks vices or abuses in a high-pitched strain of impassioned declamatory eloquence. Horace and his followers assail the enemies of common sense with the weapons of humor and sarcasm so that the wrong doer will get rid of the wrongs. These types of satirists believe in the doctrine "no one errs willingly" (Highet 201).

The optimistic satirists write in order to heal and the pessimistic satirists in order to punish. In Horatian satire, according to Abrams, the character that the speaker manifests is a witty and tolerant man of the world, who is moved more often to wry amusement than to indignation at the spectacle of human folly, pretentiousness, and hypocrisy (188). But in Juvenalian satire the character of the speaker is that of a serious moralist who decries modes of vice and error in a dignified and public style.

Satirists always aim at revealing the bitter truth; no matter whatever motives they may have behind their works. Early experiences of life make the people view the world differently. In this regard, Highet says:

In fact, most satirists seem to belong to one of two main classes. Either they were bitterly disappointed early in life, and see the world as a permanent structure of injustices; or they are happy men of overflowing energy and vitality, who see the rest of mankind as poor ridiculous puppets only half-alive, flimsy fakes and meager scoundrels.

(241)

Satirists wish to stigmatize crime or ridicule folly, and thus to aid in diminishing or removing it. Dryden says he who draws his pen for one party must expect to make enemies of the other. According to him, the true end of satire is the amendment of vices by correction. He says he who writes honestly is no more an enemy to the offender than the physician to the patient, when he prescribes harsh remedies to an inveterate disease; for those are only to prevent painful surgery.

Practice of Satire

There has been common and widespread practice of satirical writings. Highet's over implication on history of satire is: "[M]ost of us are apt to think that the history of satire begins with the Romans of republic, continues in Latin for three

centuries, and diverges into Greek with Lucian” (35). Highet sees it as one of the most original, challenging and memorable forms of literature, and says: “[I]t has been practiced by some energetic minds – Voltaire, Rabelais, and Swift; by some exquisitely graceful stylists – Pope, Horace, Aristophanes, and occasionally, as a paragon, by some great geniuses – Lucretius, Goethe, and Shakespeare” (3).

One of the chief kinds of Greek satirical writings was philosophical criticism, which is supposed to have begun with Ionian Xenophanes. The lines below, from his poem “leers or looking askance”, satirized the whole human race:

Now, if hands were possessed by oxen, by horses and lions, and they could paint with their hands, and carve themselves statues as men do, Then they would picture the gods like themselves with similar bodies. Horses would make them like horses, and oxen exactly like oxen. (qtd. in Highet 36)

It is already mentioned that the satire is as old as literature itself. But in England in the eighteenth century it was the basic form of literature. There was social, political and religious unrest among the people. People of the Augustan age wanted certain freedom and excellence in their constitution which resulted in revolution. There were naturally different groups of people holding different views and opinions demanding different kind of freedom. In this concern Halifax, a statesman, demands in his *The Character of Trimmer* (1688) an impartial law based on faith and a healthy compromise between monarchy and republicanism. Though James II, a Catholic, threatened constitution tradition, it was reduced by William III and he was praised by Locke calling him their great restore. Any how conventional parliament was reinstated in 1689. Thus we see that the aim of Politian of that age was to deal with the needs of normal man. It was not philosophical. The authors from 1668 to 1800

such as Samuel Butler, Dryden, Codwin, Burke, and others were concerned more with current practical practices than with philosophical principles. At that time, religion politics were intermingled with a party, business, election contests, foreign policy, church and state. The prevalence of corruption, perpetual agitation, pamphlets and news sheets cries for liberation were the catchwords voiced by the people. Richard Sargged wrote in his *Epistle to Sir Robber Walpol*: “[F]rom liberty each nobler science spring bacon, brightened and a Spenser song; a clerk and Locke new treats of truth expose and Newton reaches heights unknown before” (176).

After various struggles among themselves, they got political liberty. As they got freedom they wanted “full freedom.” There was a sudden and speedy change among the people. They wanted to jump from one pole to another at once. Most of them, particularly aristocrats misused their rights and duty. They broke some conventions which were necessary for harmony in the society. Consequently there was a lack of social order. Flirtation of girl was very common. In fact, the manners of the Augustan Age were coarse; politics was scandalously corrupt. It would be better to quote Dr. Johnson’s views as revealed in his *The Lives of Poets*. He says:

Dryden drew more of man in his general nature and Pope in his local manners. The notions of Dryden were formed by comprehensive speculation and these of Pope by minute attention. There is more dignity in the knowledge of Dryden and more certainty that of pope.
(123)

The notions of Dryden were formed by comprehensive speculation and those of Pope by minute attention. There is more dignity in the knowledge of Dryden, and more certainty in that of Pope. Hence, Dryden knew more of man in his general nature and Pope in his local manners.

The style of Dryden is capricious and varied, that of Pope is cautious and uniform. Dryden obeys the motion of our mind, and Pope constrains his mind to mind to his own rules of composition. Dryden is sometime vehement and rapid; Pope is always smooth, uniform and gentle. Again he says:

The dilatory caution of Pope enabled him to condense his sentiments to multiply his emerged and to accumulate all that study might produce or chance might supply. The flights of Dryden therefore are higher, and Pope continues longer on the wings if Dryden's fire the ablaze brighter, of Pope's the heat is ore regular and constant. Dryden often surpasses expectation and pope never falls below it Dryden's read with frequent astonishment and Pope with perpetual delight. (231)

Similarly, Jonathan Swift was satirist of more rapid and sweeping type than Pope. His *Gulliver's Travels* (1763) is a bitter satire on human race. Swift once said to Pope that "I hardly hope or detest that animal called man" (265). This remark is an elaboration of his cynical attitude. He is also considered as a misanthrope. All these aforesaid authors contributed in the amelioration of the eighteenth century society by their satirical writings.

