

**INTIMATE ENCOUNTERS: REPRESENTATION OF VIOLENCE
IN LITERATURE**

A Dissertation

**Submitted to the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of
Tribhuvan University in Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of**

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

ENGLISH

By

RAJAN PRASAD POKHAREL

Tribhuvan University

Kathmandu, Nepal

May 2009

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION

We certify that this dissertation entitled “*Intimate Encounters: Representation of Violence in Literature*” was prepared by Rajan Prasad Pokharel under our guidance. We hereby recommend this dissertation for final examinations by the Research Committee of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Tribhuvan University, in fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of *DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY* in *ENGLISH*.

Dissertation Committee

Prof. Dr. Shreedhar Prasad Lohani

Supervisor

Prof. Dr. Shreedhar Gautam

Expert

Date: May 10, 2009

APPROVAL LETTER

This dissertation entitled **INTIMATE ENCOUNTERS: REPRESENTATION OF VIOLENCE IN LITERATURE** was submitted by **RAJAN PRASAD POKHAREL** for final evaluation by the Research Committee of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Tribhuvan University, in fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY in ENGLISH. I hereby certify that the research committee of this Faculty has found the dissertation satisfactory in scope and quality and has therefore accepted it for the sought degree.

Prof. Nav Raj Kanel, PhD

Dean

Chairman, Research Committee

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Tribhuvan University, Nepal

Date:

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This Ph.D. thesis is the outcome of my long effort. To spare time in a working life for a Ph.D. Dissertation is really a big sacrifice. The devotion to a research work is something like the exercise of a hermit. I am really heartily grateful to my most respected supervisor Prof. Dr. Shreedhar Prasad Lohani for his incessant guidance to my Ph.D. dissertation. In course of my research he retired from his regular service at the University, but he provided an untiring supervision to my work. I don't have any appropriate terminology to express the depth of my gratefulness to Prof. Lohani. Likewise, I express my most sincere gratitude to Prof. Dr. Shreedhar Gautam, my great guardian in the Department of English at Patan Multiple Campus, for his regular encouragement. It was a surprising coincidence that Prof. Dr. Shreedhar Prasad Lohani chose Prof. Dr. Shreedhar Gautam as an internal expert to my dissertation. Dr. Gautam went through my thesis minutely and forwarded very good suggestions.

All my respected colleagues of the Department of English at Patan Multiple Campus: the professors, associate professors, lecturers and teaching assistants have deeply inspired me for completing my research. Through my thesis writing, Prof. Dr. Nandish Adhikari, and his daughter Bidya had very good supports; the father by suggesting the pros and cons of a research, and the daughter by fairly typing the write-up. My respected seniors Mr. Bharat Pokharel, Mr. Krishna Belbase, Mr. Kumar Thapa, Dr. Tara Kant Pandey and Dr. Gopindra Poudel encouraged me regularly for my work. My colleague Mr. Bharat Upadhyay supported me from material collection to idea sharing and type setting. My friend Mr. Sanjay Kumar Mishra accompanied me to different places for material collection. My friends Dr. Nagarjun Sharma, Bhim Regmi, Prabodh Devkota, and K.P. Sharma too helped me in a maximum extent. My

close kinsmen Mr. Jagat Krishna Pokharel, Mr. Dron Regmi and Mr. Baburam Koirala (Basu) too supported me with significant contribution. I must be thankful to my sweet heart Rita and lovely kids Diwas and Dikshya for their cooperation with tolerance, peace and patience. Finally I owe much to all those who cooperated me in course of my research and to Kushu Ghale too for his help in properly setting the type.

Rajan Prasad Pokharel

Department of English

Patan Multiple Campus

Tribhuvan University

Kathmandu, Nepal

ABSTRACT

Violence is in different forms like: visible and invisible, cultural and structural, open and hidden, direct and indirect, psychological and physical etc. Violence takes place on different grounds. From the large-scale genocide to the domestic violence, it is a power struggle.

Violence is not always destructive; it is mostly creative. Some times violence is the solution to violence. The process of civilization moves through the modes of violence. Art and violence have existed together. Art has beautified violence and violence has dignified art. In this sense violence has a lot of aesthetic values.

Violence of intimate relationship is most profusely used in literature as a source of beauty as well as the redemption from the cruelties of the real world because of its aesthetic value. The present research work studies violence in general, and gradually narrows down its horizon to the encounters in intimate relationship in particular.

The dissertation amalgamates the concepts of “rhetoric of violence” or “violence of rhetoric” and the theoretical interpretation of “psycho-social-sexual behavior” on the basis of the theories and discourses of Lauretis, Sigmund Freud, Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Levi Strauss, Frederic Nietzsche, Gayatri Spivak, Monique Plaza and others.

The discussion of power, violence, ideology, discourse and representation that play roles in literary writings is the basic concept. Violence is mostly founded on power, and power creates an ideology to justify its course of action. For Foucault truth is guided by power. In most of his writings sex is the central topic of discourse and the historical relationship of power. Sex is central to law, liberty and sovereignty, and also one of the most forbidden areas of our lives and bodies. Michel Foucault focuses on the development of human civilization. In his opinion, human civilization is always guided

and driven by different forms of madness. Madness has been the most motivating and influential factor of this development. Human relations are generally sentimental: full of emotions, passions, attachments, infatuations, jealousies, grudges, irritations and motivations. The extremes of these emotions may result into madness and madness into violence. The first and easiest use of violence begins in intimate relationship. The thesis presents violence on the dimension of the dialectical and historical materialism too.

Finally this dissertation sums up with the idea that intimate encounters occupy a big space in literature. Violence in intimate relationship is most frequently practiced: however its presentation in literature is artistic. The practice of violence is definitely chaotic but its impression is enormously creative. Thus, the course of violence is directed from chaos to creation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE	i
LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION	ii
APPROVAL PAGE	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv-v
ABSTRACT	vi-vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii-xi
CHAPTER I. ENERGY OF VIOLENCE: AN INTRODUCTION	1-10
CHAPTER II. STUDY IN VIOLENCE	11-62
The Dimensions of Violence	11
Violence and Dialectical Materialism	18
<i>The Law of Unity and Struggle of Opposites</i>	19
<i>The Law of the Negations of Negation</i>	20
Violence in Historical Materialism	22
<i>Base and Superstructure</i>	23
<i>Society and Social Theory</i>	24
<i>The Base Structure</i>	25
The Dialectics of Violence on Socio-Political Dimensions	26
Nationalities and Class Struggle	27
Violence of Intervention and Resistance	31
Violence Madness and the Course of Civilization	34
<i>Civilization of the Middle Ages</i>	34
<i>Renaissance and Madness</i>	35
<i>Change of Attitude in the Latter Centuries</i>	36
<i>Christianity on Madness</i>	36

The Roots and Nature of Madness	37
Hypocrisy of Bourgeois Culture	39
Laws and Moral Questions	40
Sexual Aggression as Nature and Culture	41
Violence as the Politics of Sex and Gender	43
Violence as Patriarchal Terrorism	45
Violence and Social Behaviours	52
The Dynamics of Interpersonal Aggression	55
CHAPTER III. THEORIES OF VIOLENCE	63-106
Violence and Literature	63
Literature and Political Power	65
The Politics of Violence	66
Foucault's Theory of Power and Violence	71
<i>Power, Violence and the Manipulation of Truth</i>	72
<i>Power, Civilization, and Madness</i>	73
<i>Ideology of Power and Violence</i>	74
Sexual Discourse and Power Relations	77
Sex, Violence, and the Power of the Woman	81
Power, Sexuality and Violence	84
<i>Suppression of Sexuality</i>	84
Foucault on Repressive Hypothesis	87
Beauty of Sex and its Discourses	89
Sexual Proliferation and Perversion	91

Power, Pleasure and Punishment	91
Birth of Clinic and Traditional Power	95
The Rhetoric of Violence	96
The Germ Theory of Violence	100
The Monolithic Theory of Power and Violence	102
Contestations and Explanations of Men's Violence	104
CHAPTER IV. SURVEY OF INTIMATE VIOLENCE IN LITERATURE	107-145
Violence in Oriental Hindu Mythology	107
<i>Killing and Destruction in the Vishnu Purana</i>	107
<i>Violence in The Ramayana</i>	108
<i>Intimate Encounters in The Mahabharata</i>	108
The Mythology of Greece and Rome	110
<i>Killings and Conspiracies before the Age of Man</i>	110
<i>The Birth of Heroes and Heralds for War and Violence</i>	112
<i>The Greek Drama</i>	116
The English Renaissance Plays	118
Violence in Short Plays, Short Fiction, and Poems	124
Modern American Fiction	131
The Roots and Currents of Violence	133
<i>Violence among Relations</i>	135
<i>Men's Violence to Known Women</i>	135
<i>Domestic Violence</i>	138
<i>The Male Batterers</i>	140
<i>Violence of Identity</i>	143

CHAPTER V. VIOLENCE IN INTIMATE RELATIONSHIP	146-206
Violence as Madness	146
Crisis of Existence and Spiritual Degeneration in <i>An American Dream</i>	154
Violence in Culture and Tradition	159
<i>Tradition of Torture and Violence</i>	161
Violence as a Struggle for Power	163
<i>Power as Mania and Crisis</i>	169
<i>Struggle with a Suicidal Impulse</i>	172
Sexuality and Violence	180
<i>Violence and Sexuality</i>	184
<i>The Foucauldian Paradigm</i>	187
Violence as Class Struggle	192
Violence by Religious, Racial and National Prejudices	198
<i>The Horror of Slavery and Psychic Trauma</i>	201
<i>Trauma of Violence</i>	203
CHAPTER VI: FROM CHAOS TO CREATION	207-227
IMPLICATION OF THIS THESIS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	224
SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	226
WORK CITED	228-234

Chapter I

ENERGY OF VIOLENCE: AN INTRODUCTION

Violence is an important ingredient of literature. It has been widely used in literary writings from ancient times as is evident in the great epics like *The Ramayana*, *The Mahabharat*, *The Iliad*, and *The Odyssey*. Literature in its most initial stage also has used violence in the verbal, actional, gesticulatory and pictorial forms as we see even in the cave paintings. In the olden times violence was used for moral and religious justification and also for the quest of beauty, power, and wealth. But today it is generally associated with some ideological standpoint.

In both western and eastern mythologies, the place of violence is almost central. In those mythologies, animals, birds and insects, with the same consciousness, spirit and verbal capacity as that of humans take part in the interactions with humans and in violent activities. Similarly ghosts and sprits also have a lot of involvement in mythological stories, with the corresponding overtones of violence ringing eerily at various points.

There are no realistic grounds to believe in those stories; however, they have great aesthetic values due to which they appear beautiful and long lasting. Aesthetically the mythological stories are striking because they use violence in the uttermost form of dramatization. Humans fight with humans; dogs do with dogs; birds with birds. It shows that violence is indeed the inherent character of all living beings.

Violent conflicts in the mythologies between gods and demons characterize sharp confrontations between the forces representing vice and virtue respectively. But various persons, groups and powers at their favor have differently interpreted the concept of vice and virtue. Today some people use it to satisfy their interest for amusement. Violence is also used in hunting, sexual intercourse, ego clash and

interest for crime and adventure. In the broader terms it has been given the imperialistic, nationalistic, democratic and revolutionary colors. Mostly writers and poets have written about violence associated with various literary and socio-political movements. Their writings are based on the ideological themes and standpoints that contradict all types of dominations and exploitations.

The history of human civilizations itself has been a series of violent encounters between rival groups. Of which, violence in class struggles and nationalistic movements has got sufficient room in modern literature. Similarly, religious and communal violences have also been characterized. In the historical panorama of world literature violence does have significant representation. It has been presented in the works of art with much emphasis. Many poets have talked about the economic and political relations of the people in terms of class struggles. The issues of ethnicism, language, democratic movements and questions of changes in the existing set-ups have also been abundantly raised. Art and violence existed side by side. Art has beautified violence and violence has dignified art. In this sense violence has a lot of aesthetic values. The present research work will, therefore, look into the aesthetics of violence and its representation in literature.

The work will make a survey study of the historical trends and theories of violence and its impressions on literary writings. Violence arises from the struggles for power, contradiction between system and order, and clashes between different concepts, thoughts and civilizations.

The present research work proposes to solve some crucial problems like defining and conceptualizing violence and its function in literature. It will also see the use of violence in some literary works. As violence arises from power struggle, the violence of the intimate relationship is a power struggle too. Does it have an

impression in writing? Is there any relation of violence with the work of art? Can violence be aesthetically more valuable by means of artistic presentation? Does the representation of violence in intimate relationship in literature make for its greatness? Can violence of intimate relationship, as represented in literature, be a source of redemption from the cruelties of the world? These are some important problems to be solved by the proposed study of research.

Violence starts from chaos and ends in creation. Violence creates destruction and disorders but finally a kind of order is shaped up through those disorders and that new order is naturally a new creation from where a new civilization begins. Violence of intimate relationship also brings a new mode of life and development in new forms and relations. Rama, the protagonist of *The Ramayana*, fights with his sons in the jungle unknowingly but at the realization of fact the father and sons are united in a relation that is both fresher and more intimate. Violence as such has been profusely used in literature as a source of beauty as well as the redemption from the cruelties of the real world because of its aesthetic value.

The present research work aims to be an organized and systematic study of violence and its representation in literature. The research work will take violence more as a literary term than a political or sociological question. It will study to see how violence is a power struggle even when it occurs in intimate relationship and how the representation of violence in literature is what makes for its aesthetic greatness. It will organize the aesthetics of violence as a theory and apply it to some works of art. The research work will not go into the depth of political or sociological studies but will definitely pick out some interrelated concepts of philosophical and literary significance.

Violence in the general sense of the term is a struggle for power. Generally violence takes place either as a result of madness or perversion or of power struggle. It's a causal process in which violence generates violence, and then naturally it occurs in different layers and currents. In many cases violence is used as a solution to violence but there are other ways to resolve it too. In literature violence is a very essential element that makes a work of art beautiful.

The world is full of crosscurrents and undercurrents of violence. Violence upon the weaker and poorer by the stronger and richer is found everywhere. Some people call it a natural law. Children, women, old men and disabled are often victimized. Family violence is very much talked about and has lots of issues and cases.

There are several boundaries between the humans that are amenable to exploitations. Touchable and untouchable, high caste and low caste, high class and low class, privileged and underprivileged, rich and poor are some of the artificial divisions which have categorized humans as oppressors and the oppressed. All these social divisions are based on the economic relations. Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild masters and journeymen, feudal lords and peasants, masters and tenants, bourgeoisie and the proletariat and the rulers and the ruled are some of the divisions in the history of the humans because of which different types of violent conflicts have taken place.

Weaknesses in human characters, suppressed sexual instincts, worldly desires for comfort, luxury and power-exercise have created tensions in the economic and social relations. Violence of different forms has often been used as a way of resolving such tensions. Writing about power and struggle, Gene Sharp in *The Politics of Nonviolent Action: Power and Struggle* says, "... power and struggle begins with an

examination of political power. It is often assumed that power derives from violence and can be controlled only by greater violence” (blurb). Sharp describes the way of violent conflicts that do not easily compromise until there is victory from either side. Both sides would use violence to the maximum efficiency so as to injure, kill, demolish or terrorize the other. Sharp puts the idea, “Some conflicts do not yield to compromise and can be resolved only through struggle . . . victory requires violence, people turn to the threat and use of violence” (3-4).

Gene Sharp also writes that power comes from violence. Most of the violent actions have been stimulated by the desire of political power. In the chapter entitled "The nature and control of political power”, Gene Sharp introduces the political power as:

that kind of social power which is wielded for political objectives especially by government institutions or by people in opposition to or in support of such institutions. Political power thus refers to the total authority, influence, pressure and coercion which may be applied to achieve or prevent the implementation of the wishes of the power holder.
(7-8)

Dialectical materialism propounded by Hegel and Feuerbach, and developed by Marx and Engels accurately defines and describes violence. Development of matter into life by action and reaction, then to consciousness with a gradual growth of life through the dialectical relation of the opposites, human consciousness determined and directed by the material relationship and social consciousness, a social or political system comprising of superstructure and base, class struggles between the oppressors and the oppressed classes on the dialectical basis, maximum prosperity, relative equality, workers’ utopia, dictatorship of the proletariat, stateless society, higher form

of democracy and regular revolutionary process of development are the major concepts of Marxism which argues that all violent actions have some social and economic roots of power struggle. Marxism explains violence from a philosophical and ideological point of view, and all actions of violence have some meanings in the background. Konstantinov et. al. present dialectics as “things, their qualities and relationships and also their mental reflections, concepts in their inter connection in motion: inception, contradictory development and disappearance” (24).

There are contradictions that determine class struggles and the types, forms and levels of violence; its cultural and literary understanding in terms of art has a great aesthetic significance. Violence is not always just a political or cultural and literary question. Analyzing *Jane Eyre* with some specifications of violence Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennehouse in the introduction to the book write:

As American academics at this moment in history, we feel it is somehow dishonest to speak of power and violence that belongs to the police or the military, something that belongs and someone somewhere else. For clearly the subtler modalities of modern culture, usually classified as non political keep most of us in line, just as they designated specific "others" as the appropriate object of violence. (4)

The aesthetics of violence and its representation in literature is a challenging topic of study that deals with the philosophical, ideological, moral, cultural and aesthetic concepts respectively in accordance with the context of presentation.

Johan Galtung in a training manual categorizes violence as “Visible” and “Direct”, and “Invisible”, “Cultural” and “Structural” and then maps out as “before violence” and “after violence”(Coping 4). Galtung writes:

The direct violence, physical and /or verbal, is visible as behavior. But human action doesn't come out of nowhere; there are roots. Two roots are indicated: a culture of violence (heroic, patriotic, patriarchic, etc), and a structure that itself is violent by being too repressive, exploitative or alienating; too tight or too loose for the comfort of people. (4)

The study will simply look through the historical trends and theoretical concepts of violence of aesthetic importance and will carry out a practice of application in some writings of literature to justify its aesthetic function.

Methodologically, it is a desk research using books and journals to study the topic.

The study will concentrate on the definition and typology of violence and then it will proceed forward with the theory of violence to show how power functions in its core. Thereafter, the work will go to explain the representation of violence in literature and then will narrow down idea of the representation of violence in intimate relationship. Further, the research work will make a general survey of some texts from myths to postmodern writings. In the conclusion, it will bring out the ideas that violence arises from power. Violence in the intimate relationship also is a power struggle. The intimate encounters represented in literature make the work of art aesthetically more valuable. Writing and dramatic presentation are the best way to see and experience violence. Therefore, the concluding chapter will show how violence begins in chaos and ends in creation.

The first chapter will be an introductory part of the thesis in which the writing will show different dimensions of violence and its energy at different levels and uses. The energy of violence defines and categorizes its applications on the basis of its general concepts, meanings, types, impressions and its traumatic pressures.

The second chapter will be studies in violence. It will lay the foundation for the theory of violence. It will bring the various kinds of contradictions through the dialectical

and historical panorama of the social and political development. The chapter will show the changing course of history propelled by violence. It will be a review of what has been said and written about violence in general and violence in intimate relationship in particular.

In chapter three, the thesis will present how power is important in the creation of violence. This chapter will focus on the studies of violence and the place of power in it. Lauretis amalgamates the concepts of “rhetoric of violence” or “violence of rhetoric” about its representation and gender questions from mythical texts to the post modern theoretical interpretation of “psycho-social-sexual behavior” being based on the theories and discourses of Sigmund Freud, Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, L`evi Strauss, Frederic Nietzsche, Gayatri Spivak, Monique Plaza and others. The female writers and philosophers claim that almost all the discourses in one way or the other emphasize on male supremacy, and male centrism and try to develop their own feminist epistemology. However, the theories and discourses try to raise some aspects of feminism lop-siding into other. The gender concepts are not balanced. Although the theories try to be impartial, the lopsidedness is deep within.

The chapter will further discuss how power, violence, ideology, discourse and representation play roles in any literary writing. Violence is mostly founded on power and power creates an ideology to justify its course of action.

For Foucault sex is a topic of discourse and the historical relationship of power. Sex is central to law, liberty and sovereignty and also one of the most forbidden areas of our lives and bodies.

Michel Foucault focuses on the development of human civilization. For Foucault, human civilization is always guided and driven by different forms of madness. Madness has been the most motivating and influential factor of this development. Human relations are generally sentimental: full of emotions, passions,

attachments, infatuations, jealousies, grudges, irritations and motivations. The extremes of these emotions may result into madness and madness into violence. The first and easiest use of violence begins in intimate relations. Hunger, fear, confusions, attractions, suspicions and persuasions can easily lead one to commit any sort of violence.

Literature is a big defense or a great justification for the projection of a political power. It is a strong fortress of defense and very sharp hitting artillery of offense. It is a background of any uprising, a history, a strategy, a historical document, a creation, an enlightenment and a beautiful word sketch, a lesson and an amusement. Therefore, any political power whether it is regressive or progressive, reactionary or revolutionary, feudal or bourgeois or communistic, creates its own favorable literature upon the protection of which it survives. All literatures of the world have some inherent motive. All systems of the world are founded upon their types of literary strategies. Violence between husband and wife, father and son, brother and sister, between brother and brother, lover and beloved, between friends, office associates and acquaintances has been widely presented in literary works. Robert Browning's "My Last Duchess" is one of the finest examples of violence in intimate relationship.

The fourth chapter will make a cursory survey of the representation of violence of intimate relationship in literature. This chapter will make a generic observation of the work from oriental Hindu Mythology to Greek and Roman Drama and through the English Renaissance plays to the modern and postmodern British and American fiction to show how violence of intimate relationship is dominant in all ages and all great works of literature.

The fifth chapter will narrow down the research to the violence of the intimate relationship and its root cause. The immediate reason for violence can be any thing but basically it is a kind of power struggle. Violence in intimate relationship is a reflection of external reality. The psychological development of a violent situation and the impression of the external atmosphere prepare a condition for violence to take place. The violence in intimate relationship also is the result of both internal and external situations. The inherent tendency of a human being is to possess power for which he or she will struggle. Whether a violent action is obviously due to the person's insanity or a cultural hostility or a class conflict, it is inherently a power struggle.

The last chapter will sum up the whole thesis and offer a conclusion. Intimate encounters occupy a big space in the literature of violent activity. Violence in intimate relationship is most frequently practiced: however its presentation in literature is artistic. The practice of violence is definitely chaotic but its impression is enormously creative. Thus, the course of violence is from chaos to creation.

Chapter - II

STUDIES IN VIOLENCE

The Dimensions of Violence

Conflict in its active or latent forms may suddenly take a violent outburst into direct, visible and physical forms like bloodsheds and tortures. Conflicts may lead to beating, murders, and massacre and sometimes even to a holocaust. Besides, an invisible type of violence also is widespread. Such form of violence generally starts from home affecting the whole society into sharp divisions towards agitations and aggressions. Personal clashes, family tensions, social contradictions and political and economic conflicts are some of the modes of violence.

Uncompromising conflicts lead to violence. The question of self-respect is an inherently inculcated feeling. A man may feel hurt in his conscience when his already established system of life is charged and the culture is offended. A certain structure by the unity of a group of people or a community arises which gives birth to the situation of clashes and conflicts with other groups of people that are united with other cultural set ups.

Many conflicts can be resolved. Some are recognized as conflicts only when they appear on the surface either as aggression or as open fights. Many of them can be resolved by settlement in the root causes or some are temporarily settled by forceful suppression, or some are settled by the attempt to obliterate the opponents. Such forceful attempts may create to more dreadful violence or it can create hatred and jealousy, which will mostly give rise to divisions and antagonisms.

The form of conflict in the beginning can be cultural. At this stage violence is not properly shaped. It is invisible, indirect and structural but when it takes place, it grows to be visible, direct and physical. Sometimes the direct violence can spread from the family to the streets affecting the whole society, damaging the lives and properties in a large scale. The opponents may be groups of people, communities and races, nations and sometimes even groups of nations. It can become the question of ego, prestige and self-respect. Conflict generates violence and violence may be the solution to violence.

In an over-view and a summary of his book Prof. Johan Galtung in his manual writes about violence:

Violence has occurred, in the collective form of a war, with one or more governments participating, or in the family, or in the streets. Material and somatic, visible damage is accumulating, deplored by parties and outsiders. But then the violence is abating: the parties may have run out of material and nonmaterial resources; the parties converge in their predictions of the final outcome and more violence is seen as wanton, wasted; and /or outside parties intervene to stop the violence, keep the peace, and for whatever reason, like preventing the victory of the party they disfavor. (*Coping 3*)

In Galtung's interpretation violence appears in visible and invisible forms. Visible form of violence is in the surface that is characterized as the direct clash, whereas the invisible type grows in the cultural roots. The visible violence is the direct violence whereas the invisible type goes with cultural and structural violence.

These different forms of violence are not contrary to each other. Some times violence may directly burst out in visible forms, but its prehistory can be long and

deep- rooted. Any outburst comes from the repression of rights, demands, desires and necessities. Galtung clarifies the nature and prehistory of violence:

The direct violence, physical and/ or verbal, is visible as behavior. But human action does not come out of nowhere; there are roots. Two roots are indicated: a culture of violence (heroic, patriotic, patriarchic, etc) and a structure that itself is violent by being too repressive, exploitative or alienating; too tight or too loose for the comfort of people. (4)

The invisible growth of psychological tension can erupt as the physical aggression and at the climactic height it has to be settled with a peaceful solution.

The resolution of violence at this level requires some regular institutional care that is rarely available. Surrender or victory is not the solution. The attempts towards any of them will generate more violence leading to the height of total complexity because “victory requires violence” (Sharp 3), so that people still turn to threat and use more violence following all possible ways of conventional actions of terrorizing and killing.

Sharp puts the idea as follows:

The specific means used will vary: they may include conventional military action, guerrilla warfare, regicide, rioting, police action, private armed offense or defense, civil war, terrorism, conventional aerial bombings and unclear attacks, as well as other forms. Whether threatened, used with restraint, or applied without controls, these means of violence are designed to injure, kill, demolish and terrorize with maximum efficiency. Century by century, then decade by decade,

and now year by year, this efficiency has grown as people and governments have applied talents and resources to that end. (3-4)

Then naturally a truce has to be declared, and an agreement has to be signed. Thereafter, an atmosphere of peace will continue. Galtung depicts the situation of “before violence” and “after violence.” There are the roots of war and violence, which shape up the circumstances for the eruption of violence. The state of “before violence” gives rise to tensions, which in nature is indirect and invisible. In this state the counter forces prepare themselves for a direct clash. When the situation becomes mature, the violent form of conflict will naturally burst out. Then the rival forces meet, contradict, confront, collide, crash and finally suffer. The state of suffering in “after violence” is still more formidable. There is fear and horror. The deaths, injuries, rapes, displacements and trauma spread all over. Galtung depicts the situation as it follows:

The scene is appalling. The killed, the wounded, the raped, the traumatized, the bereaved. The refugees, the displaced. The new populations of windows, orphans, the wounded and war-struck, the demobilized soldiers. The material damage, ruins; PTT, electricity and water not working, road, rail, bridges, broken. The institutional break down, the absence of law and order, the lack of governance. The land-mines and unexploded ordnance every where. People scavenging in the ruins. (*Coping 3*)

The trauma of war and violence is the most unbearable, repenting and even retaliatory. The terrible feelings of shortage, loss, absence and damage are more traumatic. Things become intolerable to remember. Everything rolls up in the mind and becomes almost incredible. It becomes very difficult to believe that it was a

reality. But the dreadful scenes appear in front of the naked eye. The moments of occurrence may be quite short; however there will be a long prehistory of violence.

There is a popular misunderstanding about the “violence in human nature” which is supposed to be expressed in terms of love, food and sex but the potential for violence in human nature comes from the realization, as Galtung states, that:

Violence is not like eating or sexing, found all over the world with slight variations. The big variations in violence are easily explained in terms of culture and structure: Cultural and structural violence cause direct violence, using violent actors who revolt against the structures and using the culture to legitimize their use of violence as instruments.

(Coping 4)

Similarly, the cultural violence is deeply rooted in the human mind, and it may turn into the structural violence. Consequently, it will come up into the visible and a physical turn. Cultural and structural forms of violence arise from different roots and they are the accumulations of various archetypal and social developments.

The cultural violence is the sum total of all the myths, of glory and trauma, and so on that serves to justify direct violence. The structural violence is the sum total of all the clashes built into the social and world structures and cemented, solidified so that unjust, inequitable outcomes are almost unchangeable. The direct violence described about grows out of this, of some elements, or out of the total syndrome.

(Coping 4)

Structural and cultural violence generate hatred and revenge between losers and winners. Military solution sometimes becomes inevitable. Leaving the cultural aspects beyond the geographical borders may tend to legitimize direct violence from an

“intra-state war” to “inter- state war”. Galtung says, “Geographical fragmentation may substitute the horizontal structural violence of ‘too distant’ for the vertical structural violence of repressing, exploiting and alienating minorities within a nation state” (*Coping* 5).

Direct and physical violence is not far, when cultural violence begins. The consequence will be heading towards violent solutions. There will be a revolt against the set up structures, and then naturally a situation of warfare persists.

To look into violence right from its root to the post- violence effects, we find that violence grows out of conflict. There are many uncontextual, misunderstood and misinterpreted concepts about war and violence. Violence erupts out of nothing or it has its origin at precise space and time, or it has no “after- effects,” or it has a “single-peak” conflict life cycle. As a consequence things will be visible and realized only at the end of violence.

There are physical and verbal acts, and also neutral acts. But the neutral acts become functionless when tension and emotion are at the height of complication. The transaction of acts between the opposing parties will be violent and harmful. Friendship and love are not seen, but everywhere evil for evil becomes apparent. Revenge and retaliation prevail with the exchange of violence.

In the post- violence situation both perpetrator and victim feel traumatized and guilty. In business term, as Galtung says, “The traumatized has a violence credit and the guilty of violence debit” (*Coping* 17). The feeling of revenge is implicit and can be expressed and exposed in any form.

Intention and irreversibility are two dimensions of violence. The intention of causing harm to others is really dangerous. Many acts of violence are irreversible. The murders, injuries, sexualized violence as rapes and abductions and the destruction of

cultural monuments as symbolic damages are some examples of irreversible violence (*Coping* 19).

The unconditional obedience and very asymmetric chain of command lead the troops to commit very unjust, dangerous and irreversible violence which sometimes result into mutinies and revolts.

There are some convictions of “Nation,” “God,” “History,” and “Law” which have generally heightened the sense of emotion to provoke violence, and the violence acts in the name of “Nation,” “God,” “History,” and “Law” have almost always been justified and legitimized. The victory of the nation has to be kept and continued at all costs. No defiance and blasphemy of god should be tolerated. The glorious history of the race, family or nation must be secured, and any offense of whatever type of law, even irrational, must be punished without any consideration. No matter how violence occurs, the reason behind can be simple. Even at the height of its complication, the solution too can be simple and interesting.

Talking about the dynamics of violence Sigmund Fried in a “Letter to Einstein” says that all wars and violent actions have long history and background. Wars develop in human minds first and when they are not resolved with proper solutions, they get expressed in the physical forms. Writing an answer to Einstein’s question about how the problems of wars can be solved rightly before they turn massively destructive, Freud begins with the relation between “Might and Right” and likes to substitute “Might” by the term violence and he says, “In right and violence we have today an antinomy. It is easy to prove that one has evolved from the other, and, when we go back to origins and examine primitive conditions, the solution of the problem follows easily enough” (“Letter” 109). Freud says that in principle the conflicts of interest between man and man are resolved by the use of violence, which

is the same as other animals. He suggests that we should cast a glance the world history where we find;

an unending series of conflicts between one community and another, or a group of others, between large and smaller units, between cities, countries, races, tribes and kingdoms, almost all of which were settled by the ordeal of war. Such wars end either in pillage or in conquest and its fruits, the downfall of the loser. No single all embracing judgment can be passed on these wars of aggrandizement. (“Letter” 111-112)

Freud says that the exercise of violence cannot be resolved until the conflicting interests exist. All these conflicts where they are between masters and slaves, rulers and the ruled, between races, nations or persons must be solved psychologically on the ground of sex which arouses love, attachment and cultural understanding. The active instinct for hate and destruction must be addressed before they raise their hood. Freud presents the methodology of eliminating wars right from the human psychology. Freud writes:

If the propensity for war be due to the destructive instinct, we have always its counteragent. Eros, to our hand. All that produces ties of sentiment between man and man must serve us as wars antidote. These ties are of two kinds. First, such relations as those toward a beloved object, void though they be of sexual intent. ... The other bond of sentiment is by way of identification. All that brings out the significant resemblances between men calls into play this feeling of community, identification, whereon is founded, in large measure, the whole edifice of human society. (“Letter” 115)

Freud presents nature and types of violence and gives the psychological solution to it, which can be one way to address violence from the root. Violence has been seen and interpreted on many other dimensions.

Violence and Dialectical Materialism

The socio-political approach to violence can be better explained with dialectical materialistic concepts. Its earliest examples can be obtained from the consciousness of the origin of the material and its dialectical process towards the development of life, society, classes, exploitations and struggles. The earliest philosophers have perceived such concepts of the dialectical relation of things in fragmentation also but modern philosophers shaped and organized the concepts. They have also pointed out that all things could be understood in terms of dialectical relations. The visionaries of such broad, realistic and scientific understandings are Hegel and Feuerbach, upon whose concepts Karl Marx and Frederic Engels developed the epistemology of class struggle and the process of history.

The Law of Unity and Struggle of Opposites

In the history of philosophy, the concept of opposition through contradiction has remained central. Many bourgeois philosophers do not believe in the essence of dialectical contradictions. “They assume that only our thoughts may be contradictory, while objective things are free of all contradiction” (Konstantinov et al 109), which is not scientifically true.

The logical contradictions or the contradictions of thought generally occur due to logical inconsistency or logical error. Contradictions in statements and contradictions of ideas are contextually impermissible. The contradictions of ideas may be true to overshadow objective contradictions, but it is not possible forever.

The contradiction between quality and quantity is the manifestation of internal contradictoriness that is inherent in things and processes. The same contradiction is the source and the motive force of development. “Lenin called the study of contradictions the ‘nucleus’ of dialectics” (Konstantinov, et al 109).

Regarding similarity and differences, Marxism holds a view that there is no absolute similarity and difference between objects. The idea of similarity presupposes that they are in the same way different or dissimilar. The simple outward comparison of two objects reveals the fact that there is a unity of identity and difference. Every object is simultaneously identical to another as well as different too. Identity is not abstract but concrete where lies the difference too. Frederick Engels has said that, “*identity with itself requires difference for everything else as its complement*” (qtd. in Konstantinov et al 110). The object is different in relation to another and also to itself. Similarity too applies in the same way.