Pope has a unique place among them. He does not write personal satires only. For instance, most people would accept *The Rape of the Lock* as a true master piece of light satire that is to say, which is amusing and good tempered, yet not with an element of social criticism. The poet has universalized the poem making Belinda, a symbol of the fashion of the 18th century.

In 19th century, Mark Twain became the best-known American satirist, publishing satires in a variety of forms, including 'news satire and full-length books. In Britain, at roughly the some time W.S. Gilbert created seemingly harmless and

unobjectionable comic operas that often tore apart the customs and institutions held so dear by the British public.

In the 20th century, satire has been used by authors such as Aldous Huxley and George Orwell to make serious even frightening commentaries on the dangers of the sweeping social changes taking place throughout Europe. The film, *The Great Dictator* (1940) by Charlie Chaplin, is a satire on Adolf Hitler and his Nazi army. A more humorous brand of satire enjoyed a renaissance in the U.K. in the early 1960s with the satire boom, led by such luminaries as Peter Cook, Alan Bennett, Jonathan Miller, David Frost, Eleanor Bron and Dudley Moore and there is an increasing perception that satire must be explicitly humorous, which has not always been the case.

Form of Satire

Although the purpose of satire has always been to correct the fault and weaknesses of human beings, it has been expressed in different forms. One of the chief means of satire is Humor. Humor means to arouse laughter or create comic situations. The origin of the word 'humor' is Latin, which is used for 'liquid', 'fluid' or 'moisture.' In early Western physiology, the four fluids of the body that were thought to determine a person's temperament and features were four humors (fluids) of the body: blood, phlegm, choler and yellow bile. They need to be in proper proportion. When one fluid exceeded its normal amount, then disproportion occurred. These four fluids are to remain in balance otherwise, the normal temperament of a person happens to be misbalanced.

It was believed that the individuals in whom this disproportion occurred would be in a choleric humor if yellow bile were predominant. There would be melancholy humor if blood were predominated and phlegmatic humor if phlegm were

predominant. Whatever humor predominated, the lack of balance indicated a deviation from normal, an excess that requires correction.

As far back Plato and Aristotle, they took laughter as a proper corrective of the excessive. When we laugh there emerges excessive of one element. The object of humor is to create laughter to satirize the event or situation. Humor is an artistic device to correct one's excessiveness and to ridicule upon an incident and situation. The person who possessed an excess of any humor becomes humorist. *The New Encyclopedia of Britannica* defines humor as "the only form of communication in which a stimulus on a high level of complexity produces a stereotyped predictable response on the psychological reflex level" (682). It means the response can be used as an indicator for the presence of the illusive quality that is called humor. The study of humor provides clues for the study of creativity in general.

Satire is activated through humor. In humour, both the creation of the subtle joke and the secretive act perceiving the joke involve the delightful mental movement of a sudden leap from one plane of associative context to another. An example of a masochist is taken for the humorous state. A masochist is a person who likes a cold shower in the morning so he takes a hot one. It is a twisted manner. One does not believe that the masochist takes his hot shower as a punishment: he only pretends to be believed.

There is a bewildering variety of moods involved in different forms of humor including mixed or contradictory feelings. In the subtler types of humor, the aggressive tendency may be so faint that only careful analysis will detect it like the presence of salt in a well-prepared dish. In Aristotle's view, laughter was intimately treated to ugliness and debasement. Cicero held that province of ridiculous lay in a certain baseness and deformity. Rene Descartes believes that laughter was a

manifestation of joy mixed with surprise or hatred or both. In Francis Bacon's list of what causes laughter, the first place is given to deformity. One of the most frequently quoted utterances on the subject is this definition in Thomas Hobbes's *Leviathan* (1651): "The passion of laughter is nothing else but sudden glory arising from a sudden conception of some eminency in ourselves by comparison with the infirmity of others or with own formerly" (683).

How the humor came into use in western literature is a wide range of research. It goes back to the time of Plato and Aristotle in Greek literature. In Greek tragedy, the humorous characters were presented in plays, and later in Shakespearian comedy they appeared as successfully as in the Greek stage. James Bergson says, "laughter is the corrective punishment inflicted by upon the unsocial individual" (683). In laughter, we always find an intention to humiliate and consequently to correct our neighbour. Sir Max Beerbohm, the 20th century English wit found "two elements in the public humor: delight in suffering contempt for the unfamiliar" (87). The American psychologist William Mac Doug argues that "laughter has been involved in human race as an antidote to sympathy a protective reaction shielding us from the depressive influence of the shortcomings of our fellow men" (683).