An object exists or doesn't exist because it contains within itself its being and non-being character. “An object is a unity of stability and changeability, of the positive and the negative, of what is dying out and what is entering life, and so on” (Konstantinov et al 110). It shows that every object or everything is a unity of opposites. It has interconnection and interdependence; the more vital aspect is *mutual negation*, (111) which implies that the opposites are “mutually exclusive and mutually repellent” (111) based upon the concept of the struggle of opposites.

The Law of the Negation of Negation

There is another very important doctrine of development. This is a central concept in philosophy in the theories and in the forms of controversies especially in the relations of social development. This is the law of the negation of negation.

In the general sense of the term, negation means to negate, to reject and to say “no” to something. In the Marxist concept, it is to negate the old for the new, or not to totally reject all old, but to preserve the essential part and negate the redundant portions and elements. Negation is a process of sublation expressing the meaning and content of dialectical negation. Bad and redundant things are negated and the remaining preserved.

In dialectics, negation has two features: “(1) One it is a condition and factor of development, and (2) It is a factor in the connection between new and old” (Konstantinov et al 118). The law of negation of negation is that the process of development is not in a straight line, but in the spiral. Negation is to negate the opposites, which is abstract, one-sided and incomplete, but negation of negation is a kind of synthesis that overcomes all the previous incompleteness.

The pre-Marxist philosophers believed in the cyclical theories of development, but the Marxists by the principle of negation of negation believe that the process of development has an irreversible tendency and it can not be reversed. The process of negation of negation has been often expressed in terms of thesis, antithesis and synthesis. Thesis is the initial development, anti-thesis is the first negation and synthesis is the second negation, so that there is a trinity of the essence of development. In fact, negation is a chain of dialectical negation that rejects all previous negative links and preserves all that are positive. From the process of preserving and negating a kind of contradiction emerges that will lead the process to a higher form of creation. “Hence the general law-governed tendency of development, from the simple to the complex, from the lower to the higher, the tendency of *progressive, ascending motion*” (Konstantinov et al 120).

The developmental process doesn't have a motion that goes from higher level to the lower level. This process does not move from higher forms to lower forms, from the more complex to the less complex which is factual and scientific also. To think of only one line of development is wrong. There are intersections of lines of development of which some can lead backwards expressing the element of regression. In this sense, progression must not be understood as smooth and straight without deviation and zigzags. The law of negation of negation operates in different ways and conditions negating some things and giving rise to development. In a socialist society the process goes in destruction, preservation and development. Therefore, the dialectical relation of negation in socialistic framework conditions that nothing is simply natural and spontaneous; everything is consciously planned in the dialectical process of negation of the old and projection of the new. The law of dialectical negation of negation does not reject all previous developments but negates and accepts as continuity and connection for the attainment of higher stages due to its progressive and ascending character in general.

In a society too there are counter forces that have the contradictions. They struggle against each other for their survival, identity and growth. There are oppressor and the oppressed classes. One dominates and another is dominated. One is powerful and another is deprived of power, property and privileges. Then naturally the struggle takes place, which is constant, continuous and sometimes hidden and sometimes open. But the process goes dialectically. Therefore, all human relations and interactions are truly dialectical. In this dialectical process when the oppressor and the oppressed classes contradict, violence is natural, unavoidable and materialistic. In this connection philosophers like Hegel, Feuerbach, Marx, Engels, Lenin, Mao Tsetung

have explained and accelerated the socio-political contradictions even to open conflicts, violence and power possession.

Violence in Historical Materialism

The concept of historical materialism is shaped in Marxism. From Vedic socialism to the most violent age of today, class struggle is the central question. Marxism deals with the idea of this contradiction between the classes of the exploiter and the exploited. The contradiction has remained continuous and constant between the oppressor and the oppressed through all the ages. The forms of oppressions have changed according to the changes of the modes of production, but the concept of production is not simply economic. It affects all the social and political relations. The real life situation of the base and literature, law and the formation of the state are formed and developed in accordance with the modes of productions and the relations made upon them. Therefore, production is neither simply economic nor senseless and abstract. The concept is so lively, and actively functioning that it creates contradictions, conflict and violence on the basis of the same relations. In materialist conception of history, production is the ultimately determining element. But Marxism opposes the idea of reducing man to a totally economic being. Marx himself has written, "It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, the social being that determines their consciousness"(qtd in Williams 75). A society has a material and productive foundation. All sorts of men maintain some kind of distance or closeness to this production.

Base and Superstructure

Marxist theory of culture proposes Base as a determining element and superstructure as determined. Production amounts to the economic structure of society, the real foundation on which a legal and political superstructure is raised. In

course of revolution “with the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed” (qtd in Williams 75). With superstructure, the terms “legal and political” are indispensably in connection. As Williams continues:

The superstructure is here the whole ideology of the class: its form of consciousness: its constitutive ways of seeing itself in the world. It would be possible, from this and later use, to see three sense of ‘superstructure’ emerging: (a) legal and political forms which express existing real relations of production; (b) forms of consciousness which express a particular class view of the world; c) a process in which, over a whole range of activities, men become conscious of the fundamental economic conflict and fight it out. (77)

The superstructure is formed in accordance with the base. If they contradict, either of them has to collapse or has to be functionless. The base that is the real life situation of the people is like the foundation of a house and the superstructure is like the top. The top stands on its base and the base also is worthless without its good-looking upper structure.

In the social and political questions also, the concept of the base and superstructure is significant. Talking about relation and contradiction between “superstructure” (ideology politics) and “base” (socio-economic relations), Raman Selden refers to Marx’s argument about culture in this way:

what we call “culture” is not an independent reality but is inseparable from the historical conditions in which human beings create their material lives; the relations of dominance and subordination (exploitation) which govern the social and economic order of a particular phase of human

history will in some sense “determine”(not “cause”) the whole cultural life of the society. (25)

Culture too is a medium of exploitation. The superstructure is formed in accordance with the cultural conditions. The oppressor class makes the superstructure favorable for the exploitation of the base or tries to make the base suitable to its superstructure and when the contradiction arises, the change in the structure of both becomes inevitable. The structures of history and society are in constant dialectical relations. There are forces working dialectically with in them even in course of the development. “Both the structure of history and structure of society are what Marx and Engels called *dialectical*, a term which draws attention to the dynamic and opposed forces within them” (Jefferson 167).

Society and Social Theory

Society in the theoretical observation of Marxism on the concept of historical materialism is clearly divided basically in two groups: the oppressor and the oppressed. The conflict is sometimes open and sometimes hidden but it is always there. The historical development of the society is also based on the concept of dialectical materialism, which deeply affects the formations of laws and propositions in the course of social development. Historical materialism is the social theory of Marxism, which gives a scientific explanation to history and laws and conditions of social development on the basis of materialist dialectics.

The Base Structure

Man as a social being has relations with the material and productive forces. Consciousness is nothing other than the conscious being. Men develop their thinking along with their material production as well as with their material intercourse. Man’s actual life will go in accordance with the material attachment. Therefore, it is not

consciousness that determines life but the actual material life that determines human consciousness.

Here, life is meant to be social life related with the real social existence and material production. Defining the general life process Marx, in 1859 in preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of political Economy* has written:

In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. (qtd. in Williams 75)

From this concrete and deliberate explanation of man's life and its relations with the material productive forces, we can deduce the fact that a society in the broader sense has two structures: the foundation (base) and the outgrowth (the superstructure). Different terms have been used to imply the meaning of "base" as: "real basis," "basis," "grundlage," "real foundation," "economic structure of society," "social conditions of existence," "forms of property," etc. (Williams 77)

These different propositions can be different from Marx's central emphasis on productive activities. Marx has made a point against reduction of "the base" to a category. "In order to study the connexion between intellectual and material production it is above all essential to conceive the latter in its determined historical form and not as a general category" (qtd in Williams 81).

In the relationship of production and in the consequent social relationships there are deep contradictions in the actual development. Therefore, the continual possibility of the dynamic variations of these forces is actively functioning. As “the base” is the foundation of the social life in relation to the material productive forces, it is the determining element.

The *German Ideology* explains that changes in history have taken place at the changes in the modes of production. Every time in history when the new productive force replaces the old one, the changes become indispensable, and mostly these changes are forceful and violent too. In this course of development the separate nationalities cannot exist separately and they will be destroyed by their intercourse with others. And the history of a nation and nationalities will turn to be the world history. It is said, “the more the original isolation of the separate nationalities is destroyed by the developed mode of production and intercourse and the division of labour between various nations naturally brought forth by these, the more history becomes world history”. (Borodulina 36)

The separate individuals become enslaved under a power or a pressure of the world market and finally the abolition of private property by the communist revolution will overthrow the existing state of society. When the private property ceases to be the capital that does not make any production, the private property simply becomes a burden and then naturally it requires an effective solution; that is, its abolition.

The Dialectics of Violence on Socio Political Dimensions

The movement of things guides the unity of the universe. Their dialectical relations also determine the movement of things. From the biggest element of the universe to the smallest molecular unit, things are in a state of continuous movement.

The contradictions cause them to move. As the human consciousness itself is the product of material development, the system of dialectical relations is naturally applicable to the human consciousness too. Thus, all human relations are dialectical on the materialistic foundations. All movements, growths, developments and destructions are dialectical.

Every thing contains within it opposites or contradictions, which make things keep moving. The whole universe is a unity of opposites. A thing to run forward needs another thing to go backward. There is an interrelationship of forward and backward movements. A swimmer has to push the water behind to swim ahead. There are several wheels in a camera in which one wheel has to run another wheel but the courses of movements of all counter wheels are contrary to one another. Similarly, when the wire has to be coiled, the movement of the wire and the roll of the coil is just opposite. When a vehicle runs on a road, it moves forward and the road backward. At our movement we struggle with the space to go ahead. The movement by contradiction is natural, universal and scientifically dialectical, and so is the course of human consciousness and social development.

Nationalities and Class Struggle

One of the most significant dialectical approaches to violence is based on class struggle. The concept is very well explained by Liu Chun in his book *The National Question and the Class Struggle*. Liu Chun shows a very close relation of nationalities and classes, and in most of the class struggles the questions of nationalities are considered as the prime issues. Liu Chun writes, “Nationalities and classes are questions which are interrelated. The question of nationalities is in essence a question of classes” (Liu Chun 1). As Mao Tse-tung also points out, “In the final analysis, a national struggle is a question of class struggle. ... This is a Marxist-Leninist

Principle” (qtd. in Liu Chun 1). The concept of nationality came up with the ascendancy of capitalistic imperialism where the system of exploitation is based on the “private ownership of the means of production” (Liu Chun 1).

In Marx’s analysis, in such a condition one nation would be involved in the exploitation of another nation. Mao Tse-tung had issued a statement to oppose the American racial discrimination in support of the struggle of the American Negroes. It was supposed that the capitalist imperialism had the tendency to exploit people in their own country for their benefits by means of segregation and discrimination, which are the forms of exploitation. Exploiting classes and oppressing nationalities or certain races has been a global question when capitalism expanded itself to capture the world market through colonialism or globalization or through the process of liberalization. Liu Chun further writes:

Aside from oppressing and exploiting the working people of their own nationality, the bourgeoisie and other exploiting classes of an oppressor nationality always oppress and exploit other nationalities in their own country, while in foreign countries they scramble for markets, regions producing raw materials and places for investment and enlarge the scope of their exploitation. They strive to establish the system of national oppression and colonialism in order to carry out ruthless national aggression and oppression and subject their nationalities to their exploitation. So long as imperialism, capitalism, the exploiting classes and the system of exploitation exist, national oppression and national exploitation will not vanish. (Liu Chun 2)

Exploitation within the nation and outside in the global market is the tendency of the rise of the bourgeoisie. It has brought a new kind of contradiction in the global

context. And, naturally the aggression against oppression has definitely taken a violent course. Along with the rise of the modern bourgeoisie all human relations are defined in terms of monetary relations.

As a theory of class struggle and contradictions among different classes on the issues of their class interests Marxism has defined all human relations in the light of dialectical materialism. It is a science and a social theory, history, politics, literature and a theory of power struggle. In this sense Marxism is a theory of economics, society, history and the theory of revolution. The early sources of Marxist literary theory are the writings of Marx and Engels, however the theory of class struggle advocates and develops class literature, literature of class conflict and literature of social revolution.

Some times violence and literature seem to go different ways. The philosophy of class struggle presents magnificent visions of the shift of power from one class to another. It talks how power comes to peasants from landlords, to workers from the capitalists and to the proletariat from the bourgeoisie. The literature of the class struggle glorifies and beautifies the bloodsheds and sacrifices of the people for the power shift from the oppressors' class to the class of the oppressed. But how terrible it is to see the reality when the real fight with the oppressors takes place!

The Chinese communist party was busy in the fight with the Kuomintang and its foreign allies. Side by side it launched campaigns of the seizure of land from the landlords. The peasants with the supports of the local communist workers seized the lands of the landlords. The communist power was not yet strengthened enough to back up the rural workers. Soon the landlords were reunited as “*huan xiangtaun* (returning home regiments)” and started violent retaliatory attacks. Dongping Han in *The Unknown Cultural Revolution: Educational Reforms And Their Impact On*

China's Rural Development (2000) presents the merciless attacks of the landlords' regiment upon the poor farmers and local communist cadres in Jimo county and surrounding areas:

On April 28, 1946, one group of *huan xiangtaun* led by Huang Xiangcui killed 25 leaders of the Poor Peasant Association and the village militia in Diaoyuzui village. Nie Yinhua, the head of the village Women's Association was only eighteen years old at the time. The landlords tortured her, they buried her alive. They sawed her palm with a string, burned her breast with a gasoline lamp. In addition, Nie's parents, grandfather, and two younger brothers were all killed. (8)

The groups of landlords and their regiments killed the peasants, local cadres, their parents, grand parents, and small children indiscriminately with all possible cruelty and mercilessness. Han describes:

They also killed CCP village head Xin Zengeng's family—his wife, two sons and two daughters. They forced them to kneel beside a well, and struck them with a big shovel and then threw the bodies into the well. Xin's wife was eight months pregnant at the time. In the same night, they also killed Xin Leigeng's family – his wife, thirteen year old daughter, his nine and five year old sons – in the same way. (8)

Similarly, they tied many young and old village leaders onto the trees and sliced them alive and they harped the limbs of many peasants asunder. They did not spare even the pregnant women, old men and the newly born babies of the families of the leaders of the peasants associations. And, when communists came back with force after their take-over, the landlords fled. Some of them were captured and punished the basis of the scale of their crimes. There are numerous stories of class struggles in the

world. The bloodshed in the name of class struggle is not probably smaller than any other type. From Paris commune to the October revolution of Russia, peoples democratic revolution of China, Cuban revolution, revolutions in Chile, Nicaragua, Peru, Turkey, European countries, Indonesia, Malaysia and the class struggles in many countries that are linked with their independence movement also.

Different forms of class conflicts took place over sixty years in Nepal. The failure of them with many events of casualties finally led the situation to an organized struggle. The decade-long people's war in Nepal initiated and launched by the Communist Party of Nepal from 1996 to 2006 was a nightmarish experience of the Nepalese people. It was merely the reaction against the government's extreme domination of the people in the past. The violence and counter violence surpassed over every past record of killing, disappearance, tortures and imprisonments in Nepal. One of the guerilla raids of the Maoist at Sandhikharka, the district head quarters of Arghakhanchi shows the casualties as commander Pasang writes in his book *Red Strides of the History: Significant Military Raids of the People's War*, "In this front, 74 of the royal armies and police were killed; 58 of them were injured" (Pasang 172). He further writes, "Sixty four of our comrades were killed including the counter at the route, and including company commander Arun. Altogether, 150 of the comrades were injured; 68 of them were seriously injured" (172). This shows that the real stories of bloodshed in course of the class struggle are not as beautiful as they are glorified in literature, however there is no significant change of age without violence and bloodshed. In this sense violence is the source of creation of new thing and therefore beauty grows out of violence.

Violence of Intervention and Resistance

In the name of “war on terror” the international powers, basically the super powers, have often launched their armies into other nations. Foreign interventions have been almost always taking place in every era from the time when nations were formed. In the ancient times the rulers used to fight on their ego clashes. They would attack others in order to prove themselves braver and more powerful. They would usurp the land of the losers or confiscate the property or abduct the beauties. The powerful kings would invade because they would expand their countries far and wide. They would make their own empires and enslave the people. The allies would be associated in a camp and fight with the enemies and opponents. The war of the *Mahabharata* had largely an international character. Similarly the war in the *Ramayana* too was broadly spread from Ayodhya to Lanka. The great war of Greece between Sparta and Troy was held with the supports of their foreign allies. Among many thousands of wars till the present times, some are largely international. The war between Greece and Turkey, First World War (1914-1918), Second World War (1939-1945), Israel-Arab war (1967 & 1971), Iraq-Iran war (1980s), Israel-Palestine tension, Israel-Lebanon conflict, America-Iraq war, the wars of independence, and the fights against foreign interventions have taken place as the tussle of power. Many of the wars and violent actions are the reactions against the age long dominations of the imperial powers.

Talking about the event of September 11 of 2001 in America, Noam Chomsky in his interviews in the book entitled *Power and Terror* says that it was “obviously, a horrible atrocity” (Chomsky, *Power and Terror* 13). Pointing out another dimension of the same event Chomsky in the same interview further says:

But I reacted pretty much the way people did around the world. A terrible atrocity, but unless you’re in Europe or the United States or

Japan, I guess, you know it's nothing new. That's the way the imperial powers have treated the rest of the world for hundreds of years.... If you look through hundreds of years of history, the imperial countries have been basically immune. There are plenty of atrocities, but they're somewhere else. Like when Japan was carrying out atrocities in China, as far as I'm aware, there were no Chinese terrorist attacks in Tokyo. It's always somewhere else. And that's gone on for hundred of years. (13-14)

The U.S. led coalition has used merciless violence in Iraq and in Afghanistan but other powerful countries like China and Russia have remained indifferent because of their own interest. Russia wants to suppress the rebels in Chechnya, and China in west China for which they have to gain U.S. support in the name of "coalition against terror" (qtd. in *Power and Terror* 18). Turkey is launching terrible repression and violence upon Kurds. "And millions of them were driven out of their homes, thousands of villages destroyed, may be tens of thousands killed, every imaginable kind of barbaric torture" (18).

Talking about the history of U.S. atrocities in Southern Vietnam and in North Korea, the U.S. Air Force had wiped out every thing by massive bombing. Even the crops and dams were destroyed (20-21). But still there were no proper reactions. Chomsky presents the horrible picture of America's war crimes in Vietnam, "Half the population had been forced to refugee camps, and children were starving and wounded" (Chomsky, *For Reasons* 222). Vietnam tragedy was a big question not only on humanity, but also on the resistance from the side of the ordinary people. If such process goes on unchallenged, the human history will be blackened totally. The effectiveness the tactics to stop such unpredictable consequences are yet to be

discussed. “Further more, no course of action open to us offers much hope of preventing the Vietnam tragedy from assuming still more awesome properties” (Chomsky, *American Power* 389). Vietnamese people, in spite of very high casualty, fought against the U.S. imperialism. They exerted this courage and energy from their glorious tradition and history. They resisted the American violence with all vigour and valour. A Vietnamese commander of the resistance movement General Vo Nguyen Giap writes in his book *National liberation war in Viet Nam* (1971) about their war: “Our nation- wide anti- U.S. war of resistance is the greatest and most glorious war against foreign aggression in our history. It is at present the front line and the climax of the struggle put up by the world’s peoples against U.S. imperialism” (Giap 20). The people of the world have developed the sense of aversion towards American hegemony for a long time. In Chomsky’s opinion the 9\11 attack too was an answer to the American violence in the international panorama in the wholesome way, no matter who did it but in the most atrocious form. Such violence and counter violence in the international power politics have constantly taken place.

Violence, Madness and the Course of Civilization

The course of civilization is violent. How madmen were understood and treated in different phases of history can be sufficient to understand the course and process of civilization. Madness has a negative connotation but for the growth of civilization, it has some positive meaning.

Madmen were tortured in the beginning. Gradually, they were put into confinement and also used for labor. When the concept was still developed, they were put in the hospital. In this way the course of civilization was decided. The history of human civilization can be observed not only on the political line but also from the anthropological perspective. Any minor idea can be quite resourceful to see how

humans developed themselves in course of process of civilization. This process too can be analyzed from the viewpoint of dialectical movement, class struggles and power relations. The idea about the constructions and deconstructions of relations can give better insights about all these developments.

Civilization of the Middle Ages

In the Middle Ages before the formation of asylums and hospitals for the madmen to treat, the madmen were badly tortured. Some madmen were publicly beaten; some were kept in the ship and sailed or hailed in the sea with an uncertain future. But still people went mad, and madmen's number did not decrease, but remarkably grew. Some madmen were used as the playthings of people's enjoyment. Foucault entitles this focus about madmen "Stultifera Navis" in his *Madness and Civilization* (1964) and depicts the situations of madmen in those days, "It happened that certain madmen were publicly whipped, and in the course of a kind of a game they were chased in a mock race and driven out of the city with quarterstaff blows. So many signs that the expulsion of madmen had become one of a number of ritual exiles" (Foucault, *Madness* 8).

Renaissance and Madness

In 1656 the Hospital General was founded in Paris. It was conceptualized as a prison cell; but it brought a significant change in the concept. In the cells of hospital wards persons of both sexes, from all localities, races, religions and types were supposed to be kept without any discrimination. It was a kind of shelter for food and lodge, supervision, control, and torture but in this period in almost all places in Europe, the madmen were confined to the cells, so that they would not create outside disorders, and they would be juridically treated in case of necessity. From the confinement centers, the persons in the cells would be used for labors. The Hospital

General had the strange power that stood between police and the courts. It did not have anything to do in the medical concept. “It was an instance of order, of the monarchical and bourgeois order being organized in France during this period. It was directly linked with the royal power . . .” (37). It was a “semi juridical structure” and “and administrative entity” and it kept the madmen. The “Hospital General” was used as the accommodation for the beggars, vagabonds, truants, outcasts and madmen and even jobless persons. They were used for forced labors. Even the revolutionaries were sent to Hospital General.

Change of Attitude in the Latter Centuries

In the 17th and 18th centuries even the family members recommended the subject for the confinement. It was said that by the emergence of madness, the honor of the family would disappear in the society. The danger of the scandal could be avoided only by confinement, and the release of the victim at the old age, or at paralyzed condition or at any infirmity there was very little chance of the scandal, so that secret confinement in the asylum was more practiced than any public trial.

This secret confinement was more bestial than the treatment to the beasts. All human values were sacrificed while dealing with the madmen. This heartlessness was a worse than that the treatment in the Middle Ages or of the Renaissance. But could the madness be subdued by the silence of this secrecy? No, not at all, and hiding the mad persons in silent and secret asylums from public scandal rather worsened their condition. Foucault says, “Unreason was hidden in the silence of the houses of confinement, but madness continued to be present on the stage of the world – with more commotion than ever” (Foucault 65).

Christianity on Madness

Foucault says that the classical Christians believed that madness is unreason. On this concept Jesus was crucified by madness of that time. To go back to those days, “When early Christianity speaks of the madness of the cross, it is merely to humiliate false reason and add luster to the eternal light of truth; the madness of God-in-man’s image is simply a wisdom not recognized by the men of unreason who live in this world” (*Madness* 74).

In course of time the cross was no longer a scandal and it was also believed that Christ himself chose to be surrounded by the men of unreason and madness, and it was also supposed that the “holy lord himself had gone somewhat mad to the Gentiles and scandalous to the Jews” (Foucault, *Madness* 75). Comparing the limits of death and madness, Foucault in *Madness and Civilization* writes in the way, “As death is the limit of human life in the realm of time, madness is its limit in the realm of animality, and just as death has been sanctified by the death of Christ, madness, in its most bestial nature, had also been sanctified” (76).

In Christianity of different ages madness has been glorified in one way or the other thinking that it is “the lowest point of humanity” and other forms of madness and unreason are concealed whereas madness is scandalized because it is close to animality, from where the divine mercy can begin.

The Roots and Nature of Madness

Foucault analyzes the roots and nature of madness in “Aspects of Madness” in his book *Madness and Civilization*” where he explains the psychological dimensions of madness, which are generally like: Mania and Melancholia, Hysteria and Hypochondria and so on. They are the forms of madness or they can be the causes of madness too.

In the sixteenth century melancholia was supposed to be associated with delirious ideas. For example, a melancholic would think himself or herself sometimes to be a beast, sometimes a glass vessel and sometimes to be some other thing. He would sometimes fear death, sometimes guilt or crime and sometimes would appear terror stricken, but he would be rather fugitive or fear-struck than violent. In Thomas Sydenham's observations melancholics, "Are people who, apart from their complaint, are prudent and sensible, and who have an extraordinary penetration and sagacity. Thus Aristotle rightly observed that melancholics have more intelligence than other men" (qtd. in Foucault, *Madness* 112). Melancholia is full of agitation that does not apparently have the power of violence. Melancholia is a kind of madness at the limits of its powerlessness, in contrast to which mania and frenzy do have violent movements.

Both hysteria and hypochondria have been understood as mental diseases from the ancient times, however their effects in the health are apparently strong. Richard Mead has said that hypochondria "is an illness of the whole body" (130). Hysteria is a disease of unknown nature, of hidden origin and uncertain symptoms, however the effect in the uterus is seen which affects the whole psychology. In this sense, it is a disease of sexual tension what creates physical and mental convulsions and movements.

Towards the end of the 18th century hypochondria and hysteria were believed to be mental illnesses or the "disease of the nerves." Hysteria was often perceived as a kind of disease which is caused by the internal heat related to "amorous ardor" linked with girls looking for husbands or the likes. It is said that women are more distracted for love than men. But hysteria is not a simple disease. It may cause a total mental disorder and disorder in the whole working and thinking activities. The effervescence

or the kind of vapor that arises out of the body creates a pathological symptom or the emergence of both the diseases. Hypochondria is more like melancholia than anything else and thus has signs of weakness, depression, inactivity, lethargy and sadness. In this sense hysteria is very much like mania and hypochondria is like melancholia but the origins and nature of the diseases even with the identical symptoms are different. Melancholia and hypochondria are the inactive forms of psychological illnesses. There is little likelihood of their coming into violence, but they are self damaging, suicidal and depressive, whereas mania and hysteria are the frenzies which are driven by a kind of heat and vapor in body and mind, so that the sufferers of these illnesses may come down to violence upon the opponents, rivals or the counterparts or even upon the persons of close relations. Such frenzies create anger, emotion, passion, jealousy, irritation, greed and the criminal sensations, so that there is much likelihood of these diseases to cause violence. Hypochondria and melancholia characterize low spirit and low blood pressure syndrome, whereas mania and hysteria feature out high spirit, alcoholic and high blood pressure signs. The maniacs and hysterics act and sometimes overact too, so that they in their abnormal or extraordinary situation cause violence, or become violence-oriented.

Hypocrisy of Bourgeois Culture

Writing in the Introduction as “We ‘Other Victorians’” to his book *The History of Sexuality: Volume –1* (1978), Michel Foucault puts his ideas that are much beyond economic relations, and he says, “But it appears to me that the essential thing is not this economic factor but rather the existence in our era of a discourse in which sex, the revelation of truth, the overturning of global laws, the proclamation of a new day to come, and the promise of a certain felicity are linked together” (7).

These ancient sexual discourses, sermons and preaching have helped us to put

aside the hypocrisies of our society and to dream of new life, new city and new havens. All arts, pictures, songs, music and writings are founded on the strength of sex. The repression of sex is the notion of bourgeoisie culture. Foucault further says, “To say that sex is not repressed, or rather that the relationship between sex and power is not characterized by repression, is to risk falling into a sterile paradox” (8).

The laws, the social systems, norms, and values and the concepts that go counter to the liberation of sex will definitely collapse. The repression of sex is something like repressing our will and ourselves.

The suppression, the concealment and the silence of sex are associated with sin in course of human civilization. To condemn sex or to think sex is a sin in itself shows that sex is not used as a matter of delight but as a matter of sinful practice. Foucault questions, “And how have we come to be a civilization so peculiar as to tell itself that, through an abuse of power which has not ended, it has long “sinned” against sex?” (9). Moreover, it has been used in such a sinful way that nature is blamed disastrous, since its most precious aspect is ignored or undermined.

The repression has long been practiced and now it has deep roots and solid reasons which weigh heavy on sex, and the repressive power has slowly and gradually fallen intrinsically on it that the liberation of sex has been very difficult with some attempts.

Laws and Moral Questions

In the eighteenth century some explicit codes of sexual practice were determined besides the “Customary regularities and constraints of opinion govern sexual practices, canonical law, the Christian Pastoral and civil law” (Foucault, *History vol.1: 37*). They made the clear division between sex centered on matrimonial relations, obligations, violent accompaniment, and unwanted relations and so on. “The Sex of husband and wife was beset by rules and recommendations”

(37), which was the most respected, most focused and most legitimate relation. “The ‘rest’ remained a good deal more confused; one only has to think of the uncertain status of ‘sodomy,’ or the indifference regarding the sexuality of children” (Foucault, *History vol.1: 37*).

The rules of marital relations and deviation from it in search of strange pleasures did not have the clear measures for respect and condemnation. Foucault says:

On the list of grave sins, and separated only by their relative importance, there appeared debauchery (extramarital relations), adultery, rape, spiritual or carnal incest, but also sodomy, or the mutual “caress.” As to the courts, they could condemn homosexuality as well as infidelity, marriage without parental consent, or bestiality.

(Foucault, *History vol.1: 38*)

The laws on sexuality regarding permissions and possibilities were based on nature and the actions “contrary to nature” were considered quite “against the law.” Apart from the matter of heterosexual monogamy of legitimate couple, “the sexuality of children, men and women criminals” (Foucault, *History vol.1: 38*) and maniacs was under strict scrutiny.

Although some sexuality was considered legitimate, it was not practiced in the discourses. The practice of sexuality in the restricted areas was considered not only illegitimate but also unnatural, and it was socially and lawfully condemned. The forms of sexual activity such as adultery, rape, marriage in a close relation, deduction of a nun and deception of one’s wife belonged to the area of condemnation. Similarly, “stealer of wives, seducer of virgins, the shame of families, and an insult to husbands and fathers” (Foucault, *History Vol.1 39*) were taken as violators of marriage, which

are manifested in the literary works that talk about the situations of those days.

The rules of sexuality were considered either legal or moral. Children, schoolboys, teachers, and husbands may sometimes appear cruel or maniacal, and they seek asylums through doctors or judges. In such kinds of bizarre impulses many families had to be closely in association with. There were a number of perverted families who were in friendly terms with delinquents and madmen on whom we can bear the stamp of “moral folly,” “genital neurosis,” “aberration of the genetic instinct,” “degenerescence,” or “physical imbalance” (Foucault, *History vol. I*: 40).

When medicine looked into the whole organic, functional and mental pathologic of sex, it became clear that all repressions that gave rise to perversion were due to the exercise of power upon sexuality.

Sexual Aggression as Nature and Culture

Sexual violence is deeply rooted in human nature. The female body is largely the reflection of nature. It moves along with the lunar calendar. Therefore, females are more concerned about sexuality and sexual roles. The feminists often raise voices about women and their roles and activity upon eliminating sexual inequality and injustices. Paglia is quite sensitive talking about females’ attachment with nature and culture. In a book entitled *Sex and Violence or Nature and Art* (1995), she writes, “Sexuality and eroticism are the intricate intersection of nature and culture. Feminists grossly oversimplify the problem of sex when they reduce it to a matter of social convention: readjust society, eliminate sexual inequality, purify sex roles; and happiness and harmony will reign” (Paglia 2).

Paglia thinks, “Modern liberalism suffers unresolved contradictions” (3). The system that imparts individualism and freedom also has suppressive social orders. Liberalism is a tyrant father but also a nurturing mother where there are repressions

and contradictions as well as political equality to women. She continues, “There are hierarchies in nature and alternate hierarchies in society. In nature brute force is the law, a survival of the fittest. In society, there are protections for the weak. Society is our frail barrier against nature” (3-4).

Paglia argues that when the state is weak, people gain freedom and, when the state resumes strength, it tries to enslave them. Similarly, sexual freedom leads on to “Sadomasochism” and then to romantic decadence, which she tries to justify as, “Nature is a hard task master. It is the hammer and the anvil, crushing individuality. Perfect freedom would be to die by earth, air, water, and fire” (Paglia 4).

Paglia believes that sex is the source of violence. Sex is neither faultless nor guiltless. “Sex is the point of contact between man and nature, where morality and good intentions fall to primitive urges” (Paglia 4). She thinks that sex is demonic. For Freud, sex has the ghost-ridden character. Love doesn’t have any meaning in sex. “A perfectly humane eroticism may be impossible” (Paglia 5).

Talking about “family romance,” Paglia says that somewhere it is full of “hostility and aggression, homicidal wishes of the unconscious. Children are monsters of unbridled egotism and will, for they spring directly from nature, hostile intimations of immortality” (6). Woman has various roles in a family and society. She works, she serves, she suffers and she rules. She has the power of love, sex and romance.

Violence as the Politics of Sex and Gender

Jeff Hearn in the introduction to *The Violences of Men* (1998) writes that men have *unities* and *differences* among themselves both collectively as well as individually. “It is very important to acknowledge the interplay of these unities and differences

between men; the paradox of the recognition of men as a gender class and the deconstruction of the monolith of men; . . .” (Hearn 4) on different contexts and dimensions.

Hearn focuses on men’s violence as a “male violence” that may take place “to women, girls, boys, children, young people, each other, animals, life, ourselves” (4). Hearn categorizes men’s violences as biological, male and plural in its nature. Similarly, men’s violence to known women, as wives, girlfriends, partners, ex-partners, mothers, other relatives, friends and neighbours, which is immense, pervasive and basically safe at home. Hearn refers to Dobash and Dobash’s book *Women, Violence and Social change* (1992) in which they have commented about family violence that is usual and commonplace and women are generally the victims and men are the perpetrators:

It is now well known that violence in the home is commonplace, that women are its usual victims and men its usual perpetrators. It is also known that the family is filled with many different forms of violence and aggression, including physical, sexual and emotional, and that violence is perpetrated by young and old alike (qtd. in Hearn 4).