Much of theorists agree that the emotions discharged relief in laughter always contain an element of aggressiveness. Laughter provides relief from tension. It also satirizes the situation considered to be opposite from the reality. Sigmund Freud involves Spenser's theory of humor into his own with special emphasis on the release of repressed emotions in laughing (684). In the mind of man, a vast amount of stored emotions exist or are derived from various, often unconsciousness, sources: repressed sadism, unavowed fear and boredom. These emotions are released by the help of humor. Humor is a task as delicate as analyzing the composition of a perfume with its

multiple ingredients, some of which are never consciously perceived while others would make one wince. People are literally poisoned by their adrenal humor; it takes time to take a person out of a mood. Fear and anger show physical after effects long after their causes have been removed.

So, the purpose of humor is to laugh at people to rectify their faults. Laughter is not acquired skill but a natural gift. But there are other outlets such as competitive sports or social criticisms which are acquired skills.

Satirical works often contain 'straight' (non-satirical) humour – usually to give some relief from what might otherwise be relentless 'preaching'. This has always been the case, although it is probably more marked in modern satire. On the other hand some satire has little or no humour at all. It is not 'funny' nor is it meant to be. Humour about a particular subject – politics, religion and art for instance – is not necessarily satirical because the subject itself is often a subject of satire. Nor is humour using the great satiric tools of irony, parody, or burlesque always meant in a satirical sense. As satire and irony are closely related, it is desirable to talk about irony briefly.

Similarities and Differences between Satire and Irony

A satire, on the surface, appears to be full of aesthetic feelings or like a romance, but its underlying intentions attack a particular target in a disguise. Satire, according to Abrams, is “the literary art of diminishing or derogating a subject by making it ridiculous and evoking towards it attitudes of amusement, contempt, scorn, or indignation” (187). *New encyclopedia Britannica* defines it as “artistic form, chiefly literary and dramatic in which human or individual vices, follies, or shortcomings are held up to ensure by means of ridicule, derision, burlesque, irony or other methods, sometimes with an intent to bring about improving” (467). A very

common, almost defining feature of satire is its strong vein of irony or sarcasm, but parody, burlesque, exaggeration, juxtaposition, comparison, analogy, and double entendre are all frequently used in satirical speech and writing. The essential point, however, as Northrop Frye says that “in satire, irony is militant” (qtd. in Booth 12). This ‘militant irony’ or sarcasm often professes to approve or at least accept as natural the very things the satirist actually wishes to attack. But all ironies are not satires.

However satires are often stable ironies. Morton Gurewitsch, in his PhD. dissertation on *European Romantic Irony*, describes irony as only corrosive. He says:

Irony, unlike satire, doesn’t work in interests of stability. Irony entail hypersensitivity to a universe permanently out of joint and unfailingly grotesque. The ironist doesn’t pretend to cure such a universe or to solve its mysteries. It is satire that solves. The images of vanity, for example, that world’s satire are always satisfactorily deflated in the end; but the vanity of vanities that informs the world’s irony is beyond liquidation. (qtd. in Booth 92)

Irony, as dictionaries tell us, is saying one thing and meaning the opposite. For its clarification, quoting Booth, we have:

Irony is usually seen as something that undermines clarities, opens up vistas of chaos, and either liberates by destroying all dogma or destroys by revealing the inescapable canker of negation at the heart of every affirmation. It is thus a subject that arouses passions (ix).

Irony is generally reductive and depends on understatement, which requires the audience to recognize that the author, speaker, or character has purposely described something in a way that minimizes its evident significance. In irony

‘unsaid’ is more dominant over ‘said’ and it exposes all the weaknesses, evils, and perversions in opposite to the readers’ expectation.

Northrop Frye believes that the ironic fiction writer deprecates himself and, like Socrates, pretends to know nothing, even that he is ironic. In this regard, Hight says that “any author, therefore who often and powerfully uses a number of typical weapons of satire – irony paradox, antithesis, parody, colloquialism, anticlimax, topicality, obscenity, violence, vividness, exaggeration is likely to be writing satire” (18).

The term “irony” basically refers to the contrast between the statement of what is said and what actual it means. The importance of irony in literature is beyond question. One need not accept the view that all art, or all literature, is essentially ironic — or the view that all good literature must be ironic. In short, irony, in drama and literature, is a statement or action whose apparent meaning is underlain by a contrary meaning. *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary* of current English defines the term irony as, “The amusing or strange aspect of a situation that is very different from what you expect; a situation like this: the use of words that say opposite of what you really mean.” Likewise, *The New Encyclopedia Britannica* defines the term irony from the point of view of its literal implication. It defines irony as, “Either Speech (verbal irony) in which the real meaning is concealed or contradicted by the literal meanings of the words, or a situation (dramatic irony) in which there is an incongruity between what is expected and what actually occurs.”

Tracing out the definitions we come to know the very basic meaning of irony as a situation in which ‘what is’ always differs from ‘what appears’. We come to know that the creative writers use irony as a literary device to show the gap between what is expressed and what is intended. The expressed meaning is for the concerned

person or whom it is addressed and intended meaning is for the privileged reader.

Thus, Irony, in its simplest form can be defined as a mode of speech, which brings a meaning contrary to the words. This concept of irony would be a fitting one in Greek comedies, however, such a simplified definition itself sounds ironical since irony in its concept and function is quite varied, dynamic and broad in its present uses. Now, irony has got a permanent seat in literature as a prominent tool for writers even to reveal existence, life and death.