In the ‘intimate’ relation violence is usually sexual or heterosexual. The study reports say that there are verbal, psychological and emotional violences. Abuse, rape coercive sex, and pressurized sex are the common types. Generally women of close relationships have been the victims of men’s heterosexuality.

Hearn believes that men’s victimization to women and young people can be reduced by its recognition. It is also important to know why men have power in society and whether this power is structured or personal or both. Hearn also believes that men’s violence to women is a personal as well as a political problem both in

private and public behaviours. “Like most issues in sexual politics and gender politics, ‘the personal is political’” (6). Even if a woman has not suffered from man’s direct physical violence, the ability of men’s emotional and verbal violence creates an intimidation for the potential physical violence. The power of men and the construction of the masculinities themselves are violence oriented. There have been many legal and social attempts and campaigns to raise issues and questions for men’s political commitments against violence and consecutively a significant progress has been marked. However, there are still physical and sexual assaults upon women. Women have to face more restrictions than men. Brophy and Smart (1982) summarize the past situations of the women’s positions as follows:

She had no right to leave her husband without his permission and if she did he could physically restrain her. . . . he could divorce her on a single act of adultery while she had to establish adultery combined with another matrimonial offence . . . Any challenge by a wife to this authority, or to the principle of sexual monogamy resulted in the courts refusing to grant her maintenance. The magistrate courts . . . treated adultery as an absolute bar to maintenance for wives. (qtd. in Hearn 9)

In Britain, different laws have been enforced to ensure the rights to women, so that men would not treat them with violence. Violence in marriage and domestic violence have been seriously taken, analyzed, observed and recognized, so that laws could be enforced to prevent them. The reformation in police forces for the enactment of laws to curtail domestic violence was done, and for their applications the pro-arrest policies were made. “Matrimonial Homes Acts 1967,” “Women’s Aid Federation 1964,” “Parliamentary Select Committee on Violence in Marriage 1975,” “Domestic Violence and Matrimonial Proceedings Act 1976,” and “Matrimonial

Homes Act 1983” (reformed) were made, passed and enacted. However, many of such laws remained either ineffective or failed. It shows that family violence was a very big problem even in Britain. Serious policy statements were issued about the treatment of domestic violence.

Jeff Hearn’s study on *Violences of Men* (1998) was brought out after long theoretical and practical researches of men and women. Hearn writes:

The violences reported included rape fantasies; sexual wrestling; long-term verbal abuse; restraining, holding, blocking; throwing against the wall; slapping, hitting, striking, punching, beating up, attempted murder; murder; the use of sticks, knives and other objects and weapons; rape; abduction; torture; throwing and smashing things, for example, bottles, damaging property, houses, furniture, cars. (Hearn 12)

In “Definitions and Explanations of Men’s Violence,” Hearn writes that there have been a number of debates over men’s violence upon women. Policies, politics and interventions have been heavily talked about, however, the males, whosoever they are, have used their violence even upon the known women (Hearn 16).

Violence as a Patriarchal Terrorism

There are several conceptualizations of violence used in “professional literature.” In domestic life, pushing, slapping and shoving are forms of physical aggression. They are the normal forms of violent offences until there is any physical injury. Arriaga and Oskamp gather from various sources that those normal forms of violence too attempts overpower and terrorize the female counterpart, and say, “Yet another perspective on relationship violence has been adopted by feminist scholars, who have suggested that

such violence involves male attempts to overpower and terrorize female victims” (Arriaga & Oskamp 4).

There have been discrepant reports about ending violence. Some suggest “couple therapy” and some others say that jail is the solution, and in some other’s opinion, removing women from their batterer’s control is the solution for the control of violence in intimate relationship. Many a time when the couples lose control, they consequently resort to hitting, pushing or kicking each other; in course such actions may escalate into more injuries resulting into life threatening or life taking situations.

There are some deeply rooted forms of violence. As Johnson has stated that such forms of violence are due to “patriarchal traditions of men’s right to control ‘their’ women” (qtd. in Arriaga & Oskamp 5). Oskamp and Arriaga write further in relevance of the nature and types of violence in the patriarchal tradition, “In addition to physical abuse, this violence involves economic subordination, extreme coercion and intimidation, isolation, and a host of other control tactics – a form of violence that Johnson (1995) refers to as ‘patriarchal terrorism’” (5).

Arriaga and Oskamp refer to Johnson’s concept that men tend to cause “extreme psychological and physical abuse” (5). Referring to Johnson’s work of 1995, Oskamp and Arriaga write about the common couple conflicts, “Research has shown that, in couples where both members engage in less severe forms of violence, the partners assault each other an average of six times a year. In contrast, male batterers who engage in extreme psychological and physical violence assault their wives an average of 65 times a year” (5).

From the above-mentioned research about the average numbers of violent behaviors, some can be labeled as “harmless,” some can be noted as “serious social problems”. Oskamp and Arriaga take the idea of Sugarman and Hotaling from a

review of literature of their research article “Dating violence: Prevalence, context, risk masters” (1989) presents a list of general causes of perpetration of violence as “sex-role attitudes, self esteem, experiencing and witnessing violence in one’s family origin, the status of a dating relationship, past experiences in relationships, interpersonal communication and so on” (Oskamp & Arriaga 6).

An analysis of distal versus proximal predictors of violence correlates with the types of violence and its design. Arriaga and Oskamp talk about “what” and “who” of violence and focus on who is more violent. They term family violence in the concepts of social, genetic, psychological, psychopathological, and even patriarchal categories. They also look into the causes, issues, nature and types of violence. They focus on the issues of how and why the behaviors of violence have taken place. They have also tried to suggest the practice and theories of problem-solving methods to controlling violence. The main thing that they want to point out is the context that is favorable for violent behaviors. The physical and sexual abuse of violence, marital discords, use of alcohol, and its effects on health, social and economic status, and marital behaviors, divorce, murder, madness, vagabondry, suicide, perversion and behavioral distresses are the obvious results generally observed in intimate partners.

These writers take glimpses into the future of the people of intimate relationships that have been plagued by violence. “The authors place primary emphasis on predicting whether violent relationships will persist overtime. They examine the longitudinal course of aggressive and non-aggressive marriages, observing the fluctuations in interpersonal aggression over time” (8).

Summarizing the types and characteristics of violence presented by different writers in the book Arriaga and Oskamp write that the violent behaviors of some male batterers are diagnosed as “borderline personality disorder” (9). Some of the violent

behaviors are termed as psychopathological categories. Physical abuse of violence should be looked differently from the viewpoint of psychological and verbal abuses. Most of the violent behaviors get expressed in the forms of “outbursts.” In many cases the expression of violence about controlling the partner that is instrumental in causing anger. Similarly some batterers are violent in all contexts, whereas some appear violent only with the people of intimate relationship. Violence may give rise to conflict between the partners. Drinking habits or behaviors or marital distresses may exacerbate the situations.

Talking about “Trends in Theories and Methods for Studying Violence,” Arriaga and Oskamp write: “The contributions in this volume exemplify a trend in research on violence toward multi level theoretical models, longitudinal designs, and relatively novel analytic strategies (e.g., survival analysis, cluster analysis, growth curve analysis)” (10). It is supposed that males inflict violence and females “sustain it . . .” (11). Researches show that “violence by men is much more serious in its likelihood of causing injury than is violence by women . . .” (Arriga & Oskamp 11).

Several methods for the study of violence have been adopted among which some are the “detailed analyses of interaction behaviors, observations of psychological changes during an interaction, and large-scale national surveys describing the nature of violence” (Arriga & Oskamp 11). In the intimate relationship, physical abuse is more dangerous than psychological abuse. Violence by physical aggression has a fluctuating nature. It may make difference in satisfaction or the rates of separation or divorce.

Generally violence is responded with violence itself; however anger, fear and surprise also have a role. Some wives try to sustain the hardships of violence. They cannot leave their husbands religious and family ties religious and family ties, having

children or fear of facing dreadful economic problems. Denial, anger, acceptance are some of the ways to cope with violence. Some wives try not to cooperate with their batterers and do not let their children see the fathers; some show hostile behaviors and some others try to sustain the violent behaviors. But generally among the couples of the conscious communities, hatred, assaults, divorce, court cases and sometimes, even murders have been the responses.

In an article “A Typology of Male Batterers: An Initial Examination,” the writers Amy Holtzworth – Munroe, Jeffrey C. Meehan, Katherine Herron, Gregory L. Stuart cite lines from Straus and Gelles, 1990 about the American situation of violence upon women by their male partners. They write, “Husband to wife violence is a serious problem in this country. Data from nationally representative surveys suggest that each year 1 out of every 8 married men will be physically aggressive toward his wife and nearly 2 million women will be severely assaulted by their male partners” (45).

The writers try to examine the correlates and potential causes of violence from husband to wife and distinguish between the men who engage in marital violence and the men who do not. The researches have brought out that “maritally violent men are actually heterogeneous” (Holtzworth-Munroe et al 45) and are different on various dimensions. There are types and subtypes of male batterers. Violence in dating, cohabiting and violence between married partners are usually listed. Slapping each other in such association is quite common and quite frequent; however, sometimes the same thing may result into injuries, and then consequently will turn into violent actions.

Between the married partners violence by husbands has had very serious consequences, both in physical and psychological terms. However, the typologies of

male battering can be examined categorically. The writers of “A Typology of Male Batterers: An Initial Examination” propose some typologies of batterers. It is referred that there had been “9 studies using deductive approaches (e. g., splitting batterers into groups on the basis of clinical observations or a priori theorizing) and 6 studies using inductive approaches (e. g., factor or cluster analysis of subjects’ scores on measures)” (46) that had been proposed as a comprehensive review of previous batterer’s typology by Holtzworth Munroe and Stuart in 1994. The batterers’ subtypes could be classified in three descriptive dimensions, which go as follows:

These are: (1) the severity of marital physical violence and related abuse, such as psychological and sexual abuse; (2) the *generality* of violence (i. e., family only or extra familial violence) and related variables, such as criminal behavior and legal involvement; and (3) the batterer’s *psychopathology* or *personality disorders*. (46)

In the first type, violence would be generally restricted within the family whereas the second type “*dysphoric/borderline* batterers would engage in moderate to severe wife abuse, including psychological and sexual abuse” (46).

This type of violence is basically limited to the wife, whereas there can also be extramarital or criminal in behavior. This can be mostly “dysphoric, psychologically distressed, and emotionally volatile” (Holtzworth-Munroe, et al 46). It is said, “Men in this group would evidence borderline personality characteristics and might have problems with alcohol and drug abuse; they would have difficulty controlling their explosive anger, particularly anger at their wives” (46-47).

In the third type, the batterer is generally *violent* and *antisocial* who “would engage in moderate to severe abuse” (Holtzworth-Munroe, et al 47). The men in this type engage in “most extra-familial aggression” and are involved in criminal behavior

and also have the “problems with alcohol and drug abuse” (47). Munroe and his fellow researchers have said about their studies upon the psychological causes of batterers:

Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) then presented a developmental model of husband violence, highlighting the potential importance of both distal/historical and proximal correlates of male violence as potential risk factors for the development of differing batterer subtypes. They hypothesized that the three proposed batterer subgroups would differ on the variables in this model, including distal/historical (i. e., genetic/ parental factors, family of origin home environment and violence, and association with deviant peers) and proximal (i.e., attachment/dependency, impulsivity, social skills – in both marital and nonmarital relationships – and attitudes – both hostile attitudes toward women and attitudes supportive of violence) correlates of husband violence. (Holtzworth- Munroe, et al 47)

Batterers of family only would have very low risk for antisocial and aggressive behavior, and they would be least impulsive compared to other types of batterers. They would be normal in their attachments with others. They can have adequate social relationship skills; however, their anger and lack of relationship skill with the partner would lead them to physical aggression and violent behavior. They may not necessarily have any negative attitude towards women, and they may stop their physical aggression after a time. But the dysphoric and borderline batterers are assumed to have complicated backgrounds of trauma, child abuse and parental rejection. Consequently they may not be able to form stable and trusting attachment with the intimate partner. These types of men are jealous and also have the fear of

losing wife. Naturally they have hostile attitude towards women. In anger and feeling of insecurity, frustration and fear, their violent behavior may go worse.

The antisocial batterers fall in the criminal groups. As it is said about their behaviors and associations, “Relative to other batterer subtypes, they would be the most likely to have a genetic/parental risk for anti-social and aggressive behavior, to have been exposed to the highest levels of family-of-origin violence, and to have associated with deviant peers as youths. . .” (Holtzworth- Munroe, et al 48).

These antisocial violent batterers are very impulsive. They have no skill in maintaining marital and non-marital relationships. They have negative and often hostile attitudes towards women. Their marital violence is only a part of their violent, antisocial and criminal behavior.

Violence and Social Behaviours

In a resourceful article entitled “Limitation of Social Learning Models in Explaining Intimate Aggression,” Donald G. Dutton explains how social learning theory can be useful in examining violence in intimate relationship. In the writing, he discusses that “the personality features and phasic behavior patterns of spousal batterers and proposes a trial of traumatic childhood experiences that can lead to an abusive personality” (73). The aggression has been deeply linked with social psychology. Social behaviors, acquisition of aggressive habits and hostilities are some of the aspects that have been discussed, analyzed and examined with the social learning theory. Dutton writes: “In a social learning theory analysis, aggression is conceptualized as an active response to an ‘aversive stimulus,’ in a similar category as assertiveness or achievement” (74).

The “aversive stimulus” may be controllable as well as uncontrollable. Under controllable ones, assertiveness, achievement, problem-solving and aggression can be

categorized, whereas the uncontrollable stimuli are eating, sex, sports, self-anesthetization, drugs, distracted thoughts, apathy, gangs, depression, resignation, psychosomatization etc. They fall under building and non-building categories. Some of the stimuli definitely have positive effects and naturally they help to build the body and mind.

The analyses of various studies and research samples about the effects of parental violence on the children are very much practical and can be useful in problem solving. Dutton further writes, “Kaufman and Zigler (1993) have pointed out to the huge rate of false positives found in research on children who witnessed parental aggression and/or experienced child abuse. The overwhelming majority of children exposed to parental hitting do not later exhibit spousal aggression themselves” (76).

But these authors reviewed the studies of “transmission rate” which are based on the idea that the children who have been victimized by parental hitting have later used aggression against their children but these rates vary from studies to studies. In retrospective studies the rates of child abusers are much higher than prospective studies, but that also is based on the methodological differences of data analyses. Dutton refers to Kaufman and Zigler (1993) that they have “reported a number of ‘protective factors’ that prevented intergenerational transmission of child abuse” (Dutton 76). Dutton further writes:

Social learning theory doesn't argue that observation is the only way of acquiring an aggressive habit, for trial and error learning can lead to the same response. Nevertheless, observational learning has been a cornerstone of social learning theory, and the finding that witnessing aggression produces real positive rates smaller than false positive rates is problematic for the theory. (76)

The “abusive personality” gets formed by childhood trauma. Aggression may take place in response to “uncontrollable and unbluntable” events. Sometimes the forms of “irrational aggression” are aroused stemming from earlier “traumatic experiences.”

Talking about personality features of intimate abusers Dutton writes, “Men who exhibit features of the abusive personality tend to demonstrate cyclical abuse corresponding to the phasic nature . . .” (77). According to Dutton the first phase is “a tension building phase” which resembles “what Baumeister (1990) calls deconstructed thinking; – a form of ‘tunnel vision’ that departs from normal associative cognition and is concrete and simplistic in form” (77). The tension-building phase is characterized by men’s verbal and emotional abuse. In this phase women are generally isolated or undermined as “gaslighting” or many battered women have described this situation as “walking on eggshells” (Dutton 77).

The second phase is the battering phase in which the tension erupts into outright physical or sexual abuse. In this stage the battered woman can be taken captive inside the house or she is terrorized. Sometimes the situation may be a social or a police case. The batterer may threaten the rescuers too. If the victimized woman succeeds to run away, she may take shelter at a friend’s or neighbor’s or relative’s house.

The third and final phase of this abuse cycle is the contrition phase in which the batterer (the husband) promises to reform, goes to church and takes counseling from others and also tries to gain support from the priest, the mother-in-law and friends. If the woman does not believe, “he cries, tells the woman he can’t live without her; in some cases he threatens suicide” (79). He also gives examples of “difficult patches” in many relationships and also tries to convince the partner against

a harsh and unjust world. If any “patch up” is done in the premature stage and drop out what happened will “have the highest recidivism risk for more spousal assault, but those who complete treatment have a better prognosis than court – referred men . . .”

(79). As Dutton further explains:

For men in this cyclical process, normal appraisal, as described by social learning theory, is not possible. In this tension building phase, which leads to abusive outbursts, appraisals are skewed in ways not described by social learning theory models. Yet these phases do not resemble what is called “bizarre symbolic control” or psychosis either. They are by-products of a personality that is neither “normal” nor psychotic – one that resembles Gunderson’s (1984) description of the borderline personality disorder. (79)

The attempts to prevent tension may fail because tension grows due to the internal events like “attachment-based dysphoria, rumination, and escalating rage” which are the personality features that have been described in a borderline personality that is formed by the childhood trauma experiences. This experience also is not sufficient for further family violence. The family violence is very much associated to a fragile ego, fear of rejection and anger as a product of intimacy. Talking about other experiences Dutton says, “These other experiences are *shaming* and *insecure attachment*” (79). Violence is not simply the question of suffering or experiencing but also the question of witnessing. The witnessing of family violence will create a kind of trauma, because of which life will be almost crippled.

Shaming as a source of trauma is generally combined with witnessing abuse and having insecure feeling of attachment that has been commented upon various writers, as “soul destroying” aspects of shame or something like a “soul murder.” In

the same article entitled "Limitations of Social Learning Models in Explaining Intimate Aggression" Dutton writes, "These personality features of assaulters include extreme jealousy and fear of abandonment, tendencies to project blame, and a high chronic level of trauma symptoms" (82). In this situation trauma dangerously occupies the human mind and blunts the whole strength of thinking and creativity.

The Dynamics of Interpersonal Aggression

Sally A. Lloyd in an article "The Interpersonal and Communication Dynamics of Wife Battering" writes that violence in marriage and family is very frequent as how "women and children are hit, slapped, pushed around, or beaten by a person who purports to love them" (91). The numbers of emotional control and psychological aggression skyrocket in case of the more "nebulous" phenomena. Reports have said that "one in six wives" has experienced "some type of physical violence at the hands of their husbands . . ." (91) and nearly one in fifteen reports the presence of violent behaviors is likely to result in an injury as researched by Straus and Gelles, (1990) that Lloyd refers to (91). Lloyd further refers to the researchers like Johnson (1995) have argued that many couples suffer from occasional violence (91). In a sense "common couple violence" is warranted. It is also being learned that "more about the interpersonal and communication dynamics that surround husbands' use of physical violence, since much evidence suggests that interpersonal and communication factors are integral to understanding the dynamics of violence in marriage . . ." (Lloyd 91).

Research on interpersonal dynamics include, "social skill and problem solving deficits, conflict patterns, 'everyday' marital interaction, negative affect and reciprocity in laboratory observations, and pattern of dominance and power dynamics" (Lloyd 92).

Dismantling the “Establishments” or the “Power centers” or the system or the economic institutions is another form of structural violence. In such power clashes discourse also is a commodity. One man’s terrorism is another man’s heroism, and one man’s individualism is another man’s harsh monopoly, and there appears a conflict with the question of winning and losing “on or off the battlefield or in or out of a court of law” (Barak 5).

Social justice, fight against poverty, development and peace are the essentially relative phenomenon to stop violence and to recognize the form of terror or revolt. In many cases “The point is that the interpersonal, institutional, and structural spheres of violence and nonviolence are overlapping and interconnected” (Barak 5-6).

In the studies of violence in America, some children before the age of 18 who have involved themselves in killing others have been mostly found as the sufferers of “poverty, unemployment, poor schools, low educational attainment, fractured families, abuse of school and drugs, and more than enough fear, mayhem, and violence to go around” (Barak 6). These youths are brought up in such social circumstances that they have their biological, physiological and psychological constraints and abilities about killing other humans. Barak writes that, “. . . when most people think about violence, they may think about anger, aggression, and bloodshed – acknowledging certain aspects of hate and vengeance – but rare does anyone think about dependence, vulnerability, and insecurity or trust, respect, and shame” (6).

Personal violence does not simply take place due to one man’s lack of love, dissociation from the self or alienation from other or simply because of humiliation and sense of revenge but mostly due to “personal and social experiences of mood elevation and depression” (6).

Similarly, shame is one of most striking sources of construction and destruction which is an emotion universally found in all cultures. Shame can be responsible for a personal as well as collective violence that may result in “maiming, slaughter, or killing in the form of a homicide or suicide” (7). Barak points out the possibility of collective violence of the most atrocious kind:

Similarly, when a nation-state feels humiliated by another nation-state or group of nation-states, collective violence of the most atrocious kind may result, including mass murder and genocide. Putting aside the question of whether or not youths or adults who have killed felt compelled, out of control, or in control when their murdering occurred, it is instructive to examine the multiple pathways toward and away from both violence and nonviolence. (7)

If we take the histories of families, we can find that there are or were generations either of victims or perpetrators of violence directly or indirectly involved as children, or as parents or soldiers or lovers. Similarly, the families, the communities and the nations have some involvement in some sorts of violence, of some visible or invisible types. The experiences of violence either as victims in the attempts of recovering, abstaining or resisting it or as perpetrators using it “as a source of strength and character development” (8) are deeply based on the emotional psyches or on the pathways of dealing with violence. The interpersonal, institutional and structural forms of violence overlap into another when complications grow. All the social, political and economic organizations are involved in one-way or the other. The cultural and social experiences of shame, inequality and oppression generate violence. The solution to the complication does not simply refer to love and

understanding but “to other socially related and silent or as yet unconstructed cultural discourses about such activities” (8). Barak presents some secrets of violence:

- a. Violent activity and the punishment of violent offenders are both grounded in the common emotion of revenge.
- b. Violence and violent acts are often social and political diseases before they are psychological malaises.
- c. Multimedia and other public representations underplay most forms of violence and nonviolence but overplay other forms. (8)

Barak brings the references of Gilligan’s argument in which there are three preconditions due to which “shame can lead to a full pathogenesis of violent behaviour” (10). The preconditions have been exemplified in Barak in the way as:

- (a) feeling too ashamed to admit that one feels shame, which only makes one feel further ashamed; (b) feeling that there is no nonviolent means available for warding off or diminishing one’s feelings of shame or low self esteem; and (c) feeling an overwhelming sense of shame in the absence of feelings of either love or guilt. (10)

Shame can effectively stimulate rage only when the preconditions are actively functioning otherwise shame also may not be the reason for violence. Many people develop “antigens” and “antibodies” to the social diseases and resist the rage of violence. Similarly, in all cases shame may not grow into the feelings of violence. Moreover, the aggrieved persons of shame restore their wounded self-esteem, or before they turn to be “angry and homicidal,” they become “depressed and suicidal.” Likewise, the media has always highlighted and over emphasized the interpersonal violence and has downplayed structural and institutional violence. But the interpersonal violence that originates from

feelings and emotions do not simply have psychological roots but comes from social evils or diseases.

Barak's research displays that juvenile violence is quite rampant. To see the data of juvenile violence of murders and criminal acts is dreadful. In America alone 104,000 Juveniles were arrested for violent crimes, which accounted for 16 percent of the total violence in America in 1999, (Barak 11). The records of gang fights, domestic killings and isolated killings among the juveniles present a horrible picture of violence. School violence has generally erupted out of jealousy, vengeance, frustration, and aggression. The students possess arms quietly and use them randomly. Barak extracts a paragraph from a research paper entitled "School Violence: Identifying Factors and Characteristics" that was conducted in 2000 by a group of researchers:

A student in this group may be characteristic of the passive-aggressive pre-adolescent, unable to express anger directly. He puts on a well-adjusted face and acts as if everything is just fine. He may have weak ego strength, and may be every sensitive to insults or perceived verbal attacks. He will become increasingly frustrated but take his anger out passively or symbolically, perhaps by taking an interest in violent entertainment, by writing morbid poetry, or obsessing about death-related themes. He rebels against authority, but passively rather than aggressively or boldly. (qtd. in Barak 12).

The tendency to express anger and frustration may be the sign of self-hatred or perfectionism. The expression of frustration by the use of animal cruelty is common and even usual.

From the discussion in the seminars and resolutions of the summits, it is found that children are violent because of child abuse, maltreatment or due to some kind of “posttraumatic stress disorder.” A plan for a three-pronged approach to violence reduction has been suggested. “Prevention,” “intervention” and “accountability” are the measures forwarded for this undertaking. Social justice, retribution and preventive therapy are also considered effective. It is found to be very dangerous to lock up and punish an undertaker of violence instead of educating and changing him or her. Providing “basic human rights to housing, to food, and self-actualization” and still many more other rights, facilities and opportunities will naturally help the reduction of violence in Barak’s opinion.

We can use the primary and secondary methods of prevention of violence with some plans and strategies for different degrees and kinds of violence. The reduction of violence by the introduction of some effective policies becomes indispensable for settlement. Policy development, professional counseling and medical treatments are some of the methods to solve the problems.

Barak says that it is difficult to locate violence properly because it remains mostly “invisible,” “hidden,” “overplayed” or “sensationalized.” The words like “law and order” are the romantic notions of good old days. Violence perpetrated by the intimates is ambivalently seen; however violence by strangers has been a big threat to the society. Barak presents fluctuating data of violent crimes and homicide rates in the American society. In some years violent rates are surprisingly low and in some years again surprisingly high. It shows that tensions and anxieties appear in newer and newer forms, which instigate the causation of violence. Violence has been either visible or invisible on various levels – “interpersonal, familial, institutional, and global” (Barak 23).

Barak takes the reference of Ladicola and Shupe's conceptualization of violence and provides a list of behaviors that come under interpersonal violence. Barak says that assault and battery, corporal punishment, homicide and murder, kidnapping, rape and sexual assault, robbery, suicide, verbal abuse, threat and intimidation are some of the examples of interpersonal violence. Similarly Barak presents the sets of the examples of institutional violence under five categories: family violence, economic violence, military violence, religious violence and state violence. Barak presents institutional violence as:

- Family: child and elder abuse (i.e., physical, sexual, neglect), spousal abuse (i.e., battering, emotional taunting, marital rape).
- Economic: Corporate and work place abuse (i.e., distributing defective products, subjecting workers to unsafe or unhealthy conditions)
- Military: ranging from petty hazing recruits to war crimes (i.e., torture and murder of civilian or non civilian enemy populations)
- Religious: abuse in the name of religious organizations, sects, or beliefs (i.e., cultism, witch hunts, heresy persecutions, religion based terrorism)
- State: abuse by authority (including criminal justice) of fundamental human rights (i.e., assassinations, discrimination, enslavement, genocide, state supported terrorism) (23)

Similarly, structural violence is based on the creation of violence obviously out of the economic and political structures. Basically this form of violence appears when the status quo is challenged. The violence is used when

1. One is allegedly for the purpose of establishing, defending, and/ or extending hierarchy and inequality by the beating, exploiting, harassing,

killing, and torturing of persons based on their age, class, ethnicity, gender, and/or sexual orientation (i.e., lynching, hate crime, terrorism). The other is allegedly for the purposes of decreasing privilege and increasing liberty by resisting, protesting, and attacking those persons, symbols, or things that represent the established order, or “Establishment” (i.e., demonstrations, riots, terrorism). (24)

We can say that violence is easiest to erupt and spread on the issues of identity. The human sentiments are easily touched and provoked for violence on the basis of customs, traditions and rituals. The nature of modern conflicts and violence require more investigations and analyses, because the developments of civilizations have given rise to new claims and clashes and naturally, civilization and violence go together. Amartya Sen in his book *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny* (2006) writes about violence, “...the ‘civilizational’ approach to contemporary conflicts (in grander or lesser versions) serves as a major intellectual barrier to focusing more fully on prevailing politics and to investigating the processes and dynamics of contemporary incitements to violence” (43).

The newly emerging identities are like the groups and associations of homosexuals or the supporters of “gay and lesbian rights” (46) too have created more complicated contradictions on political and social levels. Similarly, the identities of the West and anti-West, First world and Third world, capitalist and socialist, colonial and anti- colonial are some of the new identities which have arisen along with new contradictions that have given rise to the possibilities of contextual conflicts and violence.

Chapter III

THEORIES OF VIOLENCE

Violence and Literature

Being a representation of life, it is but natural that literature represents violence considerably. Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse have much to say about it. In the “Introduction” of their book *The Violence of Representation: Literature and the history of violence* (1989), they write, “Under the headings of new historicism, cultural materialism, socialist feminism, cultural poetics, and gender studies, work that deliberately violates traditional distinctions between poetics and politics has suddenly joined the mainstream of the humanities and social sciences” (1). They are thus concerned to show how the scholars themselves are also implementing the concept of violence in their fields. The canonical works are violently being replaced by the non-canonical ones. The fields that were previously overlooked have become the center of attention for these new violent scholarly exercises. Nancy and Leonard show the consequences brought about by such new upheavals, and they say, “We should be concerned, then, to ensure that our political self-consciousness keeps pace with the rapidly increasing use of certain interpretive procedures for reading other areas of our culture and cultures other than ours” (2).

Talking about the influence of power, politics and violence in *Jane Eyre*, Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse tell how the objects of violence have been used or characterized in a piece of art:

As American academics at this moment in history, we feel it is somehow dishonest to speak of power and violence as something that belongs to the police or the military, something that belongs to and is practiced by someone somewhere else. For clearly the subtler modalities of modern

culture, usually classified as non-political, keep most of us in line, just as they designate specific “others” as the appropriate objects of violence.

With a few notable exceptions, theory has yet to acknowledge adequately the forms of political power that operate in and through the modalities of personal life, care of the body, leisure-time activities, or literature, to name a few. (4)

In “Writing Culture: how the representation of violence became the violence of representation,” they talk about wideness of violence in different paradigms in the contexts of the development of sophisticated technology:

Successive phases of imperialism – extending down through other classes within the imperial nations as well as outward to the colonies and informing foreign policy to this day – have turned the violence of representation into the ubiquitous form of power that is the ultimate though elusive topic and target of this book. (9)

Similarly, talking about the relationship between politics and literature in “Early modern culture: putting the politics back into Poetics” the writers show that literature is heavily influenced by politics:

Stephanie Jed explores in her study of fifteenth-century Italian humanism . . . that despite the tradition of representation that sets humanist learning apart from the political tyranny with which this learning co-existed, literature is implicated in politics from the beginning. What Jed calls the humanist code contains a message of political violence both in tales of rape and murder and in the metaphors that displace this violence. (10)

Stephanie Jed in “The Scene of tyranny: Violence and the humanistic tradition” forwards that literature has distanced itself from politics but has legitimized violence under the veil of natural metaphors and as a consequence accepts that “the humanistic distinction between literature and politics is grave . . .” (10).

Introducing Jed’s article, Armstrong and Tennenhouse further say:

For example, neither the literature of Fascist Italy nor fifteenth and sixteenth century archival documents have yet, for the most part, made their way . . . into our courses on that category of writing – “literature” – which claims to transcend our everyday concerns. And we find it difficult to connect the narrative of the violence of tyrants codified by humanism as “literature” to the violence represented daily in court records, in documents emanating from the Pentagon, or in a communiqué issued by the death squads in El Salvador. (11)

Violence is at the heart and spirit of literary creation. Presentation of contradiction is the movement of a literary writing and violence is the extreme form of expression of a contradiction. All interpersonal, communal, national and international violent actions are the results of open and hidden contradictions.

Literature and Political Power

Literature is a big defense or a great justification for the projection of political power. It is a strong fortress of defense and very sharp hitting artillery of offense. It is a background of any uprising, a history, a strategy, a historical document, a creation, enlightenment and a beautiful word sketch, a lesson and an amusement. Therefore, any political power whether it is regressive or progressive, reactionary or revolutionary, feudal or bourgeois or communistic, creates its own favorable literature upon the protection of which it remains. All literatures of the world have some

inherent motives. All systems of the world are founded or crested upon their types of literary strategies.

When feudalism was badly defeated by the united efforts of the bourgeoisie and the working class people, it tried to raise its hood in literary writings. The natural superiority, the nobility and the aristocratic highness collapsed. Then it appeared to fight a literary battle, not by obviously defending itself but by trying to create contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the working class people, arousing sympathies towards the miserable situations of the workers. It was a kind of “feudal socialism” which is reactionary in character. It tries to predict that there is going to be a catastrophe and threatens the bourgeoisie that the catastrophe will be totally unbearable and destructive.

As Marx and Engels write in the third part of the *Communist Manifesto* (1848) under “Socialist and Communist Literature,” “Thenceforth, a serious political contest was altogether out of question. A literary battle alone remained possible” (61). They further write:

In order to arouse sympathy, the aristocracy was obliged to lose sight, apparently, of their own interests, and to formulate their indictment against the bourgeoisie in the interest of the exploited working class alone. Thus the aristocracy took their revenge by singing lampoons on their new master, and whispering in his ears sinister prophecies of coming catastrophe. (61)

In a political fight between the bourgeoisie and the progressive forces, the aristocratic element that has lost its power would take the side of the progressive forces, not because it wants to move the wheel of development forward, but because it

wants to regain the lost power benefiting from the ongoing contradictions between the bourgeoisie and the progressive revolutionaries.

The Politics of Violence

Leonard and Tennenhouse present a critical summary of the research articles collected in *The Violence of Representation: Literature and history of violence*. They compare the ideas of Stephanie Jed and Peter Stallybrass and say, “Violence well in the past has a certain legitimacy for all of them because they believe it was honestly political then. They speculate that everyone knew what it meant to commit certain acts of violence and that a sufficient number of the people who mattered felt violence served the interests of the entire social body” (15).

Stephanie Jed’s article “The Scene of tyranny: violence and the humanistic tradition” makes a cursory survey of tyranny and violence in the human history, basically in the studies of fifteenth and sixteenth century humanists, and finds a notable space in the narratives of “political violence”.