All good literature entails irony as a device — every work of art can be viewed from ironic perspective though it may have more or less ironic instances. One needs only list the major writers in whose work irony is significantly present: Sophocles, Euripides, Plato, Aristotle, Chaucer, Swift, Pope, Austin, Fitzgerald and many others. Such a list implies the impossibility of separating an interest in irony as an art from an interest in great literature, one leads directly to the other. Irony in the present context is a way of writing designed to leave open the question of what the literal meaning might signify. The old definition of irony — saying one thing and giving to understand the contrary — is superseded. Thus latest sense of irony says something in a way that activates not one but an endless series of subversive interpretations. The following chapter analyzes Tendulkar's *Encounters in Umbugland* as a play with political satire and irony.

III. Political Satire in *Encounters in Ubugland*

Vijay Tendulkar's play *Encounters in Ubugland* is a powerful satire on Indian politics of the post independent time. The play, although it is set in the sixteenth century imaginary island of Ubugland, allegorizes the post independent political scenario of India, as the characters represent the historical personage of the late sixties and early seventies of Twentieth century. Soon after the death of Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru, there appeared a huge political void and the question arose, "After Nehru, Who?" (Wadikar 22). This very question finds a similar echo in *Encounters in Ubugland*. The play relates the important events after the death of the King Vichitravirya, who leaves no better heir, except for his young female child, Vijaya. So the question arises in this play, "After Vichitravirya, Who?" Vichitravirya, the king of Ubugland, who is like Nehru, has been presented as a very shrewd and pro-people ruler. As a ruler, Nehru enjoyed the royal position because of his ingenuity.

After the death of King Vichitravirya the ministers: Aranyaketu, Bhagadanta, Karkashirsha, Pishtakvirya and Vratyasom try their level best to occupy the throne as the king leaves behind no trained heir except for a very young princess Vijaya. But none of the ministers become successful in capturing the throne due to the lack of unity. Tendulkar humorously narrates their political wrangling; who accuses one another of dishonesty and corruption:

KARKASHIRSHA. Your political belly will never be filled. You have been involved in thirteen acts of official dishonesty.

VRATYASOM. Ha! Don't you promote your relations for your belly's sake, Karkashirsha? My slate would have stayed as clean as yours Karkashirsha: These accusations are slanderous!

VRATYASOM. Let us not open our mouths about principles and honesty. To observe these two virtues in politics is as inappropriate and stupid as celibacy after marriage. We are partners in a most profitable game of skullduggery.

KARKASHIRSHA. I disagree vehemently with all this! In my life, politics is a sacred ritual.

VARATYASOM. Shall I tell what sacred ritual you performed to get your ministership? (273)

In this above dialogue, Tendulkar uses humour and witty language to satirize the power-hungry and greedy politicians. The phrases such as ‘political belly,’ ‘sacred ritual performed’ and ‘game of skullduggery’ are examples of humour and wit.

The king’s death really brings a great upheaval as these ministers engage themselves in power race challenging one another. They make use of their mind, influence, shrewdness and force in order to prove the backing of their mind, influence, shrewdness and force in order to prove the backing of the public which would give them strength in the power struggle. Vratyasom accuses Aranyaketu of “buying the crowd” in his favour at the formal meeting too, the ministers do not agree, so Vratyuasom stands up and shouts:

This is exactly what we did during the old man’s life time: what else did we do! The crafty old devil! [. . .]. Politics is all treachery. “Treachery to the king the country, the people and various other kinds of constant treachery. A true politician can be loyal only to himself. (287, 288)

Tendulkar satirizes the politicians by making themselves expose their real face. Another ministers Karkashirsha claims that he is not “a politician who dances to another’s tune. I follow my principles” (289). At this, Vartyasom humorously retorts: “Ha! For a full forty years, His Majesty was the only principle you followed!” (289). Here, Tendulkar satirizes the political leaders who act as stalwarts to the powerful and influential rulers for personal and selfish interest. As all of the ministers claim to take on the authority, a serious and noisy disagreement among them begins. They cannot agree on a common and unanimous leadership. They utterly fail to forge a consensus, which brings a serious crisis in the country. So, the two men, ‘THE TWO’ (sic) announce:

Serious crisis! Serious crisis!

No decision

The scales are equal.

Whom to give the power to?

Each one’s a rascal.

New meeting on Monday!

Which one’ll put the other at fault?

Which one’ll turn a somersault?

And which one’ll win it by default? (291)

In the above dialogue, the special characters, ‘THE TWO’ whom Tendulkar employs as the commentators and the means to report the events in the play to the audience cooperate the role just like of chorus in the Greek dramas. The language they use is often humorous in the play that has been proved to be the extra weapon for Tendulkar to launch satire upon the power politics and politicians.

The dialogue explains how the politicians struggle hard to claim the leadership and ascend to power. 'THE TWO' report that no one is willing to withdraw and no one is coming to the fore. This has caused the status quo. There is fierce rioting to be established in authority. People are confused. So 'THE TWO' comment about the people's confusion about the ministers:

Vratyasome's argument are reasoned

Karkashirsha's are well seasoned.

Pishtakeshi's not deficient.

Bhagadanta's quite proficient.

Aranyaketu is – sufficient. (292)

In politics, the politicians act in such a way that general public finds it very difficult to select good leaders. Tendulkar uses verbal irony to mean opposite of what appears to mean in surfaced level. All the praise of above dialogue for ministers are just opposite to the reality. This is the nature of politicians who never hesitate to adopt fair and fowl means to gain power which is very interesting and humorously satirizes by Tendulkar through 'THE TWO' in the above quotations.