Jed traces the story of Periander, the tyrant of Corinth and Thrasybulus, the tyrant of Miletus in which Thrasybulus gave a symbolic message by cutting down the tallest ears of the grain about suppressing the revolt. Thrasybulus appeared crazy to the messenger; however it was a metaphorical of message political violence (21-31). The codification of message in the humanistic tradition is a culture. Obviously the narrative seems illogical and absurd; however, as a code it is meaningful which shows the advice of the most powerful subjects in the code of the tyrants. Jed says:

The tyrants’ coding process is entirely figured within the confines of the narrative. The tyrant (whether Thrasybulus or Tarquinius Superbus) communicates his advice to decapitate the most prominent citizens by means of a metaphorical violence committed against the

grain (or poppies). And the violence takes place at the level of representation: the decapitation of citizens remains within the limits of verbal configuration. Once this narrative is transmitted; however, there is no insurance against the eruption of the tyrants' violence outside the limits of textual representation. For, at this point, the violence of the tyrants is embedded within a cultural practice by means of which the narrative is transmitted and reproduced. (31)

The decapitation and codification of classical leanings “have been enacted in real political propaganda, real political opposition, and even in real violence, real murders” (32). In the narrative context of “tyranny” and “freedom,” “As heirs to this tradition, we, modernday humanists, might want to examine the violence in our own culture as a possible by-product of our ‘literary’ activities” (32). In this sense “literature” and “politics” are closely interrelated. There have been attempts to isolate “literature” from “politics” and sometimes “literature” has been considered “non-political” and politics as “nonliterary” but in the humanistic tradition literature has been accepted as a political “reality.” Finally Jed says, “Although we are more accustomed to associating humanism with scholarly activities than with violence, there are structural similarities between the code of tyrants and the code of humanists which unmask the violence of humanistic cultural practices” (38).

For Jed, political violence leaves impressions in literature. When people write about the political violence with depth of feeling and creative imagination, it becomes a literary presentation. Likewise politics too receives impressions from literature, and literary violence gets manifested in political practices. Jed further writes, “Although it is perhaps more intriguing to consider how this ‘literary’ violence functions as an incitement to political violence outside the text, the urgent task at hand is to discover

how this violence is sublimated inside today's practice of literary interpretation, inside the 'republic of letters'" (39).

Peter Stallybrass in his article "Drunk with the Cup of Liberty: Robin Hood, the Carnavalesque, and the Rhetoric of Violence in early Modern England," Mathew Arnold's famous opposition between culture and Anarchy can, perhaps, be seen as one way of constructing an opposition between rhetoric and violence. Rhetoric, at least the "legitimate" rhetoric of the classic text, becomes a machine to overcome time, a transhistorical reason which can rebuke and exorcise the specter of anarchy. For Arnold, that "anarchy" was embodied in the crowd which tore down the railings of Hyde Park, thus erasing the boundaries between order and disorder, between a culture enclosed like the Park and the limitless horizons of chaos" (qtd. in Stallybrass 45).

In this context "Cutlture" of rhetoric regularizes the languages. "Conventional" political activities and "a social and political protest" can be some examples of violence in the current "Carnavalesque discourses." Stallybrass talks about anarchy and culture and further analyses carnivalesque as a set of the rhetorical practices. In his opinion, the replacement of the fast by feast, the transgression of the spatial barriers, transgression of bodily barriers, the inversion of hierarchy, the degrading of the sacred and the transgression of the linguistic hierarchy are the major carnivalesque practices which include like showing the parts of the body, acting like servant ruling the masters, children ruling the parents and the wife ruling the husband and speaking in oaths, curses and obscenities (46).

Basically talking about the Robin Hood Ballad, Stallybrass puts forward the carnivalesque discourse where he shows the conflict between the "play" and the "law" between the "liberties of the forest" and social order and between the natural rights

and the law of the property. Stallybrass states about the rhetoric of violence as it is structured. He says, “The ‘play’ of carnival in the ‘jests’ of the outlaw is, at the same time, a disquisition on game laws and property. As we have argued, the ballads’ *rhetoric* of violence is structured by, even as it helps to structure, rhetoric of violence (the symbolic rituals of poaching and the destruction of enclosures)” (72).

Leonard Tennenhouse in the article “Violence done to women on the Renaissance Stage” presents “the particular form of violence directed against the aristocratic female body in the Jacobean drama” (77). In the Renaissance drama the female character is presented to show either she is tortured or murdered. Tennenhouse makes it clear in the following way:

I do not take it to be either a “real” body, or a “mere” representation of the female, but rather an actor playing the part of an aristocratic woman. That such a practice existed there can be no doubt. Around the year 1794, the dramatists of all sorts suddenly felt it appropriate to torture and murder aristocratic female characters in a shocking and ritualistic manner. The assault was quite unlike anything seen on the Elizabethan stage – even at its most Senecan. If any statement holds true about violence done to these female characters, it is that such violence is never simply violence done to them as women. It is always violence done to one occupying a particular position in the social body as it was conceived at the time. (77)

He makes a differentiation between “the social body” and “the aristocratic body”. The social body has a social image, and can have the social function whereas the aristocratic body simply acts to fulfill the interest of the aristocratic design and cannot function with a separate image or does not have any independent identity. The

“body” however is problematic to explain because in the recent years the body is replaced by “person” in the social image.

Certainly the body is involved in various activities. The “mass body” stands in opposition to the classical body or elite body. In this connection Tennenhouse makes a distinction between mass body and aristocratic body, and characterizes the body in contrast as, “Where the classical body, or what I shall call the aristocratic body, was ordered, hierarchized, impermeable, and pure, the mass body was open and protruding, riotous, heterogeneous, sensual, and renewable” (78).

Violence to women in the Renaissance tragedy was common or rather. In the political hierarchy “the aristocratic female was automatically superior to a man from the lower ranks. Within the aristocratic body, however, she occupied a position of lesser degree in relation to the male of the same station” (Tennenhouse 78). The most common thing about the Renaissance tragedy is that the female character is “threatened with mutilation, rape, or murder. Her torture and death provide the explicit and exquisite denouement and centerpiece of the play in question” (Tennenhouse 79).

The criticism of the past has done very little to account for the pervasiveness of violence. In the Renaissance tragedy “the body of the aristocratic female was the centerpiece of the spectacles of violence on stage. . .” (79). Basically, the queen would be the centre of attraction and the whole actions moved round her. Tennenhouse further continues:

She constantly encouraged an equation to be made between the health of her body, its wellbeing and integrity, and that of the state. During her reign, this iconic identification between the queen’s body and the land was such that the violence done to one was the same as violence

to other. Thus the theater regularly staged scenes of violence and murder to materialize an opposition to the monarch over which monarchy asserted its order. (79)

Whether it is the position of Gertrude in Hamlet or in any other Elizabethan tragedy, the female character is either a natural body or a political one and violence upon the female body mostly gives political meaning which has no contradiction with the patriarchal cultural practices. The aristocratic women had a big influence in politics of the time and their presentation on the stage also was significant. Violence upon women was meaningful as well as cathartic.

Foucault's Theory of Power and Violence

The career of Michel Foucault (1926-84) epitomizes the radical questioning of the transcendental concept of truth in the post-Derridean era. Derrida, with his concepts of difference and logocentrism, had questioned the logocentric notion of truth, which, from Plato downward, conceived it as something that guaranteed its presence from within the structure of the text. Derrida, however, showed that the guarantor of the presence in some way also transcended the text's structurality. He contended that the meaning of a certain text could be derived insofar as it was perceived as something different from all other texts, and also insofar as the meaning could be postponed until another meaning could be derived from the same text.

Foucault is a celebrated French thinker who challenged people's old assumptions about mental illness in his most influential work *Madness and Civilization*. Madness for Foucault is a truth, a fact, an experience, a self-mystification, a self-realization, an absence, an oblivion, and a form of social tactics and strategy that David Cooper examines cursorily through Foucault's book *Madness*

and Civilization. Writing the introduction to the book *Madness and civilization*

Cooper says:

Foucault knows very well and expresses with erudition and stylistic power the nature of the violence that mental patients meet. He portrays the devastation that has been brought about in the immense area of mad, or supposedly mad, experience and behavior by the deforming influence of a pseudo-medical perspective. Foucault makes it quite clear that the invention of madness as a disease is in fact nothing less than a peculiar disease of our civilization. (Introduction VIII)

Cooper says that Foucault's work upon anti-psychiatric research into schizophrenia according to which "people do not in fact go mad, but are driven mad by others who are driven into the position of driving them mad by a peculiar convergence of social pressures" (Preface VIII). People are driven mad by complicated social circumstances and pressures.

Power, Violence and the Manipulation of Truth

Michel Foucault's famous interview on "Truth and Power" manifests the core concept of his theoretical and philosophical proposition of truth. Whether it is his proposition of "Archeology" or of "Genealogy" or even of sexuality, his interpretation of history and truth is more or less propelling around power. The movement of history or the meaning of truth is decided by power. Power manipulates history and determines the truth.

In his concept "Archeology" is the origin of human civilization. "Genealogy implies development or change and Foucault's interests had always been nothing if not historical and concerned with material events" (Hazard Adams 1134). Foucault's

investigations of “Archeology” are “descriptive,” whereas “Genealogical” investigations are “explanatory”.

Foucault realized the political status of science on its ideological basis. In those days when Foucault was tending to write, nobody realized the importance of medicine and psychiatry. In the post Stalinist Marxists discourse, the questions like “the power effects of psychiatry or the political function of medicine” (1135) were not actually realized. Foucault claims that, “The price Marxists paid for their fidelity to the old positivism was a radical deafness to a whole series of questions posed by science” (Hazard Adams 1135). Even the left politicians in France were forbidden to talk about “psychiatric politics and psychiatry as politics” and only a few doctors discussed such questions.

Power, Civilization, and Madness

Foucault’s *Madness and Civilization* (1967) also explains that various types of madnnesses in the human history have appeared that have determined the courses of human civilization.

Foucault draws the history of civilization in the periphery of madness. In course of human civilization, people have shown madness of different kinds. Some people go mad because they are deprived of privileges; they are the victims of power. Some other people go mad because they use excessive power. Power, arrogance, ambition and selfishness take them to the height of madness. Most of the violent actions caused by the state in the direction of the tyrannical dictators upon the people is the result of the power craze. At first they use violence for power possession. Then again they use violence for power continuation and still again they continue violence for suppression, enslavement and enjoyment.

Ideology of Power and Violence

Violence is mostly founded on power and the power makes its ideology to justify its course of action. The whole history of mankind has been set in the framework. In the process of defining and redefining the relationship between text and context, George Mariscal in his article “The Other Quixote” writes, “Violence, Power, Ideology, Discourse: these are words that have enchanted literary scholars in recent years. Taken together, they constitute a field of critical practice which, in its rejection of formalizing of any type, proposes to redefine the relationship between text and context” (98).

Truly to say violence has been one of the most popular discourses in the literary texts. Murders, rapes, seductions, conflicts, assaults, and clashes have been the popular contents of talks under violence. Mariscal further writes:

For not only do literary texts often represent and reveal the workings of violence, power, and the like, but these same texts (and their grouping together as canon) are always conceived and produced by an economy of exclusion, conflict, and rivalry itself inextricably caught up in a wider network of social interests and relations. (98)

Teresa de Lauretis in a critical essay “The Violence of rhetoric: Considerations on representation and gender” talks about the significant historical turns in the theories of criticism and philosophical understanding. The emergence of Nietzsche and Derrida’s concepts brought a kind of development in the philosophical position with the solutions to many enigmatic problems and unanswered questions. Nietzsche’s suggestions about woman as the symbol of Truth and Derrida’s location of the rhetoric or the rhetorical functions of “difference” as displacement, negativity, internal exclusion or marginality of the recent “philosophical speculation” brought a radical mode in the philosophical patterns of critical thinking. The feminist thinking

has become a gender question “– of the social construction of ‘woman’ and ‘man’ and the semiotic production of subjectivity” (Lauretis 240). The social reality as the “outer world” and subjectivity in as the “inner reality” are termed by Pierce to make these points clearer.

The rhetoric of violence is not simply a language for discourse; it has to discuss the social practice of violence too. The connection between violence and rhetoric will slide down and soon after they become reversible. About discourse and practice of violence, Teresa de Lauretis writes ahead, “The very notion of ‘rhetoric of violence’ presupposes that some order of language, some kind of discursive representation is at work not only in the concept ‘violence’ but in the social practices of violence as well. The (semiotic) relation of the social to the discursive is thus posed from the start” (240).

Teresa de Lauretis continues to say with more explanation of the idea further about rhetoric and violence. The writer compares her ideas with others, basically with that of Foucault and Derrida:

I will contend that both view of the relation between rhetoric and violence contain and indeed depend on the same representation of sexual difference, whether they assume the “fact” of gender or, like Derrida, deny it; and, further, that the representation of violence is inseparable from the notion of gender, even when the latter is explicitly “deconstructed” or, more exactly, indicated as “ideology.” I contend, in short, that violence is engendered in representation. (240)

“Child abuse,” “spouse abuse” or “marital violence” are some of the forms of “family violence.” Sociologists and historians agree that family violence is a social problem. Feminist writers, clinicians and some male empirical researchers have

failed to analyze the family violence in terms of family, power and gender “For Breines and Gordon maintain, violence between intimates must be seen in the wider context of social power relations; gender is absolutely central to the family” (qtd. in Lauretis 240).

They refute

. . . the idea that all violence is on similar origin, whether that origin be located in the individual (deviance) in an abstract, transhistorical notion of the society (“a sick society”). And they counter the dominant representation of violence as a “breakdown in social order” by proposing instead that violence is a sign of a power struggle for the *maintenance* of a certain kind of social order. (241-42)

In the cases of mother-son incest and father-daughter incest, the sexual assailants are mostly the males. The so-called male supremacy is a reason for this sexual violence. The “rhetorical function of gender-neutral expressions such as ‘spouse abuse’ or ‘marital violence’ in which ‘both spouses’ may equally engage in battering the other’ . . .” (242) can be one of such examples of the representation of violence in intimate relationship.

“Power relations,” “power and resistance,” “power network” are some of the terms frequently involved for the interpretation of violence. There is an interplay of the terms like “rhetoric of violence” and “violence of rhetoric” which looks paradoxical but is closely interwoven and concurrently functioning. Teresa de Lauretis sums up Foucauldian concepts of power relations and further says:

However, it is power, not resistance or negativity, that is the positive condition of knowledge. Far from being an agency of repression, power is a productive force that weaves through the social body as a network of discourses and generates simultaneously forms of knowledge and forms

of subjectivity or what we call social subject. Here, one would think, the rhetoric of power and the power of rhetoric are one and the same thing.

(242)

Writing an introduction to the book *Critical Theory Since Plato* (1992), Hazard Adams says that Foucault is concentrated on the explanation of power. Unless and until the power relation is properly located, things remain incomprehensible or unexplained. The question of power comes before the issue of language or literature. Foucault makes a departure from other writers on whether power comes first or the writing. In this connection Adams talks about Foucault, “Foucault also wrote on language, but he eschewed the prison-house notion of it, favoring a theory in which ‘power’ is prior to language. The trace of structuralism in his work is the notion of ‘relations’ of power as the dominating force in societies” (Adams 7).

The sense of power is inherent. Writing also is nothing but a systematic presentation of power that is disguised. Writing exposes the power relation between controller and the controlled. Edward Said understands Foucault’s notion, “Foucault’s contention is that the fact of writing itself is a systematic conversion of the power relation between controller and controlled into “mere” written words-but writing is a way of disguising the awesome materiality of so tightly controlled and man-aged a production” (1219). The power relation between the controller and the controlled guides literary and creative productions.

Sexual Discourse and Power Relations

For Foucault sex is a topic of discourse. Sex is central to law, liberty and sovereignty and also “seemingly one of the most forbidden areas of our lives and bodies” (Armstrong & Tennenhouse 243). Teresa de Lauretis writes,

Sexuality, then, is not a property of bodies or something originally existent in human beings, but the product of that technology. What we call sexuality, Foucault states, is “the set of effects produced in bodies, behaviors, and social relations” by the deployment of “a complex political technology” (1980: 127), which is to say, by the deployment of sexuality. The analysis is in fact circular; however, attractive or fitting. Sexuality is produced discursively (institutionally) by power, and power is produced institutionally (discursively) by the deployment of sexuality . . . nothing escapes from the discourse of power, nothing exceeds the totalizing power of discourse. His conclusion, therefore, is at best paradoxical. ‘We must not think that by saying yes to sex, one says no to power The rallying point for the counter attack against the deployment of sexuality ought not to be sex – desire, but bodies and pleasures’ (1980: 157) as if bodies and pleasures existed. (243)

Lauretis further makes the point clear by referring to Foucault about desexualizaion of rape, and argues that rape is rather a question of violence than a sexual act as it is said, “Foucault proposed that rape should be treated as an act of violence like any other, an act of aggression rather than as a sexual act” (244).

Some feminists are against taking rape as violence and think it as a matter of sexuality or as a normal part of heterosexuality. When someone is involved in rape, his sexual oppression of women has been legitimized. In the same context de Lauretis says:

As Monique Plaza put it, it is a matter of “our costs and their benefits.” For what is rape if not a sexual practice, she asks, an act of *sexual* violence? While it may not be exclusively practiced on women, rape is

sexual essentially because it rests on the very social difference between the sexes It is *social sexing* which is latent in rape. If men rape women, it is precisely because they are women in social sense”; and when a male is raped, he too is raped (244)

The idea of sexual violence from the feminist point of view is different from Foucault’s intellectual concept. The feminists oppose such concepts which plunder women and still claim that they are not sexually victimized. Rape for Foucault is some thing like a physical violence not a sexual crime. Teresa de Lauretis assimilates both the types of arguments: one a philosophical and the other sexual:

In the term of Foucault’s theoretical analysis, his proposal may be understood as an effort to counter the technology of sex by breaking the bond between sexuality and crime; an effort to enfranchise sexual behaviors from legal punishment, and so to render the sexual sphere free from interventions by the state. Such a form of “local resistance” on behalf of the men imprisoned on, or subject to, charges of rape, however, would paradoxically but practically work to increase and further to legitimize the *sexual* oppression of women. (244)

De Lauretis analyses sexual oppressions, rapes and violence from different approaches and refers to Monique Plaza’s sexual violence and Foucault’s proposal about sexuality and says that the solution is still a complication. De Lauretis writes, “To speak against sexual penalization and repression, in our society, is to uphold the sexual oppression of women or, better, to uphold the practices and institutions that produce ‘woman’ in terms of the sexual and then oppression in terms of gender” (245).

Plaza and Foucault have sharp political confrontation regarding the use of rhetoric of violence because Foucault seems “to defend the rights of the rapists . . . from the position of potential rapist that you are ‘subjected’ to by your status as a man” (245). By understanding the mechanics of power in social relations and the discourses about the techniques and strategies of gender, it is argued that, “violence is engendered” (245). The question of family violence came into existence when it became the part of the discourse of social science. Rape has been defined as a matter of violence or crime and side-by-side it is interpreted as a matter of heterosexuality.

Summarizing Foucault, Charles Sanders Peirce, Monique Plaza, Breines and Gordon, Teresa de Lauretis gather some terms involved in the violence of rhetoric such as: “signifier and signified,” “inner world” and “outer world” objectivity and subjectivity, emotional interpretant objectivity and subjectivity *emotional* interpretant energetic interpretant, logical interpretant etc. to justify the point that “violence is not simply ‘in’ language or in representation, but it is also thereby engendered” (Lauretis 249).

Violence is not only a muscular exertion but also an exertion upon the inner world or a mental effort. De Lauretis refers to Rene Girard’s classification of violence as the “violence of reciprocity” or the violence of “rivalry” (qtd. in Lauretis 250) while talking about the relations and rituals between people. A kind of war or sport arises in mind about the exchange of violence between the “subject” and the “object” engaged either in “reciprocity” or in “rivalry.” Teresa de Lauretis maintains in this connection, “For the subject of the violence is always, by definition, masculine, ‘man’ is by definition the subject of culture and of any social act” (250).

Teresa de Lauretis goes back to trace the roles of female characters in the mythical text. The female characters have always been defamed or underestimated.

They are either presented as the central causes of violence or the characters to intentionally generate violence. Lauretis writes:

In the mythical text, then, the hero must be male regardless of the gender of the character, because the obstacle, whatever its personification (sphinx or dragon, sorceress or villain), is morphologically female – and, indeed, simply the womb, the earth, the space of his movement. As he crosses the boundary and “penetrates” the other space, the mythical subject is constructed as human being and as male; he is the active principle of culture, the establisher of distinction, the creator of differences. Female is what is not susceptible to transformation, to life or death, she (it) is an element of plot-space, a topos, a resistance, matrix, and matter. (251)

Female’s role is generally minimized. She is either treated as an evil character or simply like a material. She is neither a culture bearer nor a culture maker. She remains either passive or from behind the curtain active whether it is the “inscription of violence” into the representation of gender in the artistry of Sophocles in Oedipus or in the practice of Cuna incantation performed to facilitate difficult childbirth, “woman is mother and nature, matrix and matter” (Lauretis 251). Even when the female is presented as a goddess or a spirit or totemic ancestor, she is simply in the “possession of woman’s body and soul”. Thus Lauretis stresses on “the discourse of the sciences of man constructs the object as female and the female as object. This, I suggest, is its rhetoric of violence, even when the discourse presents itself as humanistic, benevolent or well intentioned” (253). It is frequently objected that the woman is treated as a commodity or as an object, which cannot be defended.

Sex, Violence, and the Power of the Woman

Camille Paglia draws an allusion from Rousseau's *The Social Contract* (1762) and says that Feminism is based upon Rousseau's thought; however it has been realized only after the Second World War. As she sums up the historical idea about sex and violence in accordance with the development of feminism from Rousseau's concepts of social relations and bondages, Paglia in her book *Sex and Violence or Nature and Art* (1995) writes:

Rousseau rejects original sin, Christianity's pessimistic view of man born unclean, with a propensity for evil. Rousseau's idea, derived from Locke, of man's innate goodness led to social environmentalism, now the dominant ethic of American human services, penal codes, and behaviorist therapies. It assumes that aggression, violence, and crime come from social deprivation – a poor neighborhood, a bad home. Thus feminism blames rape on pornography and, by a smug circularity of reasoning, interprets outbreaks of sadism of a backlash to itself. But rape and sadism have been evident throughout history and, at some moment, in all cultures. (2)

Paglia seems to have been strikingly influenced by Sade. Sade has focused on the failure of Rousseauist experiment in the French Revolution, "which ended not in political Paradise but in the hell of the Reign of Terror" (2). Paglia introduces Sade as the follower of Hobbes rather than of Locke and also one of the most unread writers of the West and talks about sex, and aggression in the light of the historical concepts of modern philosophy and the development of feminism. She writes:

Aggression comes from nature; it is what Nietzsche is to call the will-to-power. For Sade, getting back to nature (the Romantic imperative that still permeates our culture from sex counseling to cereal

commercials) would be to give free rein to violence and lust . . .
 society is not the criminal but the force which keeps crime in check.
 When social controls weaken, man's innate cruelty bursts forth. The
 rapist is created not by bad social influences but by a failure of social
 conditioning. (2-3)

Paglia asserts that in the western culture all relations are exploitative and every one kills the other for his or her own survival, as Freud holds the idea that identity itself is conflict.

From ancient times woman's character has been differently depicted in the works of art. In religion woman is recognized as a significant power but in the art of tragedy female protagonists are rare. "Tragedy is a male paradigm of rise and fall, a graph in which dramatic and sexual climax are in shadowy analogy" (Paglia 9). In almost all tragedies "Tragic woman is less moral than man. Her will-to-power is naked" (10). The female characters are the victims of sexual strategies. "Woman introduces untransformed cruelty into tragedy because she is the problem that the genre is trying to correct" (10).

Actually tragedy is a male game. Paglia describes that woman suffers from nature's inhospitality. As she writes, "Tragedy's in-hospitality to woman springs from nature's in-hospitality to man. The identification of woman with nature was universal in prehistory" (10).

Woman is power. She derives power from nature or from her struggle with nature. In the ancient times the femaleness was very much honored but when crafts and commerce progressed, woman's importance was deliberately minimized. Woman stands on the edge of culture and nature. Paglia feels that the Americans have forgotten the concept of the great mother. She brings the allusions of Hindu nature

goddess Kali to justify her ideas, “The femaleness of fertility religions is always double edged. The Indian nature-goddess Kali is creator *and* destroyer, granting boons with one set of arms while cutting throats with the other. She is the lady ringed with skulls” (11). She also emphasizes that we cannot feel the sharpness of nature’s blade without shedding blood. And the power of woman is as strong as that of the nature.

The westerners forgot the female powers and their worship. In the name of conquest over geographical territories, they started their dominations upon women in the name of protections and gradually they curtailed women’s freedom. In Paglia’s words,

“Woman, at first content to accept man’s protections but now inflamed with desire for her own illusory freedom, invades man’s systems and suppresses her indebtedness to him as she steals them. By head-magic she will deny there ever was a problem of sex and nature. She has inherited the anxiety of influence” (13).

Human beings have to obey the nature’s system. The one who violates the natural rules will definitely suffer. Man has to try to live in harmony with nature; however, the nature’s system is so vigorously violent that man cannot adjust himself with it. Man has to struggle vehemently even to sustain himself. Camille Paglia shows the relation between sex, nature and woman,

Every human being must wrestle with nature. But nature’s burden falls more heavily on one sex. With luck, this will not limit woman’s achievement, that is, her action is male created social space. But it must limit eroticism, that is, imaginative lives in sexual space, which may overlap social space but is not identical with it. (13)

Paglia thinks that female and nature go in harmony with each other, whereas male

contradicts with nature. She also says that sex is the most original thing. It is not only the source of encouragement for living but also the source of violence. Sex is wild, inhumane and originally natural. Therefore sex is the most fundamental source of attachment and of violence.

Power, Sexuality, and Violence

In the *History of Sexuality Vol. 1* (1978) Foucault justifies the idea of violence in the intimate relationship even better. He presents the whole human history in the panorama of sexuality. It is the question of sexuality that has caused divisions in men. Sexuality of men and women, young girls and boys and even of children has been suppressed in one pretext and another. From ancient times these divisions, segregations and differences have been working to create sexual discrimination.

Suppression of Sexuality

In many communities women cannot easily express their sexual feeling because the religions and social precepts, state laws and moral lessons have set that expression of sexuality in general situation is sinful, immoral and shameful. The suppression of sexuality in this type is Victorian in nature, which is ruled by “our restrained, mute and hypocritical sexuality” (Foucault, *History vol.1* 3).

The décor, order, gentleness, decency, social rules and state laws were obstructions to sexuality, so that “sterile behavior carried the taint of abnormality” (4). Open sexuality, extraordinary frankness and visible practice of it deserved penalty in the 17th and 18th centuries. Moreover, child sexuality was badly ignored or suppressed, and silence was imposed. Talking about situation of those days Foucault narrates:

Everyone knew, for example, that children had no sex, which was why they were forbidden to talk about it, why one closed one’s eyes and stopped one’s ears whenever they came to show evidence to the

contrary; and why a general and studied silence was imposed. These are the characteristic features attributed to repression, which serve to distinguish it from the prohibitions maintained by penal law: repression operated as a sentence to disappear, but also an injunction to silence, an affirmation to nonexistence, and, by implication, an admission that there was nothing to say about such things, nothing to see, and nothing to know. Such was the hypocrisy of our bourgeois societies with its halting logic. (4)

So, naturally the repression of children's sexuality would be exposed in different forms either of violence or of truancy or of any secret association with sexual materials and images.

Similarly, the illegitimate sexual connections were repressed or restricted, so that if some people had any illegitimate sexuality, the best place for them to express was either the brothel or the mental hospital. The discourse too was based on gestures or codes. Everywhere else, modern Puritanism imposed its triple edict of taboo, nonexistence, and silence.

In Foucault's opinion, the last two centuries were a period of repression, restriction and imposition. Only beds were the whispering places about sexuality. Freud in the recent century brought a revolution and let the people know that the more it is repressed, the higher the tendency of its eruption. Foucault writes:

We are informed that if repression has indeed been the fundamental link between power, knowledge, and sexuality since the classical age, it stands to reason that we will not be able to free ourselves from it except at a considerable cost: nothing less than a transgression of laws, a lifting of prohibitions, an irruption of speech, a reinstating of

pleasure within reality, and a whole new economy in the mechanisms of power will be required. For the least glimmer of truth is conditioned by politics. (5)

In his expression about sexuality in relation with power, knowledge and truth, Foucault makes it clear that truth and power are guided by politics. Power guides truth in every age, and in accordance with the change of power, truth also changes. The repression of sexuality in the political and economic production showed the advent of the capitalist bourgeoisie society. In the historical context the freedom and repression of sexuality were maintained according to the characteristics of various types of social development that cannot be separated by the political and economic contexts of the time. In Foucault's observation of the historical panorama in different ages, repression is a bourgeois social order. Foucault argues, "By placing the advent of the age of repression in the seventeenth century, after hundreds of years of open spaces and free expression, one adjusts it to coincide with the development of capitalism: it becomes an integral part of the bourgeoisie order" (5).

Nothing is more rigorous than the repression of sex. It cannot easily be deciphered how important sex and sexual freedom are and how important it is their political implications. For some the discourse on sex might be trivial and base, but sex is something so important that it influences power. The significance of sex and sexuality and its freedom has now been realized. It will be more important in future because, ". . . the bitterness of history prevents most of us from putting side by side: revolution and happiness; or revolution and a different body, one that is newer and more beautiful; or indeed, revolution and pleasure" (7). The truth, the beauty, the delight and the enlightenment and knowledge have been often suppressed by power. There is always an attempt to repress the talks about sex, and also the attempt to "eliminate the effects of

repression” (7).

Foucault on Repressive Hypothesis

Foucault raises serious doubts on repressive hypothesis. He thinks whether this repression is a historical consequence or prohibition, censorship and denial are the exercise of power. There was a historical rupture between the age of repression and its critical analysis. The doubts against “repressive hypothesis” have presented how the discourses of sex are used in the last few centuries. Sex has been one of the forms of power of which “refusal, blockage, and invalidation, but also incitement and intensification are in short, the polymorphous techniques of power (11). The power that comes from sex and sexuality is firmly established in our socio-political situations. The falsehoods that overshadow the truth will be unveiled by the “will to knowledge” and it has been more reduced in the modern epoch. Denials, censorships and defenses are used for the repression of sexual discourse. In the historical survey Foucault locates the period of time that sexual discourses were restricted from the end of the sixteenth century.

Foucault writes:

A first survey made from this view point seems to indicate that since the end of the sixteenth century, the “putting into discourse of sex,” far from undergoing a process of restriction, on the contrary has been subjected to a mееfranism of increasing incitement; that the techniques of power exercised over sex have not obeyed a principle of rigorous selection, but rather one of the dissemination and implantation of polymorphous sexualities; and that the will to knowledge has not come to a halt in the face of a taboo that must not be lifted, but has persisted in constituting – a science of sexuality. (13)

Foucault’s introduction to *The History of Sexuality: Volume I* “We Other

Victorians” draws historical references of different periods and shows that the more civilized we claim to be, the more narrow-minded we have been. The classical age was quite liberal about the sexual discourses whereas the Middle Ages and the Renaissance too were not strict but from the seventeenth century the discourses upheld restriction, prohibition, censorships, denials, refusals, invalidation and definition, and natural sex and sexuality got repressed, perverted and corrupt.

In his repressive hypothesis under “The Incitement to Discourse” Foucault clarifies many confusions and shows how repression of sexuality got gradually overcome. Mostly he focuses on the idea that the ancient society had the freedom of sex and sexual discourses. The periods between the seventeenth century and nineteenth century were tough on sexual discourses. All the suppressions and oppressions became possible in the name of decorum, system, chastity and civilization. Sexual oppressions and violence were undertaken under the protection of strict laws and social systems. Foucault says:

The seventeenth century, then, was the beginning of an age of repression emblematic of what we call the bourgeois societies, an age which perhaps we still have not completely left behind. Calling sex by its name thereafter became more difficult and more costly. As if in order to gain mastery over it in reality, it had first been necessary to subjugate it at the level of language, control its free circulation in speech, expunge it from the things that were said, and extinguish the words that rendered it too visibly present. (17)

People did not talk of sex due to prohibitions. Silences and censorships were so heavily imposed that sometimes it tended to explode through rigorous actions and

discourses, but many things were either removed or codified. Even if the talks were allusive and metaphorical, it was also said that they could not be strictly used in some certain circumstances. Foucault says, “A control over enunciations as well: where and when it was not possible to talk about such things became much more strictly defined; in which circumstances, among which speakers, and within which social relationships” (18).

Even the symbolic talks could be based on circumstances, speakers and social relationships, so that the repression of sexuality was much guided by the impositions of certain rules. The “illicit” discourses of sex were widely used, and sometimes the indecent speech offended the decorum and had the counter-effect. The curtailing of the expression of sexual desire would get expression in daydreams, imaginations, perceiving of the images, and having the complicity between body and mind for its satisfaction. Sometimes with much restriction the relations between parents and children, masters and servants and teachers and students were maintained as the areas of silence for such talks.

People used the economy and politics of language even in restrictions. Naturally such discourses gathered momentum from the eighteenth century onward. As it is said in Foucault’s book, “There was a steady proliferation of discourses concerned with sex-specific discourses, different from one another both by their form and by their object: a discursive ferment that gathered momentum from the eighteenth century onward” (18). In the recent decades sex has been a popular subject of intellectual discourse.

Beauty of Sex and its Discourses

Sex in the true sense is a rhythm, a self-examination, penance for all sins and more so, as Foucault says, “the insinuations of the flesh: thought, desires, voluptuous

imaginings, delectations, combined movement of the body and soul: henceforth all this had to enter, in detail, into the process of confession and guidance” (19).

Sexual discourse alone gives vent to the desire, the memory, dreams and emotions. It gives expurgation to all sins, perversions and trivial matters of consciousness. Sex is associated with the interplay of innumerable pleasure, sensations and thoughts through body and soul even in the religious concept of Christianity. The restrictions were absolutely artificial that the seventeenth century society contrived. Its use in literature was termed “scandalous.” Likewise, “Victorian Puritanism” imposed restrictions to sexual discourses, and silence prevailed, which was an accident in the historical development. Foucault says, “The historical accident would consist rather of the reticences of “Victorian Puritanism”: at any rate, they were a digression, a refinement, a tactical diversion is the great process of transforming sex into discourse” (22).

Sexual discourses reduce sexual crimes. The sexuality of children can be well articulated if interactions are held with them. Expression of sexuality is the psychological treatment for many nervous disorders. Since the middle of the nineteenth century discourses of sex were realized to be necessary and consequently many juicy discourses were produced. Foucault often blames the social traditions and values that the 17th and 18th centuries developed against sex and sexuality that was regression or a halt in the movement of civilization. The discourse on sex should be like the discourses of other branches and disciplines of knowledge, and it too has to be institutionalized without making it become perverted. Talking about the trends of the 18th centuries, Foucault writes:

Sex was driven out of hiding and constrained to lead a discursive existence. From the singular imperialism that compels everyone to transform their sexuality into a perpetual discourse, to the manifold mechanisms which, in the areas of economy, pedagogy, medicine, and justice, incite, extract, distribute, and institutionalize the sexual discourse, an immense verbosity is what our civilization has required and organized.