'THE TWO' question the elevation and perdition of the five ministers. They do not see any possibility of forming a coalition, and arriving at any compromise. They sense mere delusion and confusion, various conditions, accusations, struggle and muddle in the acts of the ministers. They further announce:

This one's green!

That one's yellow!

This one's sleepy!

That one's stealthy!

He's a surpriser!

He's a surmiser!

He" modern!

He's insecure!

He's behind!

He's before! (293)

Because of their selfish nature, the ministers fail to forge consensus and unity.

Tendulkar humourously ridicules the ministers' incapacity to reach any agreement through simple rhyme scheme such as 'green/yellow,' 'sleepy/stealthy,' 'surpriser/surmiser,' etc. In addition, Tendulkar creates humour by using childish expression to satirize the politicians as he refers to them – this is this/ this is that/he is so, etc.

At last they decide to make princess Vijay their queen, the heiress of Vichitravirya. They intriguingly devise a plan to enthrone princess Vijaya for the time being as they have failed to make concrete decision to rule the country. They have only agreed on not to let remain a vacuum. Vratyasom announces: "Meet our new leader! [Vijaya shrinks]. His majesty's heir! This one in front, five of us behind! She'll be the rule we'll be the ruler! An excellent plan till we agree on a firm decision!" (293). Tendulkar here creates humour as he compares the young and naive princess to "a startled hare" (293). This shows that the people are simple, innocent and honest like hare before going into politics. But once they taste the power, they became corrupt and selfish.

The princess is then given training to give speech at the meeting among the ministers and people. The attendant notes perfect. At the swearing in ceremony, the princess is adorned with royal out fits, which represent the

position of power and authority. But here, Tendulkar satirizes people in power as he hints at the fact that power both gives pleasure and pain. This is reflected in the princess' statement: "The strings [of royal outfits] kept cutting into me during the ceremony" (294). This is the example of how position of power gives pain as well. At this, Prannarayan, in a humorous but flattering manner, says that "it is this servant's good fortune that at such a moment Her Majesty remembered him [. . .] no matter what for" (294). Tendulkar, here, attacks those who flatter and serve the people in power for personal gains.

After going through the necessary ceremonial rituals of the coronation, Vijay becomes the queen of the Umbugland. She gradually begins to learn the power games which Tendulkar initially associates with the game of "hopscotch", which the queen insists on playing with Prannarayan (296). Though Vijaya's insistence on playing 'hopscotch' with the attendant seems childish and thus humorous, Tendulkar attacks those people in power, who play power games. So, Prannarayan embarrassingly suggests that she is not ready to involve herself in such power games. He says: "Your majesty, it won't look fitting to play those games now" (296). This statement of the attendant carries double meaning as it explains that Vijaya is now, too old and great to play 'hopscotch', and at the same time he suggests that she is not ready to play such power games as she is too young and naïve. This becomes clear as he only says "[play] those games" not only 'hopscotch', as such (296). This becomes further clear when Vijaya questions him and he replies: "Power games are rather different" as he understands political power games by "hopscotch" (297). But ironically, Vijaya refutes the playing of power games as she is very young and new to the job. So, she says angrily "power! power! Power!" which shows that she is knowingly and

ironically getting drawn to the power games Vijaya in no time learns the internal matter of the politics and declares that she wants to get involved in politics and run everything in her own way unlike her father (297). She wants to devise her own plans to rule the country. This is seen from the very beginning of her political career. But the attendant as a male and mature and experienced person seems to prevent Vijaya from acting in her own way. Tendulkar writes:

VIJAYA. What else! I don't want to play power games! I want to play my own. What has power to do with the games I play?
Prannarayan, I'm not as old as my father. How is it you keep forgetting?

PRANNARAYAN. No, Princess Vijaya, I haven't forgotten it. But at the same time the queen of Ubugland can't play 'hopscotch' [. . .]. (297)

Tendulkar, here uses bitter irony and tries to expose the real face of many tyrants in the world who claim themselves to be working for the people and blame others. But they want to play power games in their own way. Here, Vijaya is expected to only act on the recommendation of the ministers; this is what Prannarayan is instructed to teach the queen. But she refuses to be the pawn of the ministers as she begins to question everything she is asked to do. When the attendant says that it would be “a breach of the royal custom” not to follow the tradition of the kingdom, Vijaya questions as “who were the people who established these customs?” (297). She further argues that it is the people who are in power make customs, so she says to the attendant: “Just show me where these customs are written down. I'll just read them and see” (297). This argument of Vijaya shows that she is no longer young and naïve, but strong-willed ruler who

wants to rule the country according to her own philosophy and principle. She obstinately insists on allowing herself to play ‘hopscotch.’ Though her insistence seems humorous as she is now the queen of the country, she argues very logically and coherent. She says:

I don't need to obtain the cabinet's permission. And that means I can't play? I didn't know that! No one told me that, when they made me queen. I thought that becoming queen gave me greater power. It's too late. If I'd known this before, I wouldn't have become queen. Prannarayan, I shall play hopscotch or jacks. And you shall keep me company as the queen of Umbugland, I order you to! (298)

Viajy, first tries to convince the attendant, Pranarayan by arguing logically but when he refuses, she orders him to obey whatever she says. This shows that though she is young and naïve, she is strong willed and determined person. Her strong will is reflected in getting the legs of the ministers, who only use the princess as their pawn. But she makes them to follow what she thinks best for herself. From the very beginning, she refuses to be their pawn. At one of the first cabinet meeting, she refuses to speak, saying “the cabinet has broken the protocol of court by omitting to bow to the queen. We are the queen of this island” (301). Vratyasom and others try patronizingly, to persuade the princess:

VRATYASOM. In private, child you seem to us like our own daughter.