(33)

Therefore, the realization, the need of the time, the requirement of discourses in all pedagogies and disciplines, the economic and political pressures and discourses, institutionalizations pave way for the favorable situation of sex and sexual discourses are that institutionalizations of sexual discourse will pave way for the favorable situation of sex.

Sexual Proliferation and Perversion

The words were forbidden, a certain list of vocabulary was censored and the expression of sexuality was considered indecent. But the proliferation of discourses developed quantitatively. Foucault writes under “The Perverse Implantation”:

Through the various discourses, legal sanctions against minor perversions were multiplied; sexual irregularity was annexed to mental illness; from childhood to old age, a norm of sexual development was defined and all the possible deviations were carefully described; pedagogical controls and medical treatments were organized; around the least fantasies, moralists, but especially doctors brandished the whole emphatic vocabulary of abomination. (36)

The development of sex and sexual discourses took a different course. The use of such talks was multiplied to the maximum degree from the height of which reduction was not possible. If there had been natural development of sexuality, it would have come to the natural level of discursive practice, but the 17th and 18th century blocked the flow, the break of which over flooded the discourse. Foucault writes, “The nineteenth century and our own (twentieth century) have been rather the age of multiplication: a dispersion of sexualities, a strengthening of their disparate forms, a multiple implantation of ‘perversions’. Our epoch has initiated sexual

heterogeneities” (37).

Power, Pleasure and Punishment

Power and pleasure are closely related to each other. Pleasure comes from the exercise of power. There are *perpetual spirals of power and pleasure*. Foucault’s *Discipline and Punish* (1975) brings the most heart-rending aspects and examples of killings and tortures that characterize and delineate the violence in the relationship either of intimacy or animosity. Damiens, the regicide as well as parricide, was condemned before the main door of the church of Paris on 2 March 1757 whose hands were burnt with sulphur, the flesh of his breasts, arms, thighs and calves were torn with hot pincers, then his body was dragged by the horse carts and boiling potion was poured over each wound. Foucault maps out the situation, “Monsieur Le Breton, the clerk of the court, went up to the patient several times and asked him if he had anything to say. He said he had not; at each torment, he cried out, as the damned in the hell are supposed to cry out, ‘Pardon, my God! Pardon, Lord’” (Foucault, *Discipline* 4).

Samson, the executioner reported to the clerk about every torture and the words of pain that he uttered according to which the sufferer underwent all pains and simply repeated “Pardon, my Lord,” kissing the crucifix that he was holding. He was not a bit convinced even by the confessors. Everybody failed to make him confess, but when he totally denied, his body was cut deep asunder.

It shows how costly and dreadful an attempt of killing a member of the royal family could be for a royal relative too, because he could not have the control and command over royal power. If the king in power had done the killing, his action would have been glorified, and he would have been mostly valorized. The styles of punishment systems changed in the west with the development of the penal codes.

The tortures and punishment were made gradually less ferocious and were also based on justice. The punishment ceremonies were abolished by the substitutions of laws and penal rules, and public execution and retaliation were discouraged, because public execution is the worst form of violence. “The public execution is now seen as a hearth in which violence bursts again into flame” (9). Foucault further writes:

Punishment, then, will tend to become the most hidden part of the penal process. This has several consequences: it leaves the domain of more or less every day perception and enters that of abstract consciousness; its effectiveness is seen as resulting from its inevitability, not from its visible intensity; it is the certainty of being punished and not the horrifying spectacle of public punishment that must discourage crime; the exemplary mechanics of punishment changes its mechanisms. As a result, justice no longer takes public responsibility for the violence that is bound up with its practice. If it strikes, if it kills, it is not as a glorification of its strength, but as an element of itself that is obliged to tolerate, that it finds difficult to account for. The apportioning of blame is redistributed: in punishment-as-spectacle a confused horror spread from the scaffold; it enveloped both executioner and condemned; and although it was always ready to invert the shame inflicted on the victim into pity or glory, it often turned the legal violence of the executioner into shame. (9)

Punishment is not a good thing of the society, because both punished and punishment givers do not have any good feelings. “It is ugly to be punishable but there is no glory in punishing” (10).

Therefore, some autonomous bodies should decide the punishment.

Punishment by ways of gallows, pillory, scaffolding, flogging and other such forms of several types have been substituted by “imprisonment, confinement, forced labor, penal servitude, prohibition from entering certain areas, deportation – which have occupied so important a place in modern penal systems are ‘physical’ penalties: unlike fines, for example, they directly affect the body” (11).

Even then these punishments of the modern system are different from the public executions. However the punishment-body relation is still continued because body is the instrument that upholds both liberty as well imprisonment. The body, according to this penalty, is caught up in a system of constraints and privations, obligations and prohibitions. “Physical pain, the pain of the body itself, is no longer the constituent element of the penalty” (11). Actually punishment on legal and logical ground is something that suspends the rights of a man for a certain period of time which itself is painful and even unbearable. Even the executioners are held by the injection of tranquillizers and the doctors watch the upholder till the last minute, so that the physical pains are not reduced. The punishment system has drastically and dramatically changed so much so that “A Utopia of Judicial reticence: take away life, but prevent the patient from feeling it; deprive the prisoner of all rights, but do not inflict pain; impose penalties free of all pain” (11).

The legal system, the laws of morality and experience taught mankind about the development of new methods of punishment. In the underdeveloped countries or in the countries where judicial system has yet to be refined or improved, punishment may be still barbarous. But in the west, generally in the European countries, it has been much changed on the strength of morality, conscience and experiences. “The modern rituals of execution attest to this double process: the disappearance of the spectacle and the elimination of pain” (11).

Foucault shows in his book *Discipline and Punish* under “The body of the condemned”:

There are no longer any of those combinations of tortures that were organized for the killing of regicides, or of the kind advocated, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, by the anonymous author of *Hanging not Punishment Enough* (1701), by which the condemned man would be broken on the wheel, then flogged until he fainted, then hung up with chains, then finally left to die slowly of hunger. There are no longer any of those executions in which the condemned man was dragged along on a hurdle (to prevent his head smashing against the cobble-stones), in which his belly was opened up, his entrails quickly ripped out, so that he had time to see them, with his own eyes, being thrown of the fire; in which he was finally captivated and his body quartered. The reduction for these thousand deaths to strict capital punishment defines a whole new morality concerning the act of punishing. (12)

In the following days and years the French system developed the hanging machine and guillotine and naturally reduced the pains, which in course of time were also, abolished from practice. By now the stories of such punishments and executions are in the dreadful memory of human history.

Birth of Clinic and Traditional Power

The outgrowth of anything new has usually volcanic nature. The eruption takes place only after the development in the background becomes complete. There are long prehistoric undercurrents in which situations are prepared. The birth of clinic too passed the same process. The conceptualization of clinic was the result of revolution

as an alternative to the priest. Foucault felt that doctors were to the body what priests were to the soul. In this sense the power of the priest was challenged by the birth of the clinic that Foucault talks in his *The Birth of the Clinic* (1963). The clinic came to replace the old traditional power. The concept is to establish the medical science over the unorganized and abstract spiritual healings of the priests. The emergence of hospitals was not only a relief in the development of medical science but also a replacement of light against darkness. In the “Introduction” to his book *The Birth of the Clinic* (1963) Foucault says, “The residence of truth in the dark center of things is linked, paradoxically, to this sovereign power of the empirical gaze that turns their darkness into light. All light has passed over into the thin flame of the eye, which now flickers around solid objects and, in so doing, establishes their place and form” (xv).

For Foucault knowledge is not always historic or aesthetic. Knowledge is mostly organized in the rational order. The birth and the development of clinic too have the same course. In this process language plays the most important role. The power of fantasies and assumptions comes from language.

In clinical analysis, it is very important to understand the relationship of the doctors and patients. The doctor’s “intervention is an act of violence if it is not subjected strictly to the ideal ordering of nosology” ... (7). The doctor does not simply observe the patient’s body but looks through many invisible things from the minute associations of things to the feelings. He naturally has to pass through the power of his observation and control to the process of violence.

The Rhetoric of Violence

Teresa de Lauretis amalgamates the concepts of “rhetoric of violence” or “violence of rhetoric” and gender questions from the mythical text to the post modern theoretical interpretation of “psycho-social-sexual behavior” based on the theories and discourses of Sigmund Freud, Michael Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Levi Strauss, Frederic

Nietzsche, Gayatri Spivak, Monique Plaza and others. Almost all the discourses in one way or the other emphasize on male supremacy, and male centrism. The theories and discourses try to raise some aspects of feminism lopsiding into the other. The gender concepts are not balanced. Although the theories try to be impartial, the lopsidedness is deeply hidden. Teresa de Lauretis draws a reference of Foucault's concept of the rhetoric of violence:

From the Foucauldian notion of a rhetoric of violence, an order of language which speaks violence – names certain behaviors and events as violent, but not others, and constructs, and objects and subjects of violence, and hence violence as a social fact – it is easy to slide into the reverse notion of language which, itself, produces violence. But if violence in language, before if not regardless of its concrete occurrence in the world, then there is also a violence of rhetoric, or what Derrida has called “the violence of the letter.” . . . (240)

Sally Ann H. Ferguson in an article “Christian Violence and the Slave Narrative” manifests how violence was undertaken upon the slave even under the Christian veils. The abolitionists wanted to abolish slavery and all sorts of violence upon them. However the monstrosity of power, class and the craze for the accumulation of property caused the Christian slave masters to undertake atrocities upon the slaves in Europe and America. The slave tradition dates back to time immemorial, and the pains and tortures upon the slaves are countless and unspeakable, even then we can categorize the types and relations as Ferguson throws light briefly on the general American tradition:

Most readers of slave narratives quickly recognize the central role that violence played in maintaining the institution of American slavery and

fostering the concomitant growth of American economic, political and military power. These folk narratives provide graphic accounts of American and African American kidnappings, horrendous journeys across the middle passage to slave markets, grueling riverboat trips and forced marches to plantations, and myriad other physical and emotional abuses sadistically inflicted for centuries on African descendants by American nation builders. (Davidson & Moon 297)

In the European and American traditions, the slaves were kidnapped from African lands. They were sold from persons to persons and were used like animals. They were embarked to America far away from their homelands. They were forced to work hard. They were mercilessly tortured even to death. Some Black women were married to the White men and the children born to them were used for light works. The inhuman treatments given to the slaves have darkened human history. The white men used the most atrocious type of violence upon the slaves whether they were closely related to their masters or not. When the abolitionists launched the movements about the abolition of the slaves, the cessationists countered them. The cessationists threatened the government that they would cease to remain within the American Union. Many leaders failed to declare freedom for the slaves. Finally, Abraham Lincoln dared to sign the *Emancipation Proclamation* that resulted into Lincoln's assassination, and also almost to the division of the Union. In course of slavery violence was undertaken to the most hateful stage. Toni Morrison's novel *Beloved* depicts the situation of slavery in which a mother kills her own daughter so as to avoid her from being a slave. That shows that slavery is worse than death.

The abolitionists said that it was against Christianity to keep the slaves, but the slave owners looked into the myths and history of the Christian and pre-Christian

ages and brought the references of slave owning tradition. They said that even gods used slaves and tried to justify torture and violence upon the slaves.

Jacques Derrida in his essay “Violence and Metaphysics: An Essay on the thought of Emmanuel Levinas” writes that philosophy died or one day it is destined to die. Philosophy cannot solve many problems and has no future too, but thought has its future and “future itself has a future” (Derrida 98) and it shows that there is a clash between philosophy and non-philosophy. Derrida says:

that philosophy died one day, within history, or that it has always fed on its own agony, on the violent way it opens history by opposing itself to nonphilosophy, which is its past and its concern, its death and wellspring: that beyond death, or dying nature, of philosophy, perhaps even because of it, thought still has a future,... (97).

Derrida holds that philosophy begins from questions and dies in question. There is a community of questions, a commandment of questions associated with philosophy. Derrida says there is, “The difference between philosophy as a power and adventure of the question itself and philosophy as a determined event or turning point within this adventure” (99).

Parallel to Hegel's 'Dialectics' are Husserl's “Phenomenology” and Heidegger's “Ontology,” which appeal to tradition untraditionally. In course of time thought is coming up and thought is fished out from the unconscious knowledge. The consciousness of crisis for Husserl is but provisional. In Kant and in Descartes, Greek thoughts are accomplished as "Philosophy of Science" (107). It is “the Greek element, the Greek thought of Being, the thought of Being whose irruption or call produced Greece” (105). But the thought of Emanuel Levinas is “not the thought of Being, but something that can make us tremble” (101). It is probably the thought of

dispossession, seduction, dislocation and destruction, which is a departure from Greek thought.

The concepts of dialectical and historical materialism, the idea of base structure and superstructure and the thought of social and political changes are the major ideological questions of Marxism. Marxism believes that the philosophers have defined the world but the main thing is to change it. Therefore, Marxism is not simply a matter of explanation of concepts; it is a guide to action. Similarly, Marxism believes that consciousness evolves from matter. It is the result of the actions and reactions of materials. Therefore, it is believed that man's consciousness is based on the materials he is attached to. The political and social contradictions too are based on the possessions of materials and deprivations from them. There is always a kind of struggle between the exploiter and the exploited for the possession of matter and power. So the Marxist literary theory and criticism also is based on the same concepts of social and political revolutions for freedom, equality and power.

The Germ Theory of Violence

Violence can be “offensive” as well as “defensive.” It may be revenge or a kind of punishment against the social contract. It may be reaction against shame, humiliation, dishonor and disrespect. It may arise from the breach of contracts and violation of rules. In this sense violence is a personal, social, economic and political phenomenon, which occupies a deep root in the human psyche in the form of shame, humiliation, frustration, anger, sense of revenge and punishment. Barak writes:

. . . perpetrators of violence may be thought of as engaging in a “defensive” reaction to some kind of real or imagined assault, injury, or harm perpetrated on or against the self, family, group, or nation. In a similar vein, state executed pain or violence is about punishing

offenders to avenge their wrongdoing and/or their victimization of others. It is also considered a defensive reaction by the community or nation-state against those violations of the “social contract” that allegedly threaten the well-being of the group. From this perspective, there is often no real difference between crime and punishment. In other words, private homicides and state-sanctioned capital punishment are reciprocal systems for the symbolic exchange of shame and honor.

(Barak 8-9)

Violent criminals are either “mad” or “bad” and criminal punishments are given for the moral justification as “retributive,” or “reformative” or “restorative,” but in reality both crime and punishment are similar in the sense that they both have the nature of violence, and it is again quite natural that violence begets violence. A victim of violence either becomes a perpetrator, or suffers from paranoia or depression. In this sense the resolution of violence has to begin from the very roots with all possible non-violent means and methods. Barak explains how violence either as crime or as punishment is often dangerous. “Some victims of violence become perpetrators, some become survivors, and others withdraw or sink further into depression, paranoia, and/or quiet desperation” (9).

It is said that man is not genetically violent. Violence neither biological nor universal nor is a product of micro-organisms but simply a result of human emotions according to Gilligan’s interpretation and analysis of violence as Gregg Barak refers to. Barak again refers to the concept in which Gilligan finds fault in the human behaviors and attitude toward other humans and says that not only in the system of the society but even at the places like prisons and mental hospital. Gilligan says, “we as a society dump the human beings whom we treat like garbage and waste products” (qtd.

in Barak 10). Even behind the prison walls the victims receive the impress of institutional and structural violence, which do not support them to go towards peaceful settlements, but inspire them for more violent practices.

Barak refers to Gilligan's germ theory of violence. The theory refuses the violent nature of man has genetic origins but posits psychopathological effects. Violent emotions develop from the relation of the social and economic systems. Barak summarizes Gilligan's germ theory of violence as:

Gilligan's germ theory of violence also examines the "water supply" as a whole or in relation to the larger social and economic systems as these exist outside of the sewer system per se according to this model, the dangerously violent are viewed as persons who carry the pathogenic emotions of violence. This model also demonstrates that it is relatively easy to identify where the violent pathogens are concentrated in society, whom they infect, and how they are grown and distributed. At the same time, it is easy to show how our social and economic arrangements are permeated with violent pathogens and how they spread the contagious disease in identifiable ways. (10)

The germ theory focuses on the elements and emotions that induce a man towards violence. Shame is one of the factors. Some other public and private sources equally contribute to the development of violence. Gilligan compares shame with tuberculosis, "just as the tubercle bacillus is necessary for but not sufficient for the development of tuberculosis" (qtd. in Barak 10). Shame becomes the cause of violence when it grows stronger.

The Monolithic Theory of Power and Violence

According to this theory monoliths possess an unlimited source of power, which cannot easily be controlled. The monolith of power uses it with the total use of the force without any control, so that violence becomes atrocious. As Gene Sharp in *The Politics of Nonviolent Action: Part One: Power and Struggle* (1984) presents, “The ‘monolith theory’ of power assumes the power of a government is a relatively fixed *quantum* (i.e. ‘a discrete unit quantity of energy’), a ‘given,’ a strong, independent, durable (if not indestructible), self-reinforcing, and self-perpetuating force” (9).

Due to these assumptions nobody can control such powers in the open conflict. Only an overwhelming threat can give the solution. In these situations the destructive power can also be used to counter the monolith. The use of explosives, massive use of warfare and even nuclear weapons are used for bringing the power of the hostile monolith to the proper size. In Sharp’s analysis:

War is based on this view of the nature of political power; faced with the actual or potential destruction of men, weapons, cities, industries, transport, communications and the like, the enemy will be forced to accept a settlement or to surrender (unless he has the greater destructive capacity). Nuclear weapons are the extreme development of the approach to control and combat based on this monolith view of the nature of political power. (9)

In this condition the regular process of changing the ownership is very much required. The regular elections are much better than any use of force. The shift of power from one person to another person or from one institution to another is very important but the question is which procedure is being used. Sharp writes:

If it were true that political power possesses the durability of a solid stone pyramid, then it would also be true that such power could only be controlled by the voluntary self-restraint of rulers . . . by changes in the “ownership” of the monolith (the state) – whether with regular procedures (such as elections), or with regular ones (regicide or coup d’etat), or by destructive violence (conventional war). The monolith view of a government’s power is quite inaccurate and ignores the nature of the power of any ruler or regime. (9)

Gene Sharp is really sharp to talk about how power plays. When somebody has unlimited and unrestricted power, he or she will use more violence. Violence becomes the system of life, and for a monolith violence alone becomes the support of the rule.

Violence and nonviolence

Martin Green compares the Indian politics and Russian literature of the time of Gandhi and Tolstoy in a book *The Origins of Nonviolence: Tolstoy and Gandhi in their Historical Setting* (1986). Both Gandhi and Tolstoy resorted to nonviolence from a violent sphere of life. Political nationalism was the only way for young Indians, however they practiced the method of nonviolence to the maximum possibility. For the Russians basically the writer of Tolstoy’s time, seeking spiritualism was the only way of life. Green writes:

Tolstoy was choosing a nonviolent way of life; but in the final analysis the arts and humanities do constitute culture’s established alternative to those life-forms which deal directly in violence. Of course, insofar as its works of art constitute one of the glories of any civilization, art lives in silent partnership and complicity with the armed forces of the state;

but the individual writer is living by the pen and not the sword. Certainly Tolstoy had not “chosen nonviolence” in the sense that Gandhi was soon to do (in *this* period, however, Gandhi, too, was living in complicity with an army – that is why he gave active support to the British Army in both the Boer War and the Zulu War). (93-94)

It shows that there is no clear boarder line between violence and nonviolence. Gandhi and Tolstoy both professed nonviolence; one in politics, another in literature, but they both lived in complicity with violence. Actually the path of nonviolence can be sometimes more violent than violence itself. Accepting violence peacefully without properly answering it, living in poor profile without any facility, boycotting the basic needs and privileges and undertaking difficulties of life with sufferings are not less violent. The question of winning sometimes is far away. Gandhi practiced the life of suffering for long and finally he achieved the political goal. Therefore, both violence and non-violence do have political significance and both are practiced with suffering. One is by making others to suffer and another is by the self-suffering.

Contestations and Explanations of Men’s Violence

All violent practices are political, however the violence upon one sex by another sex is more like interpersonal than directly political. Men’s violence against women requires definitions and explanations before analyzing and opposing it. Most of the “debates, politics, policies and interventions against men’s violence are very much about *contesting* and *contested* definitions and explanations of violence” (Hearn 14). It is dangerous to define violence through a single or particular line of explanation. The definition of violence seems to have changed in the changing context of time and place. Moreover, the actions and structures that are called violence have historical and cultural process. Every individual man, whoever he is,

can be violent and every individual woman can have experienced it. “Theories, causes and explanations can be re-used by men to explain away, excuse, justify or perpetuate men’s violences” (Hearn 14).

Theories and contestations are important to contact agencies and professions about the use of violence both by “violators and violated.” The agencies will look into the causes, types and structures of the case of violence from the views of professional explanations, or individualistic explanations or structural explanations or from all. Regarding this context Hearn writes:

The definition of violence is contested. This contestation is itself part of the process of the reproduction of and indeed opposition to violence. This process occurs differentially and unevenly in different cultural and historical contexts. It has both short-term and local dimensions and long- term historical and global dimensions. (15)

Men have practiced most of the violences upon women in intimate relationships. Women’s use of violence upon men is rare and exceptional. It is because of the male domination or the patriarchal structure of the family or because of the males access to the politics of power that men use the power of dominance and violence upon women. The cultural and historical context can also decide and explain the practice of power and violence. In a backward society very small cultural deviations or minor violations of traditional social codes can lead the situation to the commitment of violent actions. In many conservative communities the laws of the state are weaker than the traditional values and assumptions. In the advanced societies family relations are more flexible, and there is little likelihood of the commitment of violence on ordinary violations of relational ties. But the psychological perversions and motivation to crimes will push men and women to that direction in such societies also. The next chapter will

make a cursory survey of the violent practices through the writings from myth to present day literary creations.

Chapter IV

SURVEY OF INTIMATE VIOLENCE IN LITERATURE

The fourth chapter will make a cursory survey of the representation of violence in intimate relationships from myth to postmodern writings. English literary writings reflect violence in the intimate relationships. Violence between husband and wife, father and son, brother and sister, brother and brother, lover and beloved, between friends, office associates and acquaintances has been widely presented in the literary works.

Violence in Oriental Hindu Mythology

Hindu Mythology is full of the stories of violence. Violence has been the main subject matter of many oriental myths both on religious and literary grounds. All contradictions basically arise from the questions of power struggles, which lead the conflicting forces to all possible levels of violence.

Killing and Destruction in the Vishnu Purana

Of the age of Vishnu, Shiva and Brahma, there are several stories of violence. Brahma is the creator, Vishnu the operator and Shiva the destroyer. The *Vishnu Purana* tells the story of the origin of the earth and creatures. It is said that Vishnu was sleeping in the Khshir Sagar (Ocean). Out of his navel Brahma rose up sitting on a lily flower. From Vishnu's earwax two terrible monsters Madhu and Kaitav grew up. Vishnu rose up to kill them and fought for ten thousand years but failed. He then ordered them to ask for his grace but they laughed at him. Then Vishnu sought on extra vigor from Shiva and killed them. The parts of their bodies formed the earth: the blood made rivers and seas, the bones made hills and mountains and flesh made mud and stones. Then Brahma created life in the earth. The creation of the earth and life according to *Vishnu Purana* is founded on violent fights and killings. Vishnu had fought many battles and killed Hiranaksya, Hiranya Kashyapu and many other monsters who troubled gods in heaven and innocent lives on earth.

Similarly, Goddess Durga killed Mahishasur, a terribly powerful demon. Sometimes Brahma and Shiva gave very powerful life to some demons and they troubled the gods and men. Then Vishnu was invoked to kill them and sometimes Vishnu and Brahma also sought help from Shiva (Mahadeva). Vishnu had ten incarnations and Devi (Durga) had nine.

Violence in the Ramayana

The story of the *Ramayana* is not only the story of promises, obedience, veneration, devotion and sacrifices, but also the story of betrayal, tricks, war and violence. *The Ramayana* is the story of Rama's involvements in different conflicts. Rama killed many devilish monsters in the jungle for the protection of hermits. Later Rama was exiled in forest and there he killed many monsters. Rama with the help of monkeys and bears killed the invincible Ravana, the king of Lanka. The epic is full of violent events. It starts with the killing of one of the mating birds goes on its bloody course until Sita, banished by Rama, goes back to the earth. The violence in intimate relationship runs like a major theme in the ancient Hindu epic, *the Ramayan*.

Intimate Encounters in The Mahabharata

The main story of *the Mahabharata* is full of violence. The kinds of violence used in *the Mahabharata* probably include almost all major types of violence ever recorded in the world. There are a number of fantastic stories of violence in the intimate relationship based on the miraculous emergence of lord Krishna. Krishna's maternal uncle Kansa was escorting his sister Devaki to her husband Basudeva's house on a chariot. On the way he heard a voice from the sky that his sister Devaki's son would kill him. Then immediately he imprisoned his sister and her husband and ordered the guards to submit every child born out of her. Both husband and wife were chained in a small cell. Kansa forced his father to abdicate and put him in the jail.

Every time Devaki gave birth to a baby, the guard took it to Kansa. He smashed the baby down on the floor and killed it. He heard no request for mercy and went on killing every new baby. On one night on the seventh turn of child delivery, the guards heard the baby's cry. It was a girl. When the baby was taken to Kansa, he threw her down but she did not touch the ground. She flew up and told Kansa that the baby that was supposed to kill him had already been born the same night, and had gone elsewhere to stay. She said that she was Devi. Kansa was badly tense and he ordered to kill all the babies born that night. He got many babies mercilessly killed but Krishna remained untouched. In course of time, Kansa discovered the location where Krishna had been kept and ordered his sister Putana to breast-feed Krishna so that he would be killed due to her poisonous milk, but Krishna drank up her life. As a result instead Krishna, Putana died. As Krishna grew, he killed Kansa for his sins and cruelties and freed his parents and released maternal grandfather from the jail. Krishna, the lord of the Hindus, was heavily involved in the instigation of violence of the intimate relationship. He inspired Arjuna kill his kinsmen in the great battle of *the Mahabharata*. The whole of the story of *the Mahabharata* is based on violence in close relationship. Violence between friends, brothers and kinsmen is so intensely used that we can say *the Mahabharata* is the biggest epic of violence.

The fights between Pandavas and Kaurabas are intermingled with ego conflict, power conflict and many times even with class conflict. Jealousy and power conflict led both Pandavas and Kaurabas into the worst kind of violence. Kaurabas undertook the ways of conspiracies to oust Pandavas from the throne. Several times the Pandavas were put into deadly situations from which they escaped by chance and carefulness.

The Mahabharata is the finest and biggest epic in world literature. It is full of violence. Whether it is Bhisma's abduction of Amba and Ambalica or Drona's receiving the Guru's gift from Kaurabas, Pandavas and even from Eklabya or Pandavas being deprived of power and property; or Draupadi's being mistreated by Dushashana; or a fight against Kichchak at Birata's palace or of the whole eighteen days' fights at Kurukshetra, *the Mahabharata* is a magnificent book of conflict, confrontation, war and violence.

The story of *the Mahabharata* is mainly based on violence in the intimate relationship in which brother kills brother, uncle kills nephew, nephew kills uncle, grandfather, maternal uncle and seniors kill the juniors. Friends kill friends and the persons of the intimate relations. All this happens due to the struggle for the possession of power. It is equally related to the economic questions. The ethical matters of vices and virtues also lead to violence.

Another very important event in of *the Mahabharata* is the story of Krishna's offspring known as Yadubansi who are supposed to be fifty-six crores in number and who can conquer the whole world, but later confrontations arise among them and they kill one another.

The Mythology of Greece and Rome

The mythology of Greece and Rome is full of violence. The killings and conspiracies abound in every age. The ages of Cyclops, Titans, gods and the great men tell the stories of violence among friends and kinsmen.

Killings and Conspiracies before the Age of Man

The mythology of Greece and Rome is profound and rich which explains the origin of the universe and the emergence of gods. The mythology of Greeks and Romans claims that the Universe emerged from chaos and then started the generation

of Giants, Cyclops, Titans and gods came consecutively. Gaea (mother earth), Tartarus (the ruler of the underworld), and Eros (love) were the three immortal beings that emerged out of the chaos. Then Gaea created Uranus (father sky), Ourea (mountains) and Pontus (sea). Gaea, who gave birth to Uranus (father sky) without any partner married Uranus himself from whom she gave birth to three giants with hundred hands, fifty heads and fifty arms. Similarly another generation was of three Cyclops who had only one eye in the middle of the forehead. These three giants and three Cyclops were so dreadful that Uranus took them from Gaea and hurled them down into the region of Tartarus where they were bound and imprisoned. It shows that right after the time of the origin of the Universe, violence had started taking place among the intimate relations.

Then Gaea gave birth to thirteen Titans, the youngest of which was Cronus. Gaea had been really outraged by her husband's actions against her six sons: three giants and three Cyclops, for which she wanted to take revenge on Uranus. She prepared a large flint and shaped it like a stone sickle and asked all her Titan children to injure their father and free their early brothers. But none of the Titans agreed and finally she approached to her youngest son Cronus. Cronus readily obeyed his mother and waited for the suitable time to come for the action. When Uranus came to retire for the night with his wife, Cronus emasculated his father and threw the pieces into the sea. Uranus was immortal and was not dead, however he suffered from the feeling of excruciating pain. After severely maiming the father, Cronus became god of the sky but he disappointed his mother about the matter of redeeming giants and Cyclops from the dark cell of Tartarus, the underworld. Disappointed and distressed, Gaea cursed Cronus that his son would overpower him.

Every time Rhea, Cronus's wife gave birth to any child, Cronus swallowed it thinking that he would fool the destiny. On the fifth turn, Rhea delivered the baby in a deep, hidden cave of Mount Dicte in the Island of Crete according to the suggestion of her mother Gaea. There, Gaea managed to get the boy nursed by the nymphs. Rhea then brought a small rock of the size of the baby and gave it to Cronus wrapped in clothes for him to swallow and he did. But when the baby named Zeus became a boy, he lived with his mother. Cronus saw him when he took a drink from Rhea to Cronus. When he drank water, he felt it like a different drink. He felt uneasy in his stomach and vomited out all children he had swallowed.

Afterwards Zeus launched a war against Cronus and the Titans. They fought for ten years without any victory on either side. By the suggestion of Gaea, Zeus freed the hundred-handed giants and the Cyclops from the prison of Tartarus, and asked them for help in his war against the Titans. The giants and Cyclops promised for significant help and equipped Zeus and fellow gods with powerful weapons. Finally, after a long fight Zeus became successful in hurling down the Titans to the region of Tartarus and chained them in the darkness. Thereafter Zeus and the fellow gods ruled over sky, sea and the underworld.

Uranus imprisoned and tortured his own children giants and Cyclops in the dark cell of the underworld. Gaea planned for the emasculation of Uranus. Cronus injured and emasculated the body of his father Uranus. Finally Cronus and his Titan fought with gods. And gods with the help of the hundred-handed giants and Cyclops came out to be successful in hurling the Titans into Tartarus and keeping them chained in the dark and dismal cells. It shows that in the Greek and Roman mythology, violence among the beings of intimate relationship so badly took place that it has continued even to the generations of mankind.

The Birth of Heroes and Heralds for War and Violence

The Iliad and *The Odyssey* are probably the greatest works written about the ancient myth and are great assets of world literature. Both the epics are the continuation of the same story, according to which Paris, the youngest son of Priam and Hecuba, the king and queen of Troy eloped, with Helen, the wife of King Menelaus of Sparta which caused a ten year war between Troy and Sparta in which many gods and goddesses of the Greek myths were directly and indirectly involved with their blessings, curses, weapons and wishes, and many great heroes of the time fought with their marvelous gallantry and valor and killed and injured their opponents and their equals for which all the possible tricks and treacheries were undertaken. Finally Troy was destroyed, Paris was killed and Menelaus took her back to Sparta and lived with her happily thereafter. But there are different versions about Helen's position after the siege Troy. The stories of *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey* were written by Homer that manifest the extreme kinds of violence among the Greek heroes and heralds, and also there are ample examples of the events of violent actions between the persons of the close relations.

This type of violence of the intimate relationship appears right from the time when Hecuba gave birth to Paris and gave away the baby to be killed in the mountainside being influenced by the prophecy of his being likely to be the cause of the destruction of Troy. But the servants in the task of killing him left him on the mountainside to die of starvation or to be eaten up by the wild animals but was saved and raised by a shepherd couple to his manhood. Later he was recognized and brought to the palace, and his elopement with Helen became the cause of the war between Troy and Sparta.

In one of the episodes of *The Iliad*, the Greek kings with their soldiers were about to set off towards Troy and gathered at Aulis to sail across the Aegean sea to

Troy, but winds blew upon the opposite direction. Prophet Calchas announced that Agamemnon should appease Artemis, the goddess of the hunt, by sacrificing his daughter Iphigenia, because Agamemnon had killed a deer sacred to Artemis, so that Agamemnon had to soothe her rage. Agamemnon then sent Odysseus to his wife Clytemnestra to ask her to send Iphigenia, so that she would get married to Achilles. As soon as Iphigenia came, Agamemnon let Calchas put her upon an altar to sacrifice her for the satisfaction of goddess Artemis. She was secretly substituted by the goddess by a deer and carried Iphigenia off to make her one of her priestesses. For the treachery, Clytemnestra never forgave her husband, which became the cause of Agamemnon's death by his wife. So the bloody rife goes on for generations, and violence is perpetuated among blood relations.

The story of Agamemnon, brother of Menelaus and the king of Mycenae has been best presented in Aeschylus's *Agamemnon*. In this story Agamemnon comes back home with the glory of victory and pride of his bravery. But during his long absence his wife Clytemnestra was having affairs with Agamemnon's cousin Aegisthus. Agamemnon arrives in a chariot accompanied by his mistress Cassandra. Clytemnestra greets him, welcomes him to the palace and wails out with complaints of leaving her alone. She invites her husband to come into the palace over a purple cloth. Agamemnon refuses to walk over the purple cloth thinking that it's not a good sign and also not befitting a mortal man, but his wife Clytemnestra urges him to. He puts off his sandals, steps down from the chariot and goes into the palace across the purple cloth. Cassandra remains in the chariot itself. She foresees Agamemnon's and her own doom. She has the vision of Thyestes' curse hanging heavy on the house. Cassandra wants to save Agamemnon and rushes into the palace, but by the time Clytemnestra has already struck the deathblow to her husband. Consecutively,

Clytemnestra and her lover Aegisthus finish Cassandra too. Finally, Clytemnestra defends herself against her treachery and murder saying that Agamemnon had sacrificed her daughter Iphigenia and left her alone for so many years.