PISHTAKESHI. After his majesty, it is we who are fathers to you.

KARKASHIRSHA. Yesterday, that stubborn insistence on cutting the legs of the throne and today, this!

VRATYASOM. One should humour child's stubbornness. How does it harm us!

PISHTAKESHI. I think so too. What do you think, Bhagadanta?

At least talk now!

BHAGADANTA. No alternative.

ARANYAKETU. I think we'll have to follow protocol. (301)

Here, by humorously referring to the 'cutting of the legs of throne' to the pulling of the legs for grabbing power, Tendulkar satirizes the political bickering (leg-pulling) tendency in politics. Moreover, ironically enough, the ministers claim themselves to be princess's father, but in fact they intend to treat her as their tool. Irony gets further built up as the ministers see no harm in entertaining the child's humour, because this proves disastrous for them as the child completely takes over the absolute power. The ministers see no alternative but to bow to the new queen who says: "It is the custom that people that people of royal station should remember the value of their high rank. Three generation of my ancestors have kept that custom. This is history. This was made by my ancestors" (301). The ministers try to make Vijaya look at history, but ironically she appropriates history and her ancestry for strengthening her own power.

After the ministers bow to Vijaya, she is asked to sign the different royal decree so that they became laws. When the ministers mention that the royal decrees have to be written, Vijaya humorously comments: "Why does the queen also have to write? Is the queen a schoolgirl? What do you take the queen for? (303). As a queen, Vijaya does not like the word 'write' to be associated with the herself because she finds this humiliating for the queen. She also laughs at the handwriting of the royal decrees: "Well Prannarayan, how's the handwriting? Do

have a look! Chicken tracks” (303). Vijaya points out the weaknesses and incapacities of the ministers through their handwriting. This shows that while the ministers try to show themselves superior to queen by treating Vijaya as a child, Vijaya tries to prove herself superior by pointing out the follies and disrespectful nature of the ministers.

When the riot in the tribal Kadamba settlement breaks out Vijaya makes a visit to the Kadamba settlement without fearing anything. She really wants to show to the Kadamba people that she is a just queen. She enquires after the families of men killed or imprisoned in the riots and she even “kissed the children in the settlement” (311). This makes the ministers envious of the princess as Vratyasom says:

And [Vijaya] made a speech! A word-by-word account of the speech has come to my hands from the security officer. It is on – thirteen, fourteen, fifteen – fifteen subjects, from the problems facing the island to the dirtiness of the Kadamba tribe’s huts! Once again – Vichitravirya! And to top that, she gave an assurance that there would be an impartial and personal enquiry into the causes of the riots! Ha! While all this was going on, the next part of her programme, organized by the Industrialists’ Association, had to be cancelled. Because the queen did not reach! (311)

This above quotation reveals how Tendulkar satirizes the tough political competition between the ministers and the princess who makes trips to the poor settlements to win people’s favour for strengthening her power. This reminds Vratyasom of the time when the old king adopted the same techniques to consolidate his power. The above situation can be interpreted as the dramatic

irony as the long plotted conspiracy of ministers to make Vijaya, the queen and making her their puppet turns opposite. Ironically, she starts influencing public in her favour and making her grip strong in the kingdom which turns to be threat for them.

Vratysom even proposes that queen should be deposed. The ministers had feared the old king but they now openly challenge the daughter because they intend to run the country in their own selfish way. But the queen Vijaya comes out exactly the opposite they have thought. When Aranyaketu suggests that a reprimand should be given to the queen, Vratyasom senses the challenges to the cabinet and to himself. He says:

A reprimand? This occurrence is not the first, most, third offence. But what has been going on for the last seven months has, in my view, begun to appear harmful to the welfare of the island. And, to speak even more clearly, to our welfare. I am not like Karkashirsha, who talks a lot of rot about purity and traditions. I am a politician interested in my own belly. I feel the pranks Vijaya has been up to recently are a challenge to the authority of the cabinet. A spurning of that authority. In a way, an attempt to strike at the roots of our status. Eh, Pishtakeshi? (312)

Here, Tendulkar again satirizes the corrupt thinking and the moral downfall of the politicians who always think about their political interests. Tendulkar also satirizes the spinelessness of the politicians under political threat. They talk about deposing the queen Vijaya. But Aranyakeyu does not agree to depose the queen. The ministers think that if the queen goes ahead with her plan rehabilitating the Kadamba tribe which has been marginalized since time

immemorial, the queen would be popular in the island and the influence of the cabinet ministers would decline. So, they exploit all means possible to prevent the queen from implementing the Kadamba plan. The cabinet meeting rejects the queen's proposal at which the queen gets angry and swears at the ministers:

“[Choking with rage]. Bastards! Swine! Inhuman wretches! Misers!

Muckworms! ‘A tribe is being destroyed, isn't it? Let it! As if it's their own bloody property! Pigs! Jackals! Mangy dogs! Slimy muckworms!’ (324-25).