Another of Aeschylus's work *Choephoroe* talks about Orestes' revenge against his mother Clytemnestra and her lover Aegisthus. Orestes was brought up and raised in Phocis. When he came to his manhood, he thought of taking revenge on the murder of his father. Then he returns to Argos in the company of his friend Pylades. Clytemnestra had a horrible dream about giving birth to a viper that sucked at her breast and bit them. She thought that the ghost of Agamemnon might be haunting around. Then she sends her daughter Electra to his grave for the offering of some drinks. Orestes and Electra meet there and reveal themselves to each other. Finally, they decide to plot the murder of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus. Orestes pretends to be a messenger from Phokis and has to convey some good news to Aegisthus. Then Orestes slays him. When Clytemnestra comes afore, Orestes hesitates to kill her. But his friend Pylades urges him to do it. He kills his mother Clytemnestra too. At this moment, on the stage, Orestes points out to the dead bodies of both lover and beloved and says:

See, see the double tyrants of the land,
 Who killed my father and who wrecked my home!
 In arrogance they mounted to his thrones
 And even now they cling, these paramours,
 Still bound by oath – or so their end suggests . . . (qtd. in Powell 551)

The classical myths are full of violence and more so, full of the violence of the intimate relationship. Most of them are of the extreme types: heinous, treacherous, incestuous, but still so magnificently contrived and artistically wonderful.

Ancient Greek dramatists namely, Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides wrote great tragedies in which beauty of violence is so well displayed that any reader or the audience of these finest plays would be thrilled up by the emotions of pity and fear. The tragedies inculcated long lasting impressions and a cathartic feeling in the minds of the readers or of the spectators.

It is supposed that any significant work of art known as a tragic drama is a combination of knowledge and emotion. The drama imparts a significant message or learning which is Apollonian in character, and the dances, songs and violent actions and passions naturally are Dionysian. The Greek tragedians believed that a great tragedy is born out of Apollonian light and Dionysian passion. In this sense dread, horror and violence are essential for making of tragedy. Aristotle theorized the elements and importance of tragedies as something giving vent to the emotions of pity and fear. In this sense the tragic drama that includes abundant violent actions and passionate emotions create beauty. Without violence tragedy is rarely thinkable.

The Greek Drama

Oedipus Rex (c.425) is a magnificent play written by Greek dramatist Sophocles (496-406) BC. Oedipus is the powerful and benevolent king of Thebes. He had killed his father Laios and married his mother Iokaste. But he does not know that he killed his father and married his mother. But when the people of Thebes suffer from plague and come to the king to look for the effective way out to relieve them, he sends Kreon (the queen's brother and son of Menoikens) to Delphi to know the revelation of God Apollo about the kingdom. Kreon comes with a message that someone who killed king Laios is in the power. He has to be abolished, and then only people will get the relief. Oedipus tries hard to find out the man and wants to badly punish the person for the goodness of his people and country. Choragos suggests

Oedipus that he should contact Teiresias, a holy prophet who is blind, but has the inside vision. Oedipus contacts Teiresias but Teiresias refuses to speak. But when Oedipus is angry, Teiresias too repulses with angry words and charges Oedipus to be the cause of the contagion. Oedipus does not believe what Teiresias says but accuses Kreon of such sins. Oedipus gathers information about the murder of Laios from Iokaste and other sources. She says that he was killed at the crossroads of Phokis, a border between Delphi and Daulia. He remembers that he too had a fight with a group of men at Phokis. But he is sure that he is the son of Polybos and Merope, the king and the queen of Corinth, but he ran away from Corinth due to a dreadful prophesy about him. Then he still tries to gather information about himself. Iokaste tells him that a baby was born to her, which, due to very dangerous prophesy about him, was left on the mountain of Kithairon to a shepherd. She does not know who nurtured the baby. But from the shepherd childless Polybos and his wife Merope had taken him as their son. But Prophesy does not fail. He came to Thebes and did the same what was predicated about him. On coming to know the fact, Iokaste commits suicide and Oedipus asks Kreon to look after his two daughters as well as sisters. In shock he blinds himself and asks the people to drive him away from Thebes.

Sophocles's play *Oedipus Rex* can form a very good example of the beauty of violence. Whether it is due to the tragic flaw or due to the moral conflicts between good and evil or between good and good, the tragic event takes place in the most dreadful manner. It is not that the conflict always occurs between "good" and "evil," and "good" necessarily gains victory but the evil too can be so powerful that "good" gets badly crushed down. Moreover, the conflict between two rights will create dangerous moral crisis. A hero's personality sometimes can have splits. For example, there is a duty for the nation that ought to be performed, and there is a crisis in the

duties towards religion, caste, color, sex, relation, family and friendship, which, too, must be fulfilled. The crisis in personality due to duties and responsibilities may lead one to very tragic situations. In the history of mankind, such tragedies have quite often occurred with violence of all kinds. Most of the economic, political and social problems have been settled by violence in human history. The tragic plays are written with the concentration of tragic flaws, conflicts, anxieties and violent actions, so that tragedies present violence amidst tensions, and actions are developed quite deliberately arousing emotions of sympathy and hatred in the minds of the reader or the spectators.

Oedipus Rex, the play written by Sophocles, leaves an impression that the most hateful sin and heinous crime might be unknowingly committed against the most intimate persons, and the realization of which would be quite intolerable that might make a man accept the way of suicide and the way to the most painful type of suffering. *Oedipus Rex* presents the profoundest example of violence in the intimate relationship.

Sophocles's another tragedy *Antigone* is the story of King Creon who takes the charge of kingship after Oedipus's tragic end. Antigone is the niece of Creon whose brother Polynices has been killed in an attack on the city of Thebes. Creon orders that his dead body should be left unburied, but Antigone buries it at night. Antigone is to be married to the king's son Haemon. The king orders her to die but Haemon persuades the king to change his mind, but by the time the king changes his mind, Antigone has already killed herself. The story of *Antigone* does not have as serious violence as that of *Oedipus Rex*; however it also talks about the violence among relatives.

The kinds of violence that the ancient Greek dramatists introduced in their plays have powerful aesthetic values, which show that violence in literature creates an aesthetic beauty, howsoever dreadful and hateful it may be in reality.

Had there been any real story of a son killing his father and marrying his mother, it would have been really quite hateful, unbearable, and indigestible, but art makes any story readable and beautiful.

The English Renaissance Plays

Basically the English Renaissance period abounds in great tragedies which are full of horror, killing and violent actions. The works of Marlowe, Shakespeare, Webster and that of others present the most violent actions on stage.

Christopher Marlowe (1564- 1593) wrote in the true spirit of the Renaissance period. The influence of the classical drama is very much in his plays and also his plays represent the context of the Elizabethan period, its essence and its development in all fields. Marlowe's plays are full of emotions, passions, anxieties, and unfulfilled desires. Naturally, there are many elements that give rise to violence in Marlowe's plays; however he amalgamates many other elements and ideas that his works require in the spirit of the age. William J. Long in his *English Literature: Its History and Its Significance* describes Marlowe's writings as, "Though all his plays abound in violence, no doubt reflecting many of the violent scenes in which he lived, he develops his 'mighty line' and depicts great scenes in magnificent bursts of poetry, such as the stage had never before" (133).

After Marlowe, William Shakespeare (1564 -1616) emerged as a charismatic figure, who, by his great love and compassion to the human beings, richness and control of language, luck, chance and time occupied the position probably of the greatest literary figure as a dramatist, who wrote probably the finest tragedies in

modern English with a change in the classical form of drama where characters are not simply realistic but they are driven by some supernatural forces of magic and miracle to the tragic situations with violence and the temptations of power. Shakespeare's plays like: *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Julius Caesar* and *Coriolanus* are great tragedies which use violence as one of the principal means for their tragic end as the course of understanding the reality or as a way of realization or repentance with a sense of revenge or the outbursts of the emotions and suppressed desires.

In spite of writing in the Greek tradition, Shakespeare adopted some techniques of Roman dramatist Seneca about presenting bloody and horrible scenes on the stage. The writers like Thomas Sackville and Thomas Norton in *Gorboduc* (1551) and Thomas Kyd in *The Spanish Tragedy* (1589) had already used Senecan ingredients of horror and violence.

Titus Andronicus (1589-1592) is a Shakespearean drama based on the theme of intimate violence and revenge motive. It is not a complete tragedy but a tragicomedy or a thriller or a melodrama by its story. Titus Andronicus, a Roman general kills his daughter Lavinia, because he thinks that she should not outlive the shame of being raped by the Goths, Chiron and Demetrius, queen Timora's sons from her former husband. In revenge Titus later kills them and lets the queen dine on their meat. While killing his daughter he tries to justify his action by the reference of a Roman King's action in history according to which King Virginius had killed his daughter for the same type of reason.

Hamlet (1603) is probably the greatest tragedy among Shakespeare's plays, which is based on the story of the Danish Royal Family. The play is full of tragic feelings, revenge and deaths. Claudius kills his brother, old King Hamlet, secretly by

poisoning his ears. He marries Gertrude, the brother's wife on the same day of his brother's funeral and enthrones himself. Hamlet, the brother's son and the rightful heir of the throne is shocked and suspicious by all these actions. His father's ghost reveals him that Claudius is the murderer of his father. Then he becomes more shocked and waits for the chance to avenge the father's murder. In mistake he kills Polonius, the prime minister and his beloved Ophelia's father. Finally in a formal duel organized at the palace between Laertes (Ophelia's brother) and Hamlet, he kills Laertes, and assaults Claudius with the same rapier and takes the revenge. His mother Gertrude too dies unknowingly drinking the poisonous hemlock kept for Hamlet by the King. Hamlet too dies of the poisonous injuries of Laertes's sword.

Othello (1603-1604) is another great Shakespearean tragedy in which Othello is a moor and he is the commander of the army of Venice. Desdemona is Brabantio's (a senator's) daughter who elopes with Othello of which Iago is very much jealous. Othello promotes Cassio second to him by which Iago gets still tenser. Iago shows honesty to Othello, but behind his back he conspires. When Othello is deployed to control the situation in Cyprus, he leaves Desdemona in Cassio's care. Right at this situation, Iago has the chance to give vent to his jealous feeling and uses his wife Emilia to steal the handkerchief from Desdemona that was presented to her as a token of love by Othello as a wedding gift and conjures Bianca to leave it to Cassio's room. When Othello comes back, Iago and Roderigo fill his ears about the secret relationship between Cassio and Desdemona. In anger and jealousy Othello smothers Desdemona to death. But Desdemona is innocent and honest to Othello even in the last moments of her life. Cassio injures Roderigo but Iago stabs him to death. Iago injures Cassio secretly and deadly. For the time being Othello appreciates Iago, but Emilia discloses the secret to Othello. Iago kills his wife Emilia. Othello runs to Iago but is disarmed

by Montano. Iago runs away, but is captured by Lodovico and Gratiano. Othello injures Iago and in the pain of reproachfulness, Othello kills himself kissing the dead body of Desdemona. Iago is put to the trial and torture.

Julius Caesar (1599) is another great tragedy written by Shakespeare. It is a history play. Most of Shakespeare plays are based on historical legends and the history of Julius Caesar is more a history than a legend. It is in Roman history that Julius Caesar was a great hero, a commander and the conqueror of the Roman Empire. Julius Caesar (100-44BC) was a superstitious man in spite of his great valor and confidence in himself. He believed in the interpretation of omens and signs. He was counselled by his wife not to go to the capitol, but his destiny did not stop him to meet his fate. The crows surrounded his ship, and he discontinued his voyage and came back to the city. Brutus, Cassius and other conspirators stabbed him to death at the base of a statue of Pompey. Actually Brutus (Decius Brutus) thought himself a descent from the first Brutus (Junius) who had liberated the city from Tarquinius Superbus. Brutus thought that he should stand a defender of republicanism and democratic practices. There was a fear that Julius Caesar would crush down republicanism, so that Brutus and Cassius managed to murder Caesar. At Caesar's funeral Brutus allowed Antony to speak in spite of the suggestion of Cassius. Brutus first spoke and went away leaving Antony to speak, but Antony spoke against Brutus that he put Brutus into a perilous situation. The friendship that developed after reconciliation broke apart when Antony got the chance of revenge. Antony spoke in favour of Caesar and against Brutus and revealed the truth of Caesar's murder. Brutus and Cassius who had murdered Julius Caesar in the defense of republicanism failed to protect themselves from their dreamy and utopian concept. The scenes of murder and revenge are best displayed in Shakespeare's plays.

Macbeth (1606-1607) is another very violent tragedy full of blood, cruelty and dreadfulness, however it does not involve its characters in the murders and injuries of their kinsmen or intimate relation. It focuses on the dreadfulness of power temptation, for which one can use violence with all possibilities but the power mongers fail to create their favorable situations as Macbeth appears in the play. It is a play where a kinsman kills his own kinsman who is his guest.

Similarly, in Shakespeare's other tragedies *Antony and Cleopatra* (1606-1607), *Romeo and Juliet* (1594-1596), *Coriolanus* (1608) and *Julius Caesar* (1599) too the chief means of tragic incident is violence. Most of Shakespeare's tragedies are based on a limited circle of close relationship. In a palace, or in a court, or in a high-class family of a royal relation or in an army camp, the stories take place. The relations are concentrated or intensified between the antagonist and protagonist.

In the general understanding of the term Tom McAlindon refers to Aristotle's concept in his article "What is a Shakespearean Tragedy?" "the success of tragedy depends on its capacity to excite pity and fear, thereby effecting a catharsis of these emotions" (2), however the real meaning of catharsis is not yet clear and the definition vary from one age to another and also from one perception to another.

All tragedies, whether Shakespearean or non-Shakespearean, are based on the conflict theories of the value systems that see "the eternal contradiction between man's weakness and his frailty and his strength" (qtd. in Mc Alindon 3). In the same light Shakespearean tragedies are characterized with the same value of judgment basically in hero's characteristics. In his article Tom Mc Alindon observes, "The tragedies of both Shakespeare and his contemporaries have also been read in the light of Marx's materialist Hegelianism as embodying the contradictions and incipient

collapse of feudalism and heralding the bourgeois revolution of the seventeenth century” (3).

Shakespearean tragedies are not the same as Greek tragedies but Shakespeare and his contemporaries write in the Roman and late-medieval tradition which characterize, the sensational and highly rhetorical plays of Seneca apparently written for recitation, and are the narrative verse tragedies, and are very much based on sensation, passion and revenge motive.

Another very powerful dramatist of violence is John Webster whose *The Duchess of Malfi* (1623) is a magnificent example of the violence in intimate relationship. The Duchess of Malfi is a widow who is murdered by her own brothers for her secret sexual relationship with a man much below her standard. John Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi* is a very famous and representative drama of the age. The Duchess of Malfi is a widow and has an affair with her own Steward. She marries him secretly and becomes pregnant. Her brother Ferdinand, Duke of Calabria and a cardinal decide to kill her, her husband and their children, and they do. While dying she speaks the last words that heaven's gates are not so high. The Duchess of Malfi becomes victims of her position-conscious brothers. High level, high standard, high position, high status and privileged class are the concepts which make a man behave and think differently from general human beings, and the persons in such positions and privileges are full of prejudices and inhuman behaviors. *The Duchess of Malfi* is full of horror and violence. The plot is very much directed by suspicion, jealousy, espionage, terror and murder plans. *The White Devil* (1612) is Webster's another play, which manifests tragic action on the Senecan tradition of revenge and horror. The heroine of the play Vittoria Corombona is false and plays adultery with the Duke of Brachiano. The Duke makes her his mistress and for the sake of her, he murders

Vittoria's husband as well as his own duchess. Some people condemn her for her adultery and drag her to the trial but they fail because they are corrupt and ambitious men. One of them is her own brother Flamineo but finally he himself dies. He is the villain of the play but he achieves dignity in his death.

Webster's plays *The White Devil* and *The Duchess of Malfi* are written in the Senecan tradition, and they also closely follow the themes of blood and thunder of Thomas Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy*. In another dimension both of Webster's tragedies "reproduce the Italian life of the sixteenth century and for this no imaginary horrors are needed" (Long 164).

Violence in Short Plays, Short Fiction, and Poems

Another very remarkable short play of violence in intimate relationship is the one, which is written quite much later by W.B. Yeats under the title of "Purgatory." W.B. Yeats seems to believe in the concept of rebirth. Basically in the Christian belief, the soul of a man that does not pass through purgatory for its eternal redemption will come back to the earth. For sometimes it suffers as ghost or a supernatural being and then takes birth as human again. It again suffers and causes others to suffer. The souls of those who do not perform good deeds in life will have to involve in the same wheels of birth-death-ghostly suffering- rebirth and good or bad deeds. The criminal happenings continue. In Yeats's play "Purgatory," the old man who is now sixty has arguments with his sixteen-year-old bastard son. The son demands his share of property because he wants to enjoy life. The old man does not want to give him any share and tells him how he struggled in life and comes back to the sustainable standard. He tells the boy his story of suffering and struggle. He says that he was born in a castle where great persons were born, great deeds were performed and great minds lived, but the old man's father, who was a horse keeper in

the house, became successful in winning the landlady's heart. He married her, but her mother was so angry with her daughter that she did not speak to her till her death. But as she was the only daughter, the whole property naturally came to her possession. But the old man's father never remained sincere to save or increase the property. His wife (the old man's mother) died during childbirth. The old man was brought up by the people of the great house. When the old man had been just sixteen years of age, his father set fire on the house in his drunkenness as he had sold possessions and even the trees and timber. In anger the old man who was a boy of sixteen with the whole image and hope for future stabbed the father to death and pushed him in the burning house. In spite of the scar of knife, no body guessed that he was killed. A horse keeper's wife gave him food and clothes in kindness.

The old man remembers that he worked hard as peddler and earned money. He found a woman giving birth to a baby. She died at the child bearing. He brought the baby, cared and reared him. The baby grew as a boy. The old man also tells the boy that his father and mother could not pass through purgatory and are moving round the house in the rooms, in the gardens and in the roads. The father is riding his horse and the old man says that he is hearing the sound of the horse hoofs. There is movement in the room where the parents had the honey-moon.

The sixteen-year-old boy says that he will kill the old man at his sixty because the old man also had killed his father when he was sixty and the old man then was just sixteen. The old man narrates the story of the murder of his father, "I stuck him with a knife, \That knife that cuts my dinner now, \And after that I left him in the fire"(Yeats 120).The old man becomes suspicious to think that the boy may take the revenge of the murder of his grandfather. He himself stabs the boy to death but immediately hears his father's soul riding round. The old man tells us how he finished the life of his son, "My

father and my son on the same jack- knife! \That finishes there — there — there — ”

(123). Finishing a criminal generation does not end the criminal happenings. So the cycle of violence goes on and “Purgatory” unfolds the drama of existence which has in its very framework the element of violence in intimate relationship.

One of the most striking and heart- rending stories of violence is Maxim Gorky’s “The Mother of a Traitor” in which the son of Monna Marianna is the leader of the enemy army. The enemies have been killing many dwellers of the city where he himself was born. His forefathers had made their homes and high walls, and where his mother still lives today. The enemy soldiers have surrounded the city and they are going to attack the city very soon. Everybody is terror-stricken. The enemies have mercilessly and indiscriminately killed men, women, children and old people, and their blood have filled the roads. The ground is tough and sticky under the foot. Monna Marianna is very much ashamed. Then she gets out of her house in her black gown and heads towards the enemy’s camp soundless and solitary. She wanders from street to street. People watch her and whisper that she is the mother of the traitor. The patrolling guards of the city warn her to take care, because they might kill her too.

In the city people are wailing. There are sounds of melancholy. The people switch off the lights of their houses in the early evenings thinking that the bullets would be targeted. There are groans, cries, prayers and the expressions of pains. There are sounds of the murders of soldiers.

Monna Marianna walks all the way to the fortress. She sees dead bodies on her way. A woman is praying grief-stricken putting her son’s dead body beside her. She says that her husband was killed thirteen days ago and then the son too was killed.

Covering her face Marianna walks further and further and in the next morning she appears before the city defenders. She is not confident that they would let her go.

She asks the defenders either to kill her or let her go. They open the gates for her telling her that her son is equally an enemy to them as to her. She gets out and goes straight to the enemy's camp bowing to the dead bodies of the city's defenders. She thinks that it is also her duty to save the city and its citizens. Finally, she reaches the enemy's camp. She introduces herself as the mother of their commander to the enemy soldiers as they inquire. Knowing that she is the mother of the commander they show her the way to her son's tent. The soldiers praise her as clever and brave. When the son sees the mother, he welcomes her with love and respect, and kisses her hands.

The mother remembers that she had had the dreams about her son. She had wanted to see him rich, famous and admired. The mother talked to the son not to be cruel to his own land of which every stone knows him. But he is so crazy for the power and he is mad after his glory. He says that the stones and mountains are dumb, and argues that people will remember only the heroes of destructions more than the creators. He says that people do not remember the builders of Rome now whether they were Aeneas or Romulus but they remember Alaric who destroyed it. The son speaks so wildly that the mother fails to convince him. She reminds him of his childhood, of the people that loved him and of the place where he was brought up with love and affection, but he is so blinded by the cold glitters of glory.

The sun has already set and the darkness covers the surrounding. The mother looks towards the black city that looks dead as a corpse. The mother puts her son in her lap. He asks the mother to be proud of her son and he says that he loves only glory. He would conquer the city that night itself. He was simply waiting for the mother to come out. Talking to the mother he closes his eyes and falls asleep. She covers him with her cloak and stabs him to death. He dies instantly. She pushes the dead body to the feet of the sentries and says addressing the city that she did all she

could as to save her own country. Then finally she too plunges the same warm and bloody knife into her breast and dies with the son together. Gorky presents the situation of killing of the son by the mother, “And he dozed there on his mother’s breast like a child. Then covering him with her black cloak, she plunged a knife into his heart, and with a shudder he died ...” (79). Gorky further describes the self-killing of the mother, “And the same knife, still warm with his blood, her blood, she plunge with a firm hand into her own breast ...” (79). And, the mother and the son are united forever by violence (71-79).

Bessie Head’s short story “Looking for a Rain God” dramatizes upon a shocking report of the tribal rituals in the conservative communities of Africa which contradicts with the contemporary legal situation, and also shows that some of the beliefs in the African societies are very shockingly inhuman.

The story is based on a rural setting of an African village. It talks about a situation when there was no rain. Mokgobja, the old man of the family was very worried. He was seventy years old. His son Ramadi was the supporter of the family. The old man, Ramadi’s wife Tiro, an unmarried sister Nesta and his two young daughters Neo and Boseyong went to the land on a donkey car. The two women cleared the hedges of the thorn bush to make the area cultivatable. Ramadi ploughed the field. There were clouds and some signs of rain. The two innocent girls happily played around. But their hope turned astray when the rain clouds fled away during mid-November. The sun grew stronger and stronger and the sky turned cloudless. The earth grew dry. The goats stopped giving milk and it was impossible for the plantation of any crops. The girls enjoyed their own world of games. They played the exact roles of mother and daughter, but the adults paid no attention to the children’s games and their attachment to nature.

When every thing went dry, the women were so frustrated by the sense of the starvation to follow. The family sold all animals except two goats, but the two goats also fell heavy upon them. They could not think what to do but remained terribly anxious.

Mokgobja remembered the ancient customs of rainmaking ceremony. Then he whispered it to Ramadi. Then Mokgobja and Ramadi whispered with Tiro and Nesta and, then they sacrificed the innocent girls to the Rain God. The bodies of the girls spread across the land, but still it did not rain. They packed up every thing and came to village. The villagers asked where the girls had been. The family said that the girls died, and they were buried but their terror-stricken faces and murmurs could easily be read. The villagers were surprised to think how both of them died together. The police came and inquired about the deaths of the girls. “At this, the mother of the children broke down and told every thing” (Head 45-46). Then the old man and Ramadi were sentenced to death (41- 46). The whole story is made consistent by violence.

Violence between husband and wife, father and son, brother and sister, brother and brother, lover and beloved, and between friends, office associates and acquaintances has been widely presented in the literary works. Plays, novels and short stories present violence of the intimate relationship almost as their themes or subject matters. Some British and American poems too present violence with their focus. W.J.T. Mitchell’s article “Representation” presents an analysis of Robert Browning’s “My Last Duchess” which is probably one of the finest examples of violence in intimate relationship. In the poem the Duke of Ferrara is describing a painting of his late wife to a person whose daughter is going to be engaged to marry to the duke. The duke is a character invented by the poet. The whole poem is a monologue, which

unfolds the whole drama, which represents a small world. From reading the poem, “we quickly surmise that the duke is an obsessively jealous husband who had his last duchess killed because she was too free with her affections and approval ‘she liked whate’er/she looked on, and her looks went everywhere’” (Mitchell 19).

The duke shows his power even over the bride’s father and shows that he is getting ready to negotiate with him to raise his daughter in a hierarchy of the sociopolitical order. “The duke represents the aristocratic, feudal social order . . . as a system giving some men absolute power over others, and particularly over women in a system of exchange, . . .” (20). The speech echoes the era of “bad old days” of absolute power before the rise of the bourgeoisie class.

The duke has kept the picture of his duchess whom he murdered. He could have destroyed the picture of the duchess as he destroyed the original but he keeps it because he wants to show his power over it or he wants to take it as a reminder of his weaknesses or his inability to understand her. The duke the absolute power but he is lacking in confidence. The mixture of boasting and self-betrayal appear quite odd which ridicules the duke’s power and his weaknesses. The violent act of a husband killing his wife is at the crux of the poem.

WB Yeats’s poem “Leda and Swan” tells a magnificent story of god’s violence on a mortal girl. But it is violence that sets the cycle of history going. The rape of Leda by God Zeus in the form of a Swan is a haunting proof of such celestial interference in human affairs. The union between Zeus and Leda is the union between immortal and mortal beings. This unusual and powerful union gave birth to two most beautiful women, who later became the cause of great destruction, violence, killings and sufferings. The destruction of Troy and the death of many great Greek and Trojan heroes were caused by the birth of Helen, whereas Clytemnestra’s birth caused the doom of

Agamemnon and the fall of Argos and Mycenae and suffering and madness of Orestes. The violence is domestic and sexual but its outburst captures the whole political sentiments of Greek heroes, heralds and the rulers. The destruction and violence caused by the union between Zeus and Leda was the source of other violent actions. It was the violence for the world order. W.B. Yeats describes the violent rape in this way:

A sudden blow: the great wings beating still
 Above the staggering girl, her thighs caressed
 By the dark webs, her nape caught in his bill
 He holds her helpless breast upon his breast. (657)

Modern American Fiction

Norman Mailer's *An American Dream* (1965) is a novel that echoes the most representative voice of the capitalist bourgeoisie society of America, where frustration, perversion and violence happen in the extreme form. Stephen Richards Rojack is a television personality, a professor of existential psychology, an Ex-congressman and holder of various medals and honors who strangles his wife Deborah in a violent struggle. He has extensive sexual relation with Deborah's maid Ruta, and Cherry, a nightclub singer and finally journeys from New York to Las Vegas and thereby to Yucatan and Guatemala for a pilgrimage. Stephen Richards Rojack is the narrator and the central character of the novel. He tells us about three hectic days upon which the whole novel is based.

Rojack has the dreadful wartime reminiscence and the destruction of a German machine-gun nest. The atmosphere is a full moon shining. When there is full moon, he remembers the time of twenty years ago. In the full moon he killed three German soldiers and faced the fourth one. Then he succeeded in killing him too. The vision of killing comes to his mind so powerfully that it does not make him feel

boosting like a war hero but causes a tension in his mind and a kind of suicidal instinct develops.

At the opening of the novel Rojack is contemplating suicide at the balcony. He hears the call of the moon. From the wartime the moon has a powerful influence on him, and is traumatic in his mind. The material bullet is transformed into a mental bullet. He hears the mental darts in Cherry's son and becomes her lover. Every time in the moon- light he thinks of committing suicide, and to avoid this feeling he wants to walk around the parapet of his father in law Barney Kelly's penthouse.

Rojack struggles with the suicidal impulse on the balcony. He wanders around. He telephones his wife Deborah. He hurries to visit Deborah, but they have an exchange of insult, "a domination- submission struggle;" and then he strangles her to death. He leaves the dead body on the floor and enters her maid's (Ruta's) room, has sexual relation with her and then hurls Deborah's dead body out from the window to counterfeit it a suicide.

Elizabeth Hardwick charged Mailer as an obsessed writer. About the novel, its writer and the characters, she makes a very sharp comment that it is full of filth and cruelties, "the novel is . . . a collection of 'vengeful murder, callous copulation and an assortment of dull cruelties,' and Rojack's wife is a 'poor unreal creature brought to the rest in her own filth for reasons known only to the odor-and-anal-obsessed author'" (59).

Intimate violence is rampant in the novel. The American dream that Mailer presents is not simply literary. It is symbolic as well as allegorical. It draws power from "mythological roots" (59), what is more to say in this background is in Begiebing's words:

The author guides us through stark, brutal, and intense experiences ranging from the horrible to the beautiful. We are guided into the realities of the unconscious and the dream: sex, incest, masturbation, white and black magic, murder, love, creation, and painful acts of cowardice and courage. The novel is steeped into the violence and hallucinatory horror of the nightmare as much as in the visionary's dream of healing from disease and disorder. (59)

Another very famous and powerful novel of violence in intimate relationship is Toni Morrison's *Beloved*. In her novel Toni Morrison focuses on the racial violence, color discrimination, slavery, deprivations, exploitation, tortures and injustices. The kinds of presentations of tortures and discrimination she has made in her novels are based on the history of slavery, stories of particular events and experiences and her own perceptions and observations.

Beloved is Toni Morrison's the finest creation, which is based on a real story of a slave woman Margaret Garner who killed her own child rather than selling her into slavery. Based on a real life incident, Morrison has given it imaginative and political colors. The story of infanticide of a slave child from the mother is a tragic experience. The real story of Margaret Garner is transformed into the imaginative story of a fiction. Sethe has to represent Garner. In the original story Garner escaped with her children to freedom leaving her husband in slavery, however Morrison altered it that she escaped with her husband but was returned to slavery. She was not tried for killing the child but tried for running away from slavery according to the Fugitive Slave Law. A mother kills her daughter to save from slavery. A mother kills her daughter to save her from slavery. Violence is used for a horribly "good" purpose.

The Roots and Currents of Violence

There are cross-currents and under-currents of violence in the society, be it be British, American, African and Asian. All violent actions seem to have occurred either as the reaction to violence or counter violence. They definitely have some social, economic or political roots. Sometimes they get reflected as a simple madness or perversion or an obsession or as a psychological question; however, mostly violence is based on power conflicts of different forms and types. As Gene Sharp in “The Nature and Control of Political Power” writes:

Social power may be briefly defined as the capacity to control the behavior of others, directly or indirectly, through action by groups of people, which action impinges on other groups of people. Political power is that kind of social power which is wielded for political objectives, especially by governmental institutions or by people in opposition to or in support of such institutions. Political power thus refers to the total authority, influence, pressure and coercion which may be applied to achieve or prevent the implementation of the wishes of the power-holder. (7-8)

Gene Sharp puts forward two theories of political power: one is pluralistic and the other is monolithic. Pluralistic political power “is fragile because it depends on many groups for reinforcement of its power sources” in this power “governments depend on people” and in the monolithic power “people depend on governments” and, “that power can really come from a few men, and that it is durable and self-perpetuating – appears to underlie most political violence” (8).

In this way the glory of power or its arrogance can also be the source of violence. Moreover, the monolithic power possession can be more destructive than the pluralistic. The power can play in the large political structure of the state or in the

social or ethnic relations. The power play can be very much felt in the relation between the family members or even between the sexes of close relations.

Camille Paglia in her book *Sex and Violence or Nature and Art* talks about sex. In her opinion only sex is natural. Social systems, laws and relations are artificial. Unless we have a very clear concept about nature, we probably cannot understand sex. She says, “we cannot hope to understand sex and gender until we clarify our attitude toward nature. Sex is subject to nature. Sex is . . . (but) natural in man” (1).

Camille Paglia further clarifies the concepts and relations about nature and society. She thinks that sex and society contradict with each other, for they belong to the spheres of naturalness and artificiality.

Society is an artificial construction, a defense against nature’s power.

Without society we would be storm-tossed on the barbarous sea that is nature. Society is a system of inherited forms reducing our humiliating passivity to nature. We may alter these forms, slowly or suddenly, but no change in society will change nature. (1)

Man develops various cultures and tries to prove himself civilized upon the cultural strength. “Civilized life requires a state of illusion” that averts the natural disasters. Fire, flood, lightning, tornado, hurricane, volcano, earthquake are believed to be God’s functions and cultural activities are performed to console and convince itself about the occurrence of disasters and calamities.

Violence among Relations

The first violence is most likely to take place at home with the family members because home is the easiest place to commit violence. Extreme of any thing results into violence, whether it is of love or of friendship. Family is the place where the interactions

among the relatives are most frequent, which can grow positively as well as negatively. The negative impressions generally may turn into the consequent break of the relations. If the possible rift is not patched up in time, the coldness of relations may continue, and in course of time it will consequently grow into jealousy or hatred or even to animosity. At that time the attempt of the obliteration of either side may be thought of or even practiced. Then naturally the relation of violence can only be possible. In such cases any kind of violence can take place. Some of such types have been explained in the intimacies of relations.

Men's Violence to Known Women

In the "Preface" of *The Violences of Men* Jeff Hearn talks about the relationship between men and violence. Almost all relations rest upon the forms of power and the capacity of violence:

Violence is understood as a major, perhaps even the prime, form of power, and at the same time, violence is considered unfair, inappropriate, wrong-headed, as well as painful, damaging and sometimes illegal. The same people may think or say these two different things at different times, or even at the same time. (vii)

Men's violence to known women is generally ignored, however it can be seen as unfair, inappropriate, painful and even illegal, and also that has been simply taken as a legitimized taboo in spite of its being very shameful. In the recent years it has been lessened to a greater extent because of its being recognized. Violence has a persistent connection with power, control and dominance. Hearn further says, "Men remain violent to women through social power and control, which, in some cases, is combined with physical size and strength, reinforced by social power and control that reduces intervention against them and that violence" (Preface viii).

Men's using their power against women is now a political agenda. Subversion of men is to question or to destabilize "men's structural power" (Hearn 2), the ideas require explanation on the basis of "knowledge" and "theory." Understanding of men's power and domination upon women is through the study of the issues of "sexuality, sexual violence and violence" (2) as the central question in the present framework.

Hearn proposes that men are to be explained by the application of "symbolic interactionism" and "conflict theory" and through the "psychological approaches", "psychoanalytic accounts" and "interpersonal relations." Men's identity can be affirmed on the basis of power relation, which is "a taken- for- granted acceptance of that power..." (4). Hearn further says about man's relation with power that is deeply inculcated as his identity and uses it as a threat of violence to the woman of his close relation. In Hearn's words, "The psychological and social identity called 'Men' says and shows power relation. It is *identical*. An important aspect of men's power and sense of power is the use, potential use or threat of violence. And men's violence remains a major and pressing problem" (4).

Violence is not a single thing, nor can it be separated from every day human life and everyday experiences. To try to separate violence from the part of life is to give rise to many more problems. Rather it will be a continuation of violence.

Ximena B. Arriaga and Stuart Oskamp focus on the violence in the intimate relationship in their writing "The Nature, Correlates, and Consequences of Violence in Intimate Relationships" and say that it is the human nature that causes injuries upon the nearest and dearest ones. They write that, "one of the greatest contradictions of human nature is that some of the most personally injurious occur among loved ones. Rates of physical assault between intimate partners are disturbingly high" (3).

Generally, jokes or intimate slaps or dashes also sometimes turn out to be serious. Hitting, pushing and shoving are called as the “common couple violence,” however sometimes they result in severe injuries and even death, which are still uncommonly common. As Arriaga and Oskamp write, “sad to say, more severe forms of assault against women, resulting in physical injury and even death, are also not uncommon” (3). Therefore violence in the intimate relationships has been immensely a great concern for social scientists. The dynamics of violent relationships is basically focused on programs about ending violence. The statistics show that most of the physical assaults, injuries upon women and even murders have been caused or committed more by the intimate male partners or acquaintances than by strangers. Previously incidents of domestic violence were generally kept secret, but because of the enforcement of strong laws the domestic violences are not just treated as private affairs, but batterers are arrested, punished and imprisoned. Institutions have funded the project works on the research of domestic violence and everyday there are open discussions, talk programs and newspaper stories about domestic violences. Researches in violence in the intimate relationship have significantly contributed to the understanding of violence, thus it has thus paved the ways for their prevention.

Understanding violence categorically has different dimensions. Violence is understood as an abuse or a physical aggression in profession or a physical injury, or a crime in criminology or a psychological abuse or a terrorization on the feminist perspectives. There are the events of reciprocal or one-sided nature of violence between the partners. Understanding violence through the concept of “power dynamics” is also important.

Domestic Violence

There has been a controversy over domestic violence by women, which can be seen through methodological, theoretical and sociological analyses and interpretations. The discrepancies of family conflict were studied and analyzed in different approaches and measures. Family conflict studies deal with most of the conflict cases whereas crime studies cover only a small part of assaults that result in serious injuries from the medical point of view. Murray A. Straus talks about his research experience and studies in which it is found that women are physically more aggressive than men in their relationships and surprisingly enough, they commit higher rates of family violence than men. And also, the surveys and research works that were conducted by concerned 'Authorities in America' concluded that the assaults that can be counted as crimes are committed by men in higher rates than by women. "What is violence?" is a question, which is associated with a number of confusing answers. However, there are some parameters to justify violence as political, social, psychological or just physical. Even then the controversies over the definition or categorization of violence are in debate.

Murray A. Straus defines physical assault as an act of violence which is an injury as well as maltreatment, but sometimes verbal aggression can be even more damaging than the physical attacks, because it sometimes may lead one's life as far as even to the stage of suicide. The studies have shown that women have undergone more severe injuries by physical assaults than have men. But all the assaults are not lawfully punishable, nor are all injuries crimes, but are the acts of violence. Similarly the attempts of assaults, which do not result in injuries, can also be crimes. As Straus writes:

Thus, if a person is chased by some one attempting to hit them with a stick or stab them and they escape, the attack is still a felony level crime – an “aggravated assault” – even though they were not touched. However, it is also true that police, prosecutors, and injuries are strongly influenced by whether the assault did result in an injury and the seriousness of injury. (21)

There is low probability of the physical assaults resulting into injuries by women upon men but minor attacks of women can sometimes be retaliated with bigger assaults by men. Our cultures have explicitly or implicitly given some legal rights to husbands to strike their wives in the name of chastising, however:

The legacy of that norm continues to make the marriage license a hitting license for both parties. To end “wife beating,” it is essential for women to cease what may seem to be “harmless” slapping, kicking, or throwing things at a male partner who persists in some outrageous behavior or “won’t listen to reason.” (21)

There should be a social policy that focuses on the assaults by women. In a violent household the children will have a very bad effect to grow. If both the partners are violent, assaults are committed exclusively either by the male partner or by the female.

The Male Batterers

Violence is traumatic as well as retaliatory. In the broader panorama, violence generates violence and naturally it will go in the cycles of violence and counter-violence. Some times if the whole community is involved in violence, it will definitely touch the persons in the family relations and create a situation that the innocent people become victimized. If two nations or two races or two religious

communities are fighting, naturally it will affect the cross- marriage relations of the hostile groups. The war of America in Afghanistan and in Iraq will have very bad effects in the family relation between a Muslim wife and Christian husband, basically in the relations of Iraqi and American espouses. Even the friends and allies also may become enemies or remain unsuccessful in protecting the friends or grow suspicious towards each other. In such situation to draw the allusion of the violence between the hostile groups can be contextual. Writing an introduction to *Violence and Non-violence: Pathways to Understanding*, Gregg Barak talks about the “Secrets of violence and Nonviolence” that violence and nonviolence go together correspondingly sometimes parallel and sometime intersected. Examples can be cited from the world events from the time after September 11, 2001. The terrorist action generally gives rise to counter terrorist actions, and in the meantime it is very difficult to give protection to the innocent nonviolent people. The repercussions fall heavy on the nonviolent people. After September 11, 2001, many innocent men, women and children became the victims of the so called counter terrorist repercussions, “the murder of a Pakistani Muslim store owner in Dallas, Texas, and a Sikh gas station owner in Mesa, Arizona, most likely an immigrant from India” (Barak 3) were some of the worst examples of such victimization.

The counter terrorist attacks which randomly make targets upon people and buildings as retaliation and as an expression of anguish are very dangerous because in such a situation the trauma of post terrorist action turns into another form of shock which trails long into the break of the possibility of peace establishment.

Reconstruction, rehabilitation and reconciliation go far away. The counter attacks upon the Muslim communities and their business stations in America led naturally to complications, very difficult to settle back. Gregg Barak further exemplifies:

In addition, the Council on American-Islamic Relations said that it had received reports of more than 350 attacks across the country, ranging from verbal harassment to physical assaults (Milbank & Wax, 2001). In Palos Hills, Illinois, for example, two Muslim girls were beaten at Moraine Valley College. The council had also received reports that dozens of Mosques had been fire- bombed or vandalized, including a mosque in Evansville, Indiana, that had been damaged by a man who had driven his car into it at 80 mph. (3)

The then American President Bush visited mosques and consoled people. He tried to bring harmony and understanding between Islams and Christians. He made statements like: “The face of terror is not the true faith of Islam” and “Islam is peace” (qtd. in Barak 3). He also tried to convince the Muslim communities that Muslim woman should fear coming out of their homes. He “stressed the importance of treating Muslim doctors, lawyers, soldiers, and parents respectfully” (3). Appealing to the American citizens and threatening the actions of those upon the Muslims, Bush asked to make themselves the best of American citizens, however one can see from the perspective of the neutral men that whether it is terrorists, or counter terrorists or the peacemakers, they are trying to justify their missions or deeds from the view point of “moral justice”. Whether it is the violence in the name of the “holy war” or counter violence in the name of “operation infinite justice,” it shows that both are motivated by the sense of self-sacrifice and revenge. Naturally “violence begets violence,” and besides violence, there are other ways and means for peaceful solutions. Whether it is Bin Laden and the members of the al Qaeda gangs or those who undertake violence upon innocent Arabs, it will sooner or later generate the sense of counter violence, and the process of solution will definitely go towards complexity. Therefore,

understanding the earliest forms of violence and its root causes and its growth in other bigger and more complicated forms is very important. In this connection Gregg Barak writes:

Usually when we think about violence, we think about interpersonal forms of violence, such as attempted murder or homicide, assault and battery, rape and sexual assault, robbery, kidnapping, and torture. Rarely do we think of suicide, anorexia, and self-flagellation or of verbal abuse, threats, and intimidation as forms of interpersonal violence. More significantly, we usually ignore, deny, or accept other forms of institutional and structural violence that provide context for most of the personal violence that occurs. (4)

In comparison with the personal forms of violence, the “bureaucratic” and “environmental” forms are more systematic, more organized and more widespread, and also they are more invisible and more destructive than the “individualized” forms. Abuses of children and elders, environmental damages, human rights violations, workplace abuse, police and military abuses and offences are some of other institutional forms of violence which are more seriously dangerous than the domestic and interpersonal violence. Likewise, economic and political violences are structural ones. Such structural forms of violence are basically motivated by the enforcement of hierarchy and inequalities. “This can be accomplished by harassing, exploiting, beating, torturing, or killing people based on their age, class, ethnicity, gender, and/or sexual orientation” (4). The terrorist acts like church bombing and heinous killing are consequented by “killing of more than half of a million of children from various sanctions against Iraq (Welch, 2002) and the subjection of two million young children daily to impoverished living conditions of America (Ronark, 1996) do not” (Barak 5). The Iraq war created

artificial enmities among the Christian and Muslim families and neighbours, which sometimes resulted into violence too.

Violence of Identity

One of the most significant issues of violence is identity. Whether it is the violence of Muslims and Hindus in India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh or even in Indonesia, or the violence of Hutus and Tutsis in Rwanda or the violence between Blacks and Whites in America, South Africa or in Jimbawe or even the recent Madhesi violence of Nepal or the innumerable racial and religious violences of the world, they are instances of identity violence. Beyond that, whatsoever the issue of conflict and contradiction might be, in the depth of the instinct the questions of identity remain firm and strong. Divorces in conjugal relations, conflicts between communities and fights among gangs are mostly caused by identity issues. Insults, humiliations, moral pressures, marginalizations and dominations are the terms basically connected with identity crises. The deprivation of one's identity will definitely result into violence sooner or later. One of India's leading intellectuals Amartya Sen writes about identity and violence on different social and civilizational dimensions in his book *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny* (2006). Identity is probably the most important thing for human pride and for joy and also for strength and confidence. Sen writes, "A sense of identity can be a source not merely of pride and joy, but also of strength and confidence. It is not surprising that the idea of identity receives such widespread admiration, from popular advocacy of loving your neighbor to high theories of social capital and of communication self-definition" (1).

The same question of identity can be sometimes dangerously misled to violence. All violent eruptions are many times justified as the movements for justice and identity. The Hindu-Muslim riots of 1940s in India were deeply connected with

the politics of identity. When the situation of violence develops, many types of interests become associated to it, and many types of people get involved and then violence may take a very different mode. The Hindu Muslim violence that was linked with the partition between India and Pakistan turned out to be totally ruthless, and killing of thousands of people in the name of religious difference resulted into geographical separation.

Sen recollects the fierceness of Hindu-Muslim violence that erupted from January to July during partition. Sen describes that such violence destroys all warmth and attachments between friends, neighbours and communities. Sen presents the horror and terror of Hindu- Muslim violence that has been stamped as an unforgettable picture of terror. Sen recalls, “Hundreds of thousands perished at the hands of people who, led by the commanders of carnage, killed others on behalf of their ‘own people.’ Violence is fermented by the imposition of singular and belligerent identities on gullible people, championed by proficient artisans of terror” (2).

The singularity and plurality of identity are very important; however when violence is taking place, one may forget one’s other identity. A Hutu labourer kills Tutsis forgetting that he is “a Kigalian, a Rwandan, an African, a laborer, and a human being” (4). Once the violence is cultivated regarding the identity conflicts, it will increase persistently. The sense of identity is based on the social context. Identity as a vegetarian, identity as a linguist, identity as a musician or any professional will be equally important.

In this connection Sen writes:

The reasoning in the choice of relevant identities must, therefore, go beyond the purely intellectual into contingent social significance. Not

only is reason involved in the choice of identity, but the reasoning may have to take note of the social context and contingent relevance of being in one category or another. (27-28)

But the contexts and issues of identifying one may vary from time to time according to the choices. Ranajit Guha in the *Subaltern Studies I: Writings on South Asian History and Society* talks “On Some aspects of the Historiography of Colonial India” with a perspective of typical Indian contradictions of colonial elitism and bourgeois elitism. Simultaneously, the demarcation of the domains of elite politics and subaltern politics has led the political situation to even aggression. This type of division was created by colonialism. Guha describes the role of the elite:

What made the elite go through this process was, according to this historiography, no lofty idealism addressed to the general good of the nation but simply the expectation of rewards in the form of a share in the wealth, power and prestige created by and associated with colonial rule; and it was the drive for such rewards. . . . (Guha 2)

The elitist historiography represents the various kinds of elitist groups in the development of Indian nationalism leading the “people from subjugation to freedom” (2) whereas the elites were the most motivating forces for the ruling class to share the power, and naturally it antagonized the colonial regime and also let people know much “about the structure of the colonial state” (2). The impression of the colonial power on the ruling class has created problems in the third world.

Chapter V

VIOLENCE IN THE INTIMATE RELATIONSHIP

Violence as Madness

Michel Foucault's writings are basically the psychosocial interpretations of human relations. Foucault focuses on the development of human civilization. For Foucault, the human civilization is always guided and driven by different forms of madnnesses. Madness has been the most motivating and influential factor of this development. Human relations are generally sentimental: full of emotions, passions, attachments, infatuations, jealousies, grudges, irritations and motivations. The extremes of these emotions may result into madness and madness into violence. The first and easiest use of violence begins with the persons of intimate relations. Hunger, fear, confusions, attractions, suspicions and persuasions can easily lead one to commit any sort of violence. The outburst of any violent actions may not be the immediate outcome of any impulse but can have a long background. In "The Aspects of Madness" Foucault talks about mania, melancholia, hysteria and hypochondria. Among them mania and hysteria can have violent roots.

Previously melancholia was supposed to be associated with delirious ideas. It was thought that a melancholic would think he sometimes to be a beast, sometimes a glass vessel and sometimes to be something else. He would sometimes fear death, sometimes guilt or crime and sometimes would appear terror stricken, but he would be rather a fugitive or fear-struck than violent. The melancholic in this sense can be understood as a person who is prudent and sensible, intelligent and penetrating in observation with a serious sense of words, actions, visions and senses. The deliriums of melancholia can be taken positively in contrast to mania, dementia and frenzy. The sufferer of melancholia is

always obsessed by only one thought. The melancholics love solitude and leave the company.

Hamlet in the beginning appears melancholic. He does not want the company of anybody even of Ophelia. He is very conscious, thoughtful and imaginative. He is in a single thought but cannot act. He vacillates to act and soliloquizes. He has too much of thought and lots of talks. He tries to avoid being a melancholic and waits for the time. Once he loses his melancholia, he becomes ready to act and takes a rapier to fight with Laertes. During the fight he suddenly becomes maniac, which he has been trying to be, and at this stage he kills Laertes and his father's assassin and the suitor of her mother -his own uncle Claudius.

Similarly, in the *Mahabharata* Arjuna in the beginning is deeply melancholic, and refuses to kill any of his kinsmen. He expresses his sacrificial notion to Krishna that he would not want to come up to power by killing his relatives, friends and teachers. He becomes low-spirited. Then he thinks and argues rather than act. He makes questions to himself and to Krishna. Krishna tries to convince him to arouse the feelings in him towards fighting or acting like a brave man. Moreover, Krishna tries to make him a maniac from a melancholic. Then when he makes a shift from melancholia to mania, he acts daringly. He becomes ready to kill the most respected and best loved persons. Killing of the relatives in the *Mahabharata* is not simply a power craze but an involvement in the fights. Although it is guided by the achievement motivation, the fighters and warriors are attracted to the celebration of the war, which is purely maniac.

Melancholia is temperamentally suicidal, full of thought and inaction. When melancholia is over, the person may immediately enter into another state of mind. In Norman Mailer's *An American Dream*, Rojack is at first melancholic. He is confused

between whether to act and not to act. He has confusions whether to act or not to act. The suicidal instinct is so powerful in him that he cannot resist it but suddenly he makes out an idea to kill Deborah and he kills her. Killing in his mind is deeply rooted. Before killing Deborah he brings back the memory of the time when he had killed two German soldiers in the Second World War. The memory helps him revive his killjoy sentiment and empowers him for action, which too is a kind of madness; that is more like a mania than any thing else. Melancholia is full of agitation that does not apparently have the power of violence. It is the madness at the limits of its powerlessness. In contrast to melancholia, mania and frenzy do have violent movements.

In transition, a melancholic too tries to generate lots of violent feelings. This state is full of contradictions. In case of women the symptom of melancholia has lots of conflict; however a woman sufferer is violently disturbed by the symptom of melancholia. In his *Madness and Civilization* (1964), Foucault makes it clear that the melancholic women are generally more serious. He refers to Monsieur Duncan “They are cruelly used and violently disturbed by it, for melancholia being more opposed to their temperament, it removes them further from their natural constitution” (qtd. in Foucault, *Madness* 113-114). These qualitative changes will generate conflict and when “the entrails are heated, when all simmers within the body . . . and all the juices are consumed” (114), then, “There is a kind of dialectic of qualities which, free from any constraint of substance, and from any predetermination, makes its way through reversals and contradictions” (114). In women these qualities remain idle, subdued and intact, but the time comes when the inertia will be broken and they become dynamic and dialectical. The blackness, sadness, slowness and immobility of the melancholia are no longer physiological but pathological of idea, fear and terror. A melancholic would want to

remain “closer to dark chemical vapour than to pure light” (Foucault, *Madness* 116). A chemical vapour would be more acidic than sulfurous or alcoholic. In frenzy or mania the latter types of vapour would be more active, so that they are activated by the agitation of a violent movement.

Whether it is the case of Hamlet in *Hamlet* or Rojack in *An American Dream* the melancholia is powerful upon them, so they prefer loneliness, darkness, memories of the past and monologues and soliloquies. Moreover, Rojack is irritated by the moonlight. He fears it. He connects it with the death of the German soldiers in a fight with him. In those years it was a gallantry but in course of time it developed a dangerous impression because it always came to his mind either as a guilty conscience or as a neurotic obsession. Therefore he cannot act. In melancholia there is a sort of the abnormal obsession due to which a kind of inaction functions. In contrast with melancholia, mania is a kind of frenzy that is impulsive or impetuous, and thus naturally violent, whereas melancholia is cool, actionless, and slow and languishing, and it takes times for it to burst out with agitation and violence if there is any dramatic mode of irritation or tension. Foucault describes the types of melancholia and exemplifies it with the increasing tension. One is nervous melancholia that can be strong, active and even violent and another is slow, immobilized and passive melancholia. Both types occur according to how blood flushes or gets clogged. Foucault describes the first type in the way as, “The one whose origin is in solids is nervous melancholia: a particularly strong sensation agitates the fibers which receive it; as a result, tension increases in the other fibers, who become and at the same time susceptible to further vibration” (Foucault, *Madness* 117).

The second type is termed in James dictionary as “apoplectic melancholia,” which is a form of delirium with the characteristics of “sadness, bitterness, a preference for solitude, immobility” (118). This type of melancholia is described in James’ diction in the way that the sufferers: “Refuse to rise from their beds . . . once on their feet, they will not walk unless they are forced by their friends or attendants; they in no way avoid others, but they seem to pay no attention to what is said to them; they make no answer” (qtd. in Foucault, *Madness* 118). Sometimes it is very difficult to distinguish whether the sufferer is having nervous melancholia or apoplectic melancholia or mania itself. But we can suppose that there is a continuous shift or oscillation from one to another.

Hysteria and Hypochondria are other forms of madness. They appear to affect the human senses with strong drives in human life. Foucault alludes to show the contrast. Foucault refers to Sauvages’ classification about hypochondria among the hallucinations, that “. . . hallucinations that concern only the health” (qtd. in Foucault, *Madness* 129)

“– hysteria among the forms of convulsion” (129). Foucault alludes that Willis deals with them as the diseases of the head. In the case of hysteria “the over heated spirits are subject to a reciprocal pressure which may give the impression that they are exploding – provoking those irregular or preternatural movements whose insane aspect constitute hysterical convulsions” (129).

Hypochondria is termed as *passio colica* in which, according to Willis, “the spirits are irritated because of a matter that is hostile and inappropriate to them (infesta et improportionata); they then provoke disturbances, irritations, *corrugations* in the sensitive fibers” (qtd. in Foucault 129). Foucault argues that the violent convulsion of hysteria may cause the pains and irritations of hypochondria; however

they are not the same thing. In this connection Foucault brings the reference that in 1725 Richard Blackmore described these two diseases “as two varieties of a single affection” whereas in the middle of the eighteenth century Whytt identified that they are identical in their symptoms. Therefore, Whytt writes:

An extraordinary sensation of cold and heat, of pains in several parts of the body; syncopes and vaporous convulsions; catalepsy and tetanus; gas in the stomach and intestines; an insatiable appetite for food; vomiting of black matter; a sudden and abundant flow of clear, pale urine; marasma or nervous atrophy; nervous cough; palpitations of the heart; variations in the pulse; periodic headaches; vertigo and dizzy spells; diminution and failure of eyesight; depression, despair, melancholia or even madness; nightmares or incubi. (qtd. in Foucault, *Madness* 130)

Both hysteria and hypochondria have been understood as mental diseases from the ancient times, however their effects on health are apparently strong. Richard Mead has said that hypochondria “is an illness of the whole body” (qtd. in Foucault, *Madness* 130). And hysteria is a disease of unknown nature, of hidden origin and uncertain symptoms, however the effect in the uterus is seen which affects the whole psychology. In this sense, it is a disease of sexual tension what creates physical and mental convulsions and movements.

Towards the end of the 18th century hypochondria and hysteria were believed to be mental illnesses or the “disease of the nerves.” Hysteria was often perceived as a kind of disease which is caused by the internal heat related to “amorous ardor” linked with the idea of girls looking for husbands. It is said that women are more distracted by love than men. But hysteria is not a simple disease. It may cause a total mental

disorder and the disorder in the whole working and thinking activities. The effervescence or the kind of vapor that arises out of the body creates a pathological symptom or the emergence of both the diseases. Hypochondria is more like melancholia than anything else and thus has signs of weakness, depression, inactivity, lethargy and sadness. In this sense hysteria is very much like mania and hypochondria is like melancholia but the origins and nature of the diseases even with identical symptoms are different. Melancholia and hypochondria are the inactive forms of psychological illnesses. There is little likelihood of their coming into violence, but they are self damaging, suicidal and depressive, whereas mania and melancholia are the frenzies which are driven by a kind of heat and vapor in body and mind, so that the sufferers of these illnesses may come down to violence upon the opponents, rivals or the counterparts or even upon the persons of close relations. Such frenzies create anger, emotion, passion, jealousy, irritation, greed and the criminal sensations, so that there is much likelihood of these diseases to cause violence. Hypochondria and melancholia characterize low spirit and low blood pressure syndrome, whereas mania and hysteria feature out high spirit, alcoholic and high blood pressure signs. The maniacs and hysterics act and sometimes overact too, so that they in their abnormal or extraordinary situation cause violence, or become violence-oriented.

Foucault explains the relation of madness or mental illness with other aspects of life and society. Madness is attached to many other things that are social, economic, political, religious, familial, and sometimes circumstantial or even accidental. Foucault explains these dimensions of madness in "The Great Fear" in his *Madness and Civilization*. Why somebody is naked or in rags is not only based on social and economic reasons. There can be unreason behind. This unreason gives rise to the idea of madness or insanity. Through all ages the madman too has remained a social individual, who

conversed and was conversed with, but the kinds of incoherence, unreason and irrationality that he exhibited in his conversation and behaviors turned him a madman. Madness was feared to be the birthplace of terror, which may give rise to the reign of terror.

In the time of great confinement, the madmen would become worse than better. They would take other more dangerous forms of diseases besides madness, and sometimes they would come out more insane and violent due to which there might be a danger for them to cause violence upon other in anger and obsession.

In the middle of the eighteenth century people suddenly had a great fear by of kind of stinking vapor that they smelt coming form the houses of confinement, which, they guessed, was contagious and tainted. The people thought that the vapor of rottenness would cause an epidemic. The smell of rottenness was the corrupted air of hospitals, prisons and houses of confinement. It created a conflict between morality and medicine and between emotional and political exploitations of fears. People had the epidemic in the cities from the Hospital General in 1780, and also the smell of rottenness naturally aroused the fears of the contagion. The stinking smells were later discovered as the smell of the “putrid fever” or the kinds of infections of the people in the Hospital General or in the houses of confinement and also due to poor sanitary conditions.

Similarly, the unreason that people manifest in them is a kind of illness that is more pathological than logical or psychological. In the same book Foucault claims:

It is important, perhaps decisive for the place madness was to occupy in modern culture, that *home medicus* was not called into the world of confinement as an arbiter, to divide what was crime for what was madness, what was evil from what was illness, but rather as a guardian, to

protect others from the vague danger that exuded through the walls of confinement. (195)

There was “an inextricable mixture of physical and moral contagions” (196). When the complications of the fear of this contagion increase, the question arises, “The question, for the moment, was not to suppress the houses of confinement, but to neutralize them as potential causes of a new evil. The problem was to organize them while purifying them” (Foucault, *Madness* 196). The reform movement of destroying impurities began in the second half of the 18th century along with the realization of ideas of correction. The parents also made their children aware of such houses, their environment and the men fettered inside, so that the correction could be done right from the roots. Then only morality could comply with medicine.

The ancient myths and writings, whether they are eastern or western, manifest violence in profusion. Most of these ancient writings are either tragedies or tragicomedies or melodramatic works which were based on the concept that there should be action that is guided by violent conflict between the forces of the antagonist and protagonist. The antagonist would play upon the protagonist’s love or family relation or the property or friendship with treachery, betrayal, hypocrisy, domination, torture and murder. The antagonists and protagonists themselves are either of intimate relationship or the antagonists cause to create the situation so that the protagonist commits blunders which become the cause of his downfall or the protagonist finally comes to be victorious after many tragic fights, losses and damages. Any way, the violence of intimate relationship that occurs most frequently is the touchiest type in the human relations among all violent actions. Foucault shows similarities and differences between the madness of the age of reason and that of Renaissance and of

the Middle ages, where some sorts of contradictions are clearly remarked. Foucault says:

A strange contradiction: the classical age enveloped madness in a total experience of unreason; it reabsorbed its particular forms, which the Middle Ages and the Renaissance had clearly individualized into a general apprehension in which madness consorted indiscriminately with all the forms of unreason. But at the same time it assigned to this same madness a special sign: not that of sickness, but that of glorified scandal. (*Madness* 65-66)

In the classical period, even if the madmen were kept behind the bars, they were there to be looked at to see what monstrous or bestial instinct functioned inside the madmen.

Crisis of Existence and Spiritual Degeneration in *An American Dream*

Violence for existence and identity is common in the writings of post the Marxist era. Poirier sees that American fiction abounds in violence. Rapes, abductions, lynching, physical and mental tortures and murders are probably the dominant themes of the American novels. In the modern American novels, violence is presented in its extreme forms. Some of these forms are structural in the sense that they are very much organized, for example America's interventions in Vietnam or much later in Iraq are such types. Many others are cultural and interpersonal. The violence in the intimate relationship has rampantly affected the American society. Norman Mailer's *An American Dream* (1965) is one of the most representative novels to characterize the American society and to depict the violence used in the intimate relationship.

The post-Marxist writer, Mailer, begins to blur ethical and aesthetic categories.

In *An American Dream* Stephen Richards Rojack is the principal character who is “a television personality,” “professor of Existential Psychology,” “ex-Congressman,” “holder of distinguished services cross.” Such a celebrated personality strangles his wife Deborah in a violent struggle in her apartment. In the beginning of the novel Rojack tells the readers that he won his D.S.C. by killing four German soldiers in the Second World War. Then for twenty years he has not been able to do any significant work nor has he written any good book. He leads a nominal life as “an intellectual figure and socialite.” He has lot of psychic ups and downs. He is hung on to the dependence on his wife Deborah. He loses self-standing capacity.

He fears to have suffered from cancer. In the condition of dependence, internal isolation and incapability of any significant work of social recognition, once after a party in his friend’s apartment he stands alone on the balcony, stares at the full moon and has “a powerful compulsion of suicide.” Then his impulse drives him to the suicidal action but he fails to commit it. “He goes so far as to step over the balustrade; then, waving, he clammers in fear back to safety. The failure to obey his impulse to jump is invested with great significance by Rojack, and described in terms of the theory of cancer . . .” (Leeds 128).

Rojack is frightened and sick with the fear of cancer and by the impulse of suicide. He goes to his wife Deborah but there they quarrel. Rojack gets badly insulted. Deborah slaps him in anger and shock. They have a violent struggle with each other, and at the height of excitement and anger, Rojack strangles his wife to death. He leaves the dead body in her bedroom and enters the maid’s (Ruta’s) room

and has an extensive sexual relation with her. Then finally he throws Deborah's dead body out through the window to make it look like suicide.

Deborah's dead body is lying on Riverside Drive. There takes place a minor traffic accident by a car of Eddie Gunnucci, a mafia leader. He is caught in his car along with his nephew Tony and a blonde called Cherry. Cherry too has a significant role in Rojack's life.

Roberts, the chief investigating detective, investigate Deborah's death. Rojack deals with the police boldly and confidently at the police station. He is temporarily released. He goes to the downtown club, which is owned by Tony where Cherry is a singer. He has a tense confrontation with an ex-prize fighter like "Romeo" Romalozzo. Rojack wins Cherry's favor and consequently Cherry leaves her work early defying Tony, and they have a secret union in Cherry's sister's room. Cherry's sister has sexual affair with Shago Martin, a famous Negro singer. This worries Cherry but she herself arranges relation with Shago Martin. The frustrated sister has a brutal affair with "a nameless pimp" which ends her life in suicide. Cherry, later, gets the man killed.

Having a long sexual affair with Cherry in the apartment, Rojack leaves her asleep to a new day and moves out. He faces many hostilities in the world out. Rojack comes back. He gives calls to Arthur and Dr. Frederick Tarchman, consecutively a television producer and the head of his department at a University for his book. Both talk to him sympathetically but cancel his connection with their institutions regarding the matters of the murder scandal. He then receives a call from Mr. Gigot, a mentally disturbed friend to Deborah, to reveal that Deborah was a spy as well as a double agent. Ruta too is Barney Oswald Kelly's mistress. Kelly had been using Ruta to spy on his daughter's life and her connections.

According to his earlier appointment, he walks up to meet detective Roberts. They have questions, counter questions, arguments and struggles. Roberts's suspicions have some credible grounds; however, he drops Rojack's case and gives him clarification. Eddie Gannucci, the mafia leader whose car has been suspected to crush Deborah, also is released. The detective has a suspicion that Rojack may be a CIA operative.

Rojack phones Barney Oswald Kelly and arranges an appointment. Rojack takes Cherry into sufficient confidence, and admits to her about Deborah's murder. Cherry also tells him that in Las Vegas she had been "the mistress of an older man, a wealthy and influential businessman who was integrally connected with the mafia . . . she reveals that her lover was Barney Kelly" (Leeds 131). While they are talking, Shago Martin enters. Shago gets intensely excited with anger to see Rojack and Cherry in affair. Rojack has a fierce fight with Shago. He succeeds in beating Shago and pushes him down the stairs into the street. Rojack takes Shago's forgotten umbrella and goes straight to meet Kelly. Kelly and Rojack settle to meet at Waldorf Towers. Kelly is accompanied by Eddie Gannucci, Ruta, Deborah's young daughter Deidre, and Deborah's mother's cousin Bess. Looking at the mood, they leave Kelly and Rojack alone. Kelly reveals that he had had incestuous relation with Deborah. He also charges Rojack that Deborah's death was not a suicide but a murder. Leeds summarizes the height of this confrontation as it goes below:

Aware that Deborah's death was not a suicide, Kelly attempts to push Rojack over the edge with Shago Martin's umbrella, thrusting as with a sword. Grasping the umbrella, Rojack pulls himself back for safety and bludgeons Kelly once across the face with the umbrella, then leaves the hotel. (132)

Rojack goes back to Cherry but he finds her badly beaten almost to death. Roberts, the detective tells Rojack that Shago Martin had been beaten to death two hours earlier. Cherry dies but she becomes able to whisper to Rojack that she was fiercely beaten by one of Martin's friends as revenge. Finally in the state of frustration and depressed feeling, Rojack sets out on a drive to South America: to Guatemala and Yucatan as a pilgrimage for his salvation. The presentation of Rojack is like Mailer's self-reflection. He was ambitious and had the wide experiences of traveling. He thought sex as "the sword of history." He had several risky fights with his wife. "In Mailer's second marriage, violence, the temptation to risk violence, was becoming an aspect of the relationship" (Glenday 20).

Richard Foster summarizes the subject matter of mailer's novels; "Life threatened in our time by the forces of death is Mailer's subject everywhere" (Foster 18). Mailer begins his novel *Naked and Dead* with, "Nobody could sleep, when morning came, . . . all over the ship, all through the convoy, there was a knowledge that in a few hours some of them were going to be dead" (Mailer 7). In his novels Mailer presents the horror and cruelty of death. The terror of death is sometimes suicidal and sometimes murderous as it happens to Rojack in *An American Dream*. There is "a final sacrifice to the drive in Rojack (now totally purged) for suicide or murder" (Leeds 149). And then Rojack chooses murder instead of suicide. Violence and sex are two major themes in Mailer's novels. In almost all his novels violence is closely connected with the sexual act as it is seen in *An American Dream*. In a dialogue between himself and Eitel, Mailer spoke about the importance of sex, "Would You agree that sex is where philosophy begins?" (qtd. in Poirier 37). Sex is the central theme in Mailer with which violence is trailed indispensably. Mailer goes deep in human psychology with symbolic comparison. As in his *Why are we in*

Vietnam? Mailer presents the violence with the animals in a hunting trip in Alaska.