Though Vijaya claims that her motives behind her Kadamba plan are “pure” and she wants to give status to the poor people of the island, the attendant smells foul in her plans as the dialogue follows:

VIJAYA. [angrily]. My motives are pure! I want to give status to the poor people of this island.

PRANNARAYAN. Perhaps thereby Your Highness wishes to increase your own! The motive of improving your own position on this island may also be hidden behind this pure motive- Your motive may also be an obstinate desire to make what hasn't happened. Happened in the end. The ambition to rule in earnest and without restraint

VIJAYA. Praqnaryan, have you considered carefully before saying these words?

PRANNARAYAN. No I was just remembering them. The words are your highness' own; the interpretation is mine. Your highness yourself said sometime ago, while talking to me, that you wish to have the credit of achieving what had not yet been achieved. You wish to show that you are not just your father's

daughter, nor a puppet ruler. Your Highness said, 'I am going to rule in real earnest from now on.' (325)

The above dialogue between the attendant and the princess ironically reflects the Vijaya's desire to rule absolutely. Here the 'pure motive' is nothing but indication of authoritarian motive which Tendulkar ridicules.

When the cabinet rejects the queen's proposal, Vijaya makes use of the special prerogative rights and puts the plan into action, disregarding and humiliating the cabinet which Karkashirsha terms as "murder of tradition!" (333). Then the ministers excite some people against the queen and organize a movement around the palace, so that the queen would step back. But to the dismay of the ministers, Vijaya boldly comes out of the palace, speaks to the crowd, persuades that she is doing the right thing. Before going out she speaks her mind to Prannayan:

Prannarayan, I don't just want to live, I want to rule as well! I want to rule a hundred years, a thousand years. I want to thumb my nose at these ministers and give my Umbugland whatever shape I wish. Who are these old dodderers to stop me? I am young! If I'm not here, how will it? If I am not on the throne, what will these useless old men do the island? I must look after everything myself. I will have to do it. I'll do everything! Let these ministers come! Let their mob come! Let it happen! Some final decision will be taken to say, Prannarayan. Today is my supreme test! (345)

These statements of Vijaya show her desire to impose dictatorial rule on the island. So here Tendulkar satirizes obdurate and uncompromising tendency of the dictators. Then the ministers have no option but to support the queen. Thus,

Vijaya becomes successful in devising her own plans against the ministers – her rivals, fulfilling her dream of ruling the country in her own way.

Finally, Vijaya faces the crowd, which swings on the side of her. The ministers become frightened of the queen's further action against them. They begin to blame each other and beg the queen for their life:

VRATYASOM. I don't wish to go! I won't go!

KARKASHIRSHA. The C-cabinet does not wish to go!

PISHTAKESHI. Save me, Your Majesty!

KARASHIRSHA. I was a patriot- from the very beginning. All
this is Vratyasom's mischief.

VRATYASOM. You're lying!

KARKASHIRSHA. You're a liar!

VARTYASOM. Both of you have stabbed me in the back.

KARKASHIRSHA. I fought for my principle. Otherwise I am a
devoted subject.

PISHTAKESHI. My god! The protection of the cabinet is here
after the d-duty of the Throne! (355)

Here, Tendulkar ridicules the fickle-minded and cowardly nature of the politicians who blame to each other and try their best to become ideal. They are ready to do anything to save themselves.

In this way, it is not difficult to find reflections of the political situation in India of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century royalist regime of Dambadwip (Umbugland). But the play is not merely topical; it unveils the essential nature of the game of politics but also the basic craving for power in human nature. The powerful satire that Tendulkar builds exposes the intricate political intrigues

designed to attain positions of authority power, and the corruption involved in holding on to them.

Despite the distancing achieved through the creation of a fictitious milieu, it is easy to identify the characters with political figures who held ministerial positions in those years – the principled politicians who spouts moral platitudes; his antitype, a blatantly immoral character; the statesman whose face is stretched in a constant smile and who gesticulates wildly but at the same time is aloof to a fault; the floor-crosser who pretends to be ill and sits on the fence till the eleventh hour. And of course, there is the strong and determined princess Vijaya, herself the daughter of the autocratic king, who creates favourable situation for herself and refuses to be the puppet and pawn of her advisers. Tendulkar has portrayed this character with utmost care.

There is a definite development in her from a headstrong, self-opinionated but politically inexperienced young princess to an intelligent yet whimsical ruler who devises her own (successful) methods of vanquishing her enemies. There is an intensely human aspect to her nature which is revealed in her highly complex but interesting relationship with Prannaryan, the eunuch. Prannaryan's function in the plot is same as that of a *sutradhar* or that of a chorus. It is he who introduces the play and acts as the neutral and patient commentator throughout the action. Yet he is not a mere observer or even commentator, but a philosopher as well. In the light of his natural wisdom, the reader-audience becomes aware of the ugliness and futility of the power game. It is through his eyes that the dramatist uncovers the central concern of the play: All power corrupts.

The play has the usual three-act, multiple-scene structure, but Tendulkar uses an interesting device in the play which also acts as a jibe against the media. The theatrical function of this device is to create interludes where information regarding

the political feuds are provided and apparently objective observations are made on the recent developments in the political situation of Dambadwip (Umbugland). Tendulkar uses two masked actors, armed with outsized pens, who arrive at regular intervals mouthing hackneyed remarks set in free verse in a sing-song way. In their observations, one can hear an echo of the cynical tone of the headlines published daily in our newspapers-ultimately meaningless statements that resolve nothing but aggravate existing problems.

So, Tendulkar, creating political allegory set in the sixteenth century imaginary island, Umbugland, and employing the opportunist ministers and highly ambitious princess Vijaya as the characters, engaged in power game during the political chaos after the death of king Vichitravirya leaving no legal heir except a very young princess Vijaya, symbolically represents the post independent India suffering from political void after the death of Nehru. Thus, he satirizes the power hunger political ambition of the corrupt politicians during that period. By employing the frivolous, headlong, and tricky, Vijaya along with stupid and coward ministers, Tendulkar satirizes the power seeking tendency of the politicians of the post independent India. To achieve the goal of satire upon corrupt politicians, Tendulkar has applied the device of irony enmeshed with humor to expose the real faces of the politicians who manipulate the common people vowing the public welfare, but doing its opposite.

IV. Conclusion

Vijay Tendulkar's *Encounter in Umbugland*, a political satire set in Maharashtra in the sixteenth century, allegorizes and satirizes the power game played out in Indian politics soon after the death of Nehru. It is a play of completely different nature, which falls in a separate class in comparison with other plays. It is a political allegory but not lacking of human dimensions. The play is steeped in political intrigue as it is designed to attain the position of authority. It is easy to identify the characters with the political figures that held ministerial positions in those years. More significant is the evolution of princess Vijaya's character from a self-willed, whimsical, mischievous, and playful girl into an intelligent and ambitious dictator.

So, the play throws light on the fact that in the political field -- power is more important than duty. So, selfish designs have replaced selfless service. All the ideals behind the establishment of democracy – a state its name: as soon as power changes, those at the top try to make the ruler collapse or reduce him to the stature of a pawn.

After the death of Vichitravirya, each minister tries his best to occupy the throne but none become successful in it due to lack of unity. At last, they decide to make Vijaya their queen, the heiress of Vichitravirya. They have all devised a plan to rule the country in her name. Prannarayan teaches her how to be diplomatic in her relations with others. At first, Vijaya rejects all this as she wishes to enjoy her freedom. But in the course time, she succeeds in suppressing her humanity. Towards the end of the play, she comes out victorious over her rivals.

The role of Prannarayan is very significant. His function in the play is the same as that of a *sutradhara* or a chorus. Though he is presented as a detached observer and neutral patient commentator, at times he seems as a stalwart of the rulers. In fact, it is through his comments that the audience becomes aware of the ugliness and futility of the power game and it is through his eyes that the playwright brings forth the central concern of the play: absolute power corrupts absolutely.

With the publication of this play, it becomes quite evident that, in the field of power politics, nothing is real: appearances are deceptive; success and treachery go hand in hand as Prannarayan teaches Vijaya that one should take stock of the situation – give some advantages, and get some back. Politics means sweetly smilingly enmity the experience of sacrifice. A show of sacrifice is always profitable in politics. A ruler should always remind that each of the persons is more important than the next. The self-importance of the subjects should not suffer at any rate. Actually, all those things are difficult to accept for a man of truths. So, the ruler has not to be human, but superhuman or even divine. One should not be true to oneself in politics. Princess Vijaya's development from a headstrong, inexperienced Princess to a prudent, intelligent ruler provides a proof to the fact that a ruler learns all those tricks of the trade gradually in the course of time. The playwright makes his readers conscious of the ugliness, corruption, and treachery in politics and stimulates them to think over them.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 6th ed. Bangalore: Prism Books, Pvt. Ltd., 1993.
- Banerjee, Arundhati. Introduction. *Five Plays: Kamala, The Court is in the Session, Sakharam Binder, The Vultures and Encounters in Umbugland*. By Vijay Tendulkar. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2008. vii-zix.
- Bergson, James. *Laughter out of Place*. New York: New York University Press, 1956.
- Booth, Wayne C. *Rhetoric of Irony*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Gokhle, Shanta. *Tendulkar on his Own Terms*. Eds. Geeta Rajan and Shoma Choudhry New-Delhi: Katha, 2001.
- Highet, Gilbert. *The Anatomy of Satire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.
- Holman, High C. *Satire as Rhetorical Play*. London: Duke University Press, 1972.
- Johnson, Samuel. *Lives of the Poets*. Ed. Hill and Scott. London: Oxford University Press, 1938.
- Muecke, D.C. *The Compass of Irony*. London: Routledge, 1969.
- Prasad, A.N. and Saryug Yadav, ed. *Studies in Indian Drama in English*. Bareilly: Prakash Book Depot, 2003.
- Saxena, Sumit. "A Conversation with Sir Vijay Tendulkar." *Passion for Cinema*. 20 (Dec 2006) <<http://passionforcinema.com/a-conversation-with-sir-vijay-tendulkar>>

Sharma, Ram. *A History of Indian English Drama*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 1995.

Tandon, Neeru. *Perspectives and Challenges in Indian-English Drama*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 2006.

Tendulkar, Vijay. *Five Plays: Kamala, The Court is in the Session, Sakharam Binder, The Vultures and Encounters in Umbugland*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Ullman, B. L. "Satura and Satire." *Classical Philology* 8.2 (1913): 172-94. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 Mar. 2010.

Wadikar, Shailaja B. *Vijaya Tendulkar: A Pioneer Playwright*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995.