The novel is not about any event or story of Vietnam, nor is the term used in the novel more than once. The last sentence of the novel goes like; “This is D.J., Disk Jockey to America turning off. Vietnam, hot damn” (Mailer 208). The novel seems to compare the terror of violence of the American soldiers in Vietnam with the deer hunting in the snow of Alaska. “It can be read as a symbolic psychic explanation of why America fights in Vietnam” (blurb). In this context Sigmund Freud’s reference to Lipps’s thesis about “Conscious and Unconscious” can be appropriately relevant according to which,

“... apart from conscious there are also unconscious psychical processes. Lipps carries things further with his assertion that the whole of what is psychical exists unconsciously and that a part of it also exists consciously” (Freud, *The Interpretation* 775). The question of Vietnam occupied the psychic being of every American at that time where the terror of violence ruled. In an interview with Steven Marcus, speaking about “Craft and Conscious” Norman Mailer expresses the development in his visions in the later days, “I’m not speaking now of violence or of active conflict between one being and another. That still belongs to drama. But the war between being and nothingness is the underlying illness of the twentieth century. Boredom slays more of existence than war” (Pontifications). The change of attitude about violent conflict in mailer’s later works is an inward tuning to ponder about the psychic degeneration of life. The expression of confusion in the form of a question ‘Why are we in Vietnam?’ is probably the result of the same development.

Violence in Culture and Tradition

In historical and philosophical writings, we find cultural violence in profusion. The fictional writings too are the reflections of the cultural traditions. In oriental

mythology basically in the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata*, most of the violent activities are influenced by the-then cultural motivations. It is said that the Kshetriyas have to fight because it is in their culture. The whole story of the *Mahabharata* is inherently guided by culture. Rama obeys his father's order, goes to jungle, chases with golden deer, loses the wife, fights with Bali, fights with Ravana, comes back home, deserts his wife for his prestige, fights with his sons Lava and Kusha, and finally gets reunited with his sons and wife - all according to the cultural values. Similarly, in the *Mahabharata* the thing goes according the cultural practices. The traditions of the Kuru dynasty about being the king, about getting married, about fighting and about respecting the systems, attitudes towards seniors and women are based on culture. The contradictions arise when the cultural values and understandings are not followed and the real turmoil begins when the family systems are violated.

The most heinous type of violence is the one in which people give human sacrifices in order to please their gods and goddesses. In one of the episodes of *The Iliad*, Agamemnon sacrifices his own daughter so that the winds will blow.

Even in modern times we have heard and read about such superstitious activities in some of the communities through out the world. This is followed as an intimate religion of a family or of certain backward community. Even if law prohibits and severely punishes such actions, people still very secretly follow the ways.

One such cruel religious practice has been delineated in Bessie Head's short story "Looking for a Rain God" where a father sacrifices his daughters to bring rainfall.

Such human sacrifices in the cultural traditions are nothing other than the sheer human madness professed as religious practices. Such traditions can never be

taken as tokens of human civilization, but civilization also has been developed through all such good and bad customs, rituals and cultural traditions.

For Foucault the cultural set-ups and the their changes are made for developments in human civilization; however many of such cultural practices were conceived by the momentary madness of some power holders. In one sense the formation of culture was madness, in another sense it was to develop the order in the rule or to develop the rules conduct and discipline in the society. For Foucault, any offence committed to obtain the remission of sins and the mercy of God for the pardon of the sins was a crime, and it deserved punishment.

Tradition of Torture and Violence

Tony Morrison focuses on racial violence, color discrimination, slavery, deprivation, exploitation, tortures and injustice. The presentations and picturization of tortures and discrimination she has made in her novels are based on the history of slavery, stories of particular events and experiences and her own perceptions and observations. Visible violence is direct violence whereas the invisible type goes with cultural and structural violence (Galtung, *Coping* 4).

Toni Morrison's *Beloved* is based on the "true story of Margaret Garner, a slave woman who killed her own child rather than sell her into slavery" (Smith 372). The novel presents the true picture of the condition of the black people before the civil rights movements of 1960s. Valerie Smith further says, "*Beloved* is one of a number of contemporary novels by African American authors that retell the story of slavery" (372). Morrison has captured the true image of an "unspeakable horror of slavery" and has developed it by the power of her imagination. The protagonists experience both "horrors of slavery" and "psychic trauma" persist in *Beloved* 'which

undermines their sense of self” (Fitzgerald 120). Valerie Smith has presented the whole dynamism of the experience of the slave tradition in Morrison’s novels:

Beloved reflects Morrison’s interest in recovering the slave’s experience, given the paucity of available materials from the slave’s own perspective. Her sensitivity to the relationship between history and fiction is evident through her fiction to name but two examples, the experience of World War I shapes the life of Shadrack in *Sula*, and the legacy of slavery and the civil rights movement informs the world of *Song of Solomon*. (372)

The historical information of infanticide in *Beloved* provides a basis for historical research, and the presentation of the history in fiction requires the craft of fiction and creative imagination, which Morrison locates artistically in her novel. Morrison herself said that she was not so much interested in Margaret Garner’s records of life, nor was she interested to focus on Margaret Garner’s personality as a historical matter. From reading and researching her, Morrison just wanted to find the points how Garner got the feeling of killing her only daughter. Garner could be anybody, but she lived in such a dreadful situation, so that she felt like killing her daughter even to express her affection and sympathy against the system of slavery and torture. Morrison says:

I did research about a lot of things in this book in order to narrow it, to make it narrow and deep, but I did not do much research on Margaret Garner other than the obvious stuff, because I wanted to invent her life, which is a way of saying I wanted to be accessible to anything the characters had to say about it. Recording her life as lived would not interest me, and would not make me available to anything that might be

pertinent. I got to a point where in asking myself, who could judge Sethe adequately, since I couldn't, and nobody else that knew her could, really, I felt the only person who could judge her would be the daughter she killed. (qtd. in Smith 372)

The main line of history of *Beloved* is based on the “real life incident” however Morrison has given adequate imaginative color so as to make a “political point”. The protagonist escapes from slavery and again brought back to it. Running away from slavery was also a crime. Since they thought that the Fugitive Slave Law was unconstitutional, they tried Margaret Garner for murder. Slavery, attempts of running away from freedom, murder for final redemption, trial or murder and again slavery and for freedom seeking practice are the general contents of *Beloved*, however the novel characterizes the kind of slavery that deconstructs a certain period of time. It is not slavery of total submission but of revolt for freedom.

Violence as a Struggle for Power

Most of the violent actions in human history have taken place due to the power motivation. Jealousy, greed, sense of rivalry, ego, arrogance and passions may be working behind violence as the guiding force. Violence from the persons of the most intimate relations to the persons in the state power has occurred due to the inherent motive of the power possession. From the earliest form of the humans of the Stone Age to the most advanced men of the modern times, the power struggle has remained continuous. The power struggle is basically the animal instinct. In the animals the struggle for power appears to be naturally inherent and instinctual. They fight with each other only to prove who is powerful and who is not. When the power is tested, many things among the animals become settled, but among the humans it is full of ego, rivalry and the question of existence. Man being the most rational and intelligent

creature of nature, its involvement in violence sometimes becomes very much irrational and indolent. Most of man's violent activities are guided by passions, and he tries to rationalize them. The attempt at rationalization of any violence is a way to create truth. Any truth that becomes established for a moment or for a period of time is determined by power. When power changes, truth also changes. Therefore, there have been continuous power struggles that have influenced truth. The struggle for power is termed as power politics. Moreover, the forces around always guide the truth.

Michel Foucault has worked upon the concept of the relation of truth over power. He holds the idea that truth is determined by power. Therefore, all power struggles always try to decide and substitute the truth established by earlier power relations. Foucault believes "truth isn't outside power, or lacking in power" (Foucault, "Truth and Power" 1144) and more so, truth is what power defines or interprets.

Foucault further presents his ideas more clearly:

Truth is a thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its "general politics" of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts is true. ("Truth and Power" 1144)

To apply Michel Foucault's concept of truth and power in the literary writings, it can have better justifications. Moreover, the application with interpretation will definitely appear brilliant and beautiful.

In "political economy," truth appears as form of scientific discourse and truth is "as much for the economic production as for political power" and it is the center of all political debates, and "ideological struggles" (1144).

Foucault emphasizes on the roles of the intellectual in the matter of truth. The intellectual battles "for truth" or "around truth." It depends what roles he is performing: whether he is in the service of the bourgeois capitalism or "'organic' intellectual of the proletariat." Foucault's main concern is to show "the battle about the status of truth and economic and political role it plays" (1144). Foucault wants to explain "the political problem of the intellectuals not in terms of "science" and "ideology," but in terms of "truth" and "power" (1144).

In his whole proposition of truth and power, he does not mean that truth is something that is discovered or accepted but by means of some rules it can see how false and true are separated by the effects of power. Foucault almost sums up not to confuse the relation between truth and power by saying:

"Truth" is to be understood as a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of statements. "Truth" is linked in a circulation relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extend it. A "regime" of truth. ("Truth and Power" 1145)

The regime of truth is not simply "ideological or superstructural" but "the condition of formation and development of capitalism" or of socialism. Truth cannot

be separated or emancipated from power, but there should be attempts for the detachment. Truth is nothing other than truth itself.

The whole story of the *Mahabharata* can be best interpreted in the light of the concept that power determines truth. When Dushashana is drawing Draupadi's sari, she entreats the great men of justice, intellect and gallantry, the great guardians of the family and of the state, and the persons who can influence the rule and politics of the time, but they remain just silent and keep watching everything helplessly. Nobody speaks in her favour against the injustice as if they were the cowards or they thought that that was right.

All great and brave heroes and guardians of the court remain spellbound and head-bent. They do not speak not because they do not know what is good and what is bad but because they pay obeisance to power. Power dominates their wisdom and they cannot speak the poetic truth or that was the truth established by the power at the time. From today's vantage point we have the concept of different truth but for the time that probably was the truth. Kansa killed all the elder brothers and sisters of Krishna, because such a great king like Kansa had the threat of assassination from the births of her sister's womb, which was not simply bearable for a great power holder like him. To establish the truth of the power Kansa imprisoned his father and went on killing all the babies born of Devaki in his knowledge. When Krishna was born, such a miraculous figure too could not kill him outright. Krishna had to wait for the right situation. By the time Krishna killed Kansa the situation had changed. Kansa's immorality and viciousness had reached the climax. He had been weak and frustrated. He was almost powerless to continue the truth he had established. Krishna too was strong enough to have his own truth of his power. Then the fight occurred and the other side of the opposition became able to set its own truth.

Hiranya Kashyapu prohibited his son Prahlad from expressing his intimate feelings and his willful attachment. His power clash with Bishnu did not only make him mad but also led him to destroy his own son and himself. Similarly, the war between Rama and Ravana was sheerly the power conflict over the possession of beauty and glory. The clash between Vaali and Sugreeva too reflects the same interest towards power and beauty. Rama favours Sugreeva because he too wants to gain power from Sugreeva's monkey soldiers about getting his Sita back from Ravana's capture. All the fights between Deva and Danava are based on power conflict. Most of them have been held for regaining the lost power and truth. In those times it was the concept that whoever was more powerful, he claimed himself to be the rightful person to possess the state power and the beauty, which is the universal assumption of power politics.

Likewise, in the mythology of Greece and Rome the clash between Uranus and his son Cyplops and giants, the conflict between Uranus and Cronus and the whole fight between Titans and the Gods are power struggles. The war between Troy and Sparta in the Greek myth was a great struggle for power and beauty. Like the stories of the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata*, the stories of the *Illiad* too manifest the sharp tussles of power of the kings, commanders and the heroes of the time.

For the possession of power Duryodhana undertakes all tricks and treacheries superseding his seniors in the *Mahabharata*, Kansa keeps his father, his sister and her husband in the jail cells in the *Krishna Charitra*, Hiranyakashyapu tortures his son with a view to killing him in the *Bishnu Purana*, Uranus hurls down his own sons to the region of darkness, Cronus deceives his mother's hope, dismembers his father's body and throws it in the sea, and finally Zeus releases the Cyclops and the giants in order to get himself empowered to overcome the generations of Titans in ancient

Greek mythology. Similarly, in the *Illiad* Priam and Hecuba throw their son Paris to the mountain and Agamemnon sacrifices his daughter Iphigenia absolutely with the hope of gaining power, Odipus kills the king of Thebes, unknowingly his own father Laios and becomes the king of the kingdom of Thebes in *Oedipus Rex*, Claudius kills his own brother Hamlet and marries the sister-in-law in *Hamlet*, Iago conspires to throw his commander Othello into the sheer jealousy and prepares the situation for Othello to kill his wife and finally to commit suicide in *Othello* and Brutus and Cassius manage to kill Caesar in *Julius Caesar*. In these manifestations, there are clear examples of the struggles for power. Everytime violence is undertaken in order to seize power. In most of these situations violence has been used in the intimate relations.

Truth is almost always associated with power, and as the power shifts truth changes. Foucault's "Truth and Power" is instrumental to examine how power influences truth and how power comes down to undertake violence. Power may use his domination upon the less powerful or powerless beings. In a family a husband generally uses its domination upon his wife, the power of which has been already bestowed upon him by patriarchy, the religion, social system and tradition. Similarly, children are also repressed or dominated by the superiors or powerful persons in the family or elsewhere. Their sexuality or the expression of feelings are often curtailed or subdued by power. All this endowment of power either social or juridical is political, which establishes or influences truth. The power struggle in the political structures changes the already established system of power. The power clashes may dreadfully create the concatenation of serious violent events in the political superstructures. Father against son and son against father, brothers against brothers, relatives and kinsmen involve in violence so much so that power determines what is true and what not. The

emergence of power is not immediate or volcanic. Power grows out of events, consequences and development of series of minute actions and interactions.

Power as repression is yet to be defined above the mere idea of power in the form of law, a juridical force, or a force of prohibition. But for Foucault power is not simply a force to put burden upon us, or makes us do whatever it wants. In “Power and Truth” Foucault says that power “traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse” (1139). It is not simply the force of the army, police or fiscal administration, but from the classical period, it has been obvious that power has created its own economy and circulated its effects “in a manner at once continuous, uninterrupted, adapted and ‘individualized’ throughout the entire social body” (1139).

In Foucault’s opinion the development of science and its forms of knowledge brought out the questions of power politics in focus and also manifested how power circulated, how “the external power imposes itself on science” and how the “internal power regime” functions for its external manifestations.

Foucault in his *Madness and Civilization* brings the concept of power still more clearly that power creates madness, so that it should be repressed to silence. In this context he connects power with psychiatry and says that, “vulnerable and anxious madness which the mechanisms of power and psychiatry were supposed to have come to repress and reduce to silence” (“Truth and Power” 1139).

During the Middle Ages monarchy used its power despotic, tyrannical and claimed itself to be capable of ending all wars.

Sovereign, law and prohibition formed a system of representation of power which was extended during the subsequent era by the theories of right: political theory has never ceased to be obsessed with the person

of the sovereign. Such theory still continues today to busy themselves with the problem of sovereignty. (Foucault, "Truth and Power" 1140)

The king's sovereignty contradicted with the development of political philosophy, new system and new meaning of power, so that the king's head was cut off.

State means sovereignty, which uses all its state apparatuses for essential repression by means of army, police and justice. State power is important in the questions of power relations, but the analysis of power goes beyond this limit. In this sense, in spite of its omnipotent power possession, the state "is far from being able to occupy the whole field of actual power relations" (1140) and in the super-structural level of the state, it encompasses "a whole series of power networks that invest the body, sexuality, the family, kinship, knowledge, technology and so forth" (1140). It is a kind of 'meta-power' which implies "multiple and indefinite power relations" (Foucault, "Truth and Power" 1140).

Power as Mania and Crisis

In both the novels *Beloved* and *An American Dream* power plays an important role for violence. In Toni Morrison's *Beloved* violence is used as a revolt against the White power and domination and against the submission to it. The mother kills the child because she wants to end all her pains and sufferings caused and inflicted by the tortures of slavery. Killing a child by the mother to save her from pains of slavery means that slavery is worse than death. The mother reacts against the power and dominations of the slave owners. Moreover, she ridicules and challenges that power of the Whites which cannot save life. The woman cannot fight slavery because she is powerless, but she fights with the slave owning power the Whites'. At the situation of power crisis if some body cannot win, he or she will react against the power either by

damaging the self by suicide or by self-flagellation or by killing and torturing the intimate person. In Toni Morrison's *Beloved* too, the mother kills her child because she cannot fight with the White domination and as a revolt to the system she undertakes the way in which she uses her most devastating power to sacrifice her own baby. This reaction is an extreme form of frustration but she does not have any way out. When she feels powerless to revolt against the system, she uses her power to violate the existing social and political system.

It indicates that the system of enslaving the people of certain race and colour is totally unjust and unjustifiable. It also shows that power can be used only upon the less powerful ones. The woman is in the power crisis because she cannot launch a united revolt but can use the way of self-destruction that results into the killing of her own child.

It clearly shows that the Black woman feels a kind of power crisis. This is the case of the whole Black community of the time. As the Black woman revolts against the power holders by killing her own child, she ridicules the so-called power of the Whites, of the White government and even of the almighty that have created and protected the unjust and unfair system in which the whole race of the Black community has been enslaved, tortured and crushed down.

In power politics, Norman Mailer's *An American Dream* appears to be an anti-pole to Toni Morrison's *Beloved*. In *An American Dream* the killing is an expression of jealousy and hatred whereas in *Beloved* it is the expression of love and affection. Therefore, violence is not always the result of the broken relationship but of the depth of feeling.

Norman Mailer's *An American Dream* exposes all perversions and disharmonies of the rise of capitalism. In a capitalistic bourgeois society people

always run for power and money, not for intimacy and hearty relationship. Stephen Richards Rojack marries Deborah not because he loves her but because he thinks that he can have money, prestige and power from her father. But in course of time his dream gets shattered because he feels dominated and humiliated. He senses that he is insecure and he cannot have the satisfaction of the privileges that he had expected. More so, he cannot have sufficient sexual pleasure from Deborah. Rather, he undergoes a kind of sexual impotence. At this situation he thinks that he is totally powerless. He goes back to his past and feels nostalgic. He develops a kind of suicidal instinct. At this point either he has to kill himself or kill his wife. He kills his wife in order to avoid self-killing. More so, he kills his wife in order to test his power over her. It shows that the state of power crisis is generally violence-oriented. In reality, too, in many cases when the husband cannot become victorious or he feels that he has lost his self-dignity, he satisfies himself by killing his wife or his intimate kinsmen or by torturing those powerless ones who have remained long dominated by him.

Another very important idea is that in a growing capitalistic bourgeois society the conflict of rights brings sharp contradictions between persons. In Mailer's *An American Dream*, Rojack seems to claim his domination over his wife as his patriarchal right whereas Deborah seems to claim her freedom from all traditional bondages over a woman. This sharp contradiction between old patriarchal domination and modern matrimonial claim for freedom leads the husband and wife to their cold and bitter relation which finally results into a violent fight and then to the murder of the wife. Therefore, Norman Mailer's novel *An American Dream* is a novel of power struggle and power crisis, and hence of perversions, confrontations, murder and violence. *An American Dream* is truly a representative novel of a capitalistic

bourgeois society in which human relations are totally mechanical where violent encounters between intimate persons are frequent and natural.

Struggle with a Suicidal Impulse

Rojack struggles with his suicidal impulse and wanders away. He gives a telephone call to his separated wife, Deborah. There are significant marks of “domination – submission struggle” and more so she has never been identified by her married name until he announces her death. As Gutman writes to relate to this particular situation:

Deborah’s veiled violence and her need for mastery and cruelty bring Rojack to a fever pitch, so that in the space of at most an hour and a half the moon guides him through a murder; a compressed orgy which involves masturbation, foot fetishism, anal and vaginal penetration; a mutilation of a dead body; and yet another sexual encounter – quite a series of “extreme situations.” (106)

It is not always hatred and suspicion but love and jealousy or passionate attachments that also result into murder and violence. Sometimes the momentary emotions dominate the rational self-leading one to commit violence upon the persons of the intimate relationship. When the demonic self becomes dominant, the psychic being of a person powerfully becomes violence-oriented, to such an extent that all the other selves get easily defeated or give way to the commitment of violence. Rojack in his restlessness forgets his status and loses his power of rationality, and kills his wife because he finds killing only a way to give vent to his demonic impulse that has remained in him suppressed for long. Norman Mailer has most successfully presented the murder by the hero of his wife, which he had tried before in his earlier novels. Actually Gutman works upon the self and society to understand murder and death as: “Murder requires an

extraordinary commitment to discover the self, since it violates the most basic mandates and taboos of society and since it involves the murderer in a confrontation with death” (Gutman 106).

To depict the situation of murder, in a work of art naturally has to break the concepts of social norms, values, system and laws, and the emotions have to supercede or surpass the social rules. Murders are naturally possible because they are based on the instincts and emotions which are to function through the human actions. “Certainly murder . . . forces the individual back to his instincts” (106).

Rojack is caught up in mortal combat and his instinct of self-preservation is one of the ways of returning to his instinct. Secondly, by murdering his wife, Rojack’s emotions act out. Thirdly, committing an act of murder very much depends upon his individual situations, resources and rejection of social values. In Rojack’s case he acts against the society rejecting its taboos and presenting himself as a rebellious character. “In this process of death, action, rebellion, and outlawry, the murderer is forced upon himself; he must rely on his instincts and the courage he can muster” (106).

Rojack commits murder of his wife Deborah because he thinks that murder is a process of liberation. He tries to solve the confrontation between his exterior and interior reality. He wants to end his marriage-ties with Deborah, but yet he feels that he is in the magical and spiritual hold of his murdered wife.

The interpersonal violence of the intimate relationship in the novel is best manifested in Rojack’s act of Deborah’s murder. Rojack wants to solve many problems of his life by this murder. As Gutman writes:

Murder, then, involves the simultaneous confrontation of exterior and interior reality. Rojack begins his voyage without and within when he

murders Deborah. As is the case with most human endeavours, his voyage within is more difficult and more important than his voyage without. He murders Deborah, ostensibly, as an act of liberation. Now he is free of her, of her malice toward him, and of his past. Their marriage is dissolved, and though Rojack believes that Deborah still maintains a magical, spiritual hold over him, the hold seems to weaken during the course of the novel. (106-107)

By this murder he goes through the “rediscovery and repossession of his violent soul” in a sense that *An American Dream* can be examined from the viewpoint of an experiment of the postmodern concept. By murdering Deborah, Rojack decenters himself. As Rojack himself has tried to drift away from the hold of the center. Rojack says, “I had opened a void - that I was now without center, can you understand? I did not belong to myself any longer. Deborah had occupied my center” (Mailer, *An American Dream* 30-31).

Rojack does not want to depend upon anything or anybody outside him. He wants to seek the meaning of his existence, and also wants to measure the heroism that is supposed to lie within him. He wants to find the center within himself. The question there is “. . . how does a man, surrounded by nothingness, make out of his existence something meaningful or valuable? Although such a man may not be happy – indeed is not happy, being encumbered with dread – he alone leads an authentic existence” (Gutman 107).

Rojack loses confidence because his center is captured by Deborah. He wants to free himself. He wants to break all chains and boundaries. He wants to remain himself and behave like himself. He is different from Kelly and thinks that he does not belong to himself. After committing the murder he realizes that he is a criminal: a

murderer. He feels that the devil has filled in him and he cannot distinguish love from devil. He says:

And that sensation of not belonging to myself, of not being owned at my center by Deborah – that emotion which had come on me not five minutes before I killed her – now came back. I felt murder. It frightened me. The possibility that what I felt, when we made love, was a sensation which belonged to me alone, left me murderous. For how did one distinguish love from the art of the Devil? (Mailer, *An American Dream* 157)

In the face of fear and dread Rojack commits a heinous crime, a strong social taboo or an incest. By this murder he frees himself from the armature and also wins a kind of battle over the fear and dread, which he has lost time and again while facing a full moon. From the murder of Deborah, Rojack is set on the road to his salvation, toward his own center. He finds himself renewed by the feeling of a catharsis, and he thinks that he has got a new life. He realizes, “If Deborah’s dying had given me a new life, I must be all of eight hours old by now” (qtd. in Gutman 107).

Murder gives relief to Rojack. It promises him a vast relief. It gives him a sexual charm. “Rojack finds murder more exhilarating than suicide because suicide promises no relief” (107). For Mailer, murder is a way of self-knowledge, the search for apocalypse and a feeling that is close to the sexual climax. Mailer presents Rojack as one to take up murder as the process of spiritual emancipation. Rojack describes murder as something plucking out or squeezing the “softest breast of the softest pigeon” which can be compared with the breast of a woman. Rojack finds connection between sex and murder but somewhere his thought is obstructed and his fantasy shattered. As it is described about Rojack by Stanley T. Gutman:

But the most explicit connection between sex and murder occurs when Rojack kills his wife; he is in an orgy of violence, first fantasizing a rare heaven within the female body, then forcing his way in, driving impelled by spasms; pressure and desire build up as he imagines himself ejaculating in an unprotected woman; and finally he explodes, hurling out what is within him in stupendous array, crying “never halt now” as the orgasmic intensity overwhelms him and he feels everything within him pass out in waves through an open door. (108).

Rojack describes the moment of the action of the murder and the feelings and emotions that arise within him. He says:

I released the pressure on her throat, and the door I had been opening began to close. But I had had a view of what was on the other side of the floor, and heaven was there, some quiver of jeweled cities shining in the glow of a tropical dusk, and I thrust against the door once more and hardly felt her hand leave my shoulder, I was driving now with force against that door; spasms began to open in me, and my mind cried out then, “Hold back! You’re going too far, hold back!” (qtd. in Gutman 108).

Rojack admits that his mind cries out to him with a series of orders and command and he becomes ready to obey. He feels angry. He is overwhelmed with rage and hatred. He feels that his mind is exploding into the fireworks of rockets, stars and embers. He looks at Deborah’s body and still feels that it is murmuring in her throat. He says:

. . . the arm about her neck leaped against the whisper I could still feel murmuring in her throat, and crack I choked her harder, and crack I gave her payment – never halt now – and crack the door flew open and

the wire tore in her throat, and I was through the door, hatred passing from me in wave after wave, illness as well, rot and pestilence, nausea, a bleak string of salts, I was floating. (qtd. in Gutman 108-109)

From all these emotional description of Rojack's deeds, a kind of mounting sexual rhythm seems to be reinforced in repetition. From murdering his wife Deborah Rojack feels that he has won the battle against the dread and death. Rojack has faced a major challenge. He has daringly confronted the dread and death. He gambles with the police, loves Cherry, faces Shago, sees Kelly and walks up the parapet.

. . . these major confrontations are echoed and reinforced by smaller ones: whether to take a drink, whether to face a boxer and his gangster friends, whether to climb the stairs to Kelly's apartment. Sometimes Rojack wins, sometimes he loses in his effort to face the compulsions and emotions deep within his soul, to achieve in the flux of a temporal existence those rare and precious moments of authenticity. (109)

The murder in this novel is worth comparing with sex because sex also is something like a battle against fear; the price of defeat in sex is very severe and painful. Sex too requires courage for its performance. Mailer has created the finest model of an individual who represents the wholeness of Mailer's concept of murder and sex, as well as the American notion towards violence – basically of the interpersonal violence in the intimate relationship.

Sex becomes a major battleground of existence, on which the individual makes himself and discovers himself. Mailer, in this respect, reveals one of his fundamental beliefs, that sex is not romantic folderol or solely a drive toward libidinal satisfaction and fulfillment, but is rather one of the few areas open to man in which he can encounter his

naked desires, in which he must face up to the possibilities of mastery and subjection. In the sexual act, man is alone, and cannot put off his failures on anyone else. (109-110)

Mailer tries to justify every thought and action from the idea of dread and death, murder and sexuality. Through his characters like Rojack, Deborah, Cherry, Kelly and Shago Martin, Mailer talks about god and devil, not to represent good and evil but to present that God and devil can be indistinguishable. They can come in each other's guises and also that they don't always come for good intentions. Rojack gives a long and varied sex life to Cherry. Mailer discusses the male sexual power that appears almost like his own neuroses. Mailer's attempt at presenting his male character's potency of sexual power and masculinity is dubious, which reflects his personal life. "Rojack, in accord with Mailer's own biases, is caught up in the savage world of *machismo*. He can never back down, he must always prove himself" (110). The sexual frustration is the basis of murder and torture. Rojack kills his wife Deborah and Cherry in the state of extreme frustration and restlessness. As Gutman interprets:

The whole simplistic reaction to his threatened masculinity cast doubt on the validity of Mailer's vision, since much of his exploration of the search for meaning in the deepest levels of the psyche and the exploration of the areas beyond the fringe of morality can be seen as simple outgrowths of this insecurity. Even the necessity to grow at each instant can be interpreted as a glorification of the *machismo*. (110-111)

Likewise, for Mailer as Gutman says that dread naturally leads man to death and meaninglessness. In this line of thought, embracing dread by confronting with death or

sexuality is a kind of existential grace. Grace is a theological concept. Mailer has a view that there is a continuous war between God and the devil and this world is simply a battleground. Even if god loses, it graces. The same grace that comes out from the reward for right action is for the support to God in its eternal war with the Devil. As Gutman describes Mailer's religion, "Mailer lends credence to his view of man and society by tying it in with the divine: everything he describes or posits takes on richer significance if it is past of the teleology of the universe. In *An American Dream* Rojack's religion is courage" (111).

Deborah knows the secret of existence that God and Devil are in constant fight. This knowledge makes her feel insufferable and she pushes herself to the extreme limits of experience and tries to seek authenticity. In the same process she pushes Rojack. "She inflicts injury on Rojack, by her sins of both commission and omission" (112). The situation gets abnormally violent and Deborah foresees her murder. Rojack tries to kill himself; however immediately he externalizes his search and commits Deborah's murder. "Rojack murders her not as the stronger murdering the weaker, but because he is at a crisis in his life and floundering" (Gutman 112).

Rojack himself calls it a brave murder. He does not seem to have any repentance. He thinks that it is a solution to the problem of his existence, his dread and suffocation. By murdering his wife Deborah he avoids his own death. Rojack too glorifies murder as Faye does in *Advertisements for Myself*.

Deborah receives good and evil knowledge from her father Barney Oswald Kelly. Kelly has made Rojack understand that he and his daughter Deborah have committed incest several times due to temptation, which shows that in the combat between God and Devil, God lost the battle, so that the Devilish feeling would tempt a man over and over again. Kelly in the novel refers to Kierkegaard's thought at the

climax of his existential crisis. He uses a term “jump” to refer to his suicidal impulse, when he thinks of jumping out through an open window at the height of sixteen feet from the ground. Then at this state of frustration he tries to avoid the suicidal attempt, he goes to his daughter’s room and commits a devilish action of incest to submit himself to his deepest desires. He tries to break the incest taboo to conquer himself and to be much stronger than what he is. “And indeed, after seducing his daughter, there is little that is denied to Kelly, who becomes one of the most powerful men in the world” (Gutman 114).

Cherry is in love with Shago Martin that she tells it with Rojack. She understands Rojack’s motif and bargains with the evil; Ruta too understands God-Devil struggle when Rojack speaks. From presenting the character’s intentions and inclination Mailer tries to show the relationship between sex and murder, orgasm and death. As the action implies, “The most compelling rendering of this schema of the universe is when Rojack enters Ruta’s bedroom after killing his wife and, catching her in the act of masturbation, gets into bed with her” (114).

Sexuality and Violence

The social division among the people between classes, levels and races is based on the economic distinction but in the long run this distinction has been established as the distinction of sexuality. The aristocratic class is not simply economically or politically privileged and powerful but is aristocratic because it considers itself superior to other classes on its sexual relations. Formally it is hostile to make any family association with the people of other classes. The low castes and high castes are the sexual divisions determined by the early economic set up or by the nature of work. All the social and political rules are associated with sexuality. In the ancient times, to say that somebody was more powerful than some body else was to

believe that the powerful one was more sexually privileged than another person. Therefore, beauty has always been associated with power. Persons always tried to taste their power by attempting to possess beauty, which invited violence.

Sita's abduction by Ravana and usurpation of Sugreeva's wife by Vaali are the questions of sexuality tested by power. Ravana and Vaali obviously wanted to deprive Rama and Sugreeva of their sexuality against which they revolted and succeeded to regain the losses. The question of sexual deprivation can be a big cause for violence and destruction. Moreover, Ravana and Vaali had established their own order, discipline and truth that Rama, Sugreeva and Bivishana defied and wanted to establish a new truth. So sexuality has a chain-link with truth and power.

Power is used to curtail the people from their sexuality. To say that man is free is to imply that the sexual division has been loosened and there is no strict distinction between the oppressor and the oppressed. In this sense the oppressor's sexuality is a bit reduced and the oppressed is a bit invigorated and the gap is narrowed.

Feudalism is very merciless about sexuality. The feudal powers do not even hesitate to kill their own persons of the intimate relationship. One such example is Robert Browning's poem "My Last Duchess" which is probably one of the finest examples of violence in intimate relationship. The Duke of Ferrara is describing a painting of his late wife to a person who comes with a marriage proposal to the duke. The duke is a character invented by the poet. The whole poem is a monologue, which unfolds the whole drama that represents a small world. From reading the poem, "we quickly surmise that the duke is an obsessively jealous husband who had his last duchess killed because she was too free with her affections and approval 'she liked whate'er/she looked on, and her looks went everywhere'" (Mitchell 19).

The duke tells the story to the count's emissary either to give an impression of his power or about his truthlessness or he wants to indirectly warn his new wife not to behave in the way his old wife did or wants to show his inability of any affection towards women. A reader may guess that the duke is going to marry for dowry but he admits that he is marrying for love as he says: "his fair daughter's self, as I avowed/At starting, is my object" (18). The duke shows his power when he says to the go-between that he is getting ready to negotiate with him to raise count's daughter in a hierarchy of sociopolitical order. "The duke represents the aristocratic, feudal social order . . . as a system giving some men absolute power over others, and particularly over women in a system of exchange, . . ." (20). The speech echoes the era of "bad old days" of absolute power before the rise of the bourgeoisie class. The duke has kept the picture of his duchess whom he murdered. He could have destroyed the picture of the duchess as he destroyed the original but he keeps it because he wants to show his power over it or he wants to take it as a reminder of his weaknesses or his inability to understand her. The duke has absolute power but he is lacking in confidence. The mixture of boasting and self-betrayal appear quite odd which ridicules the duke's power and his weaknesses.

Another very powerful dramatist of violence is John Webster, whose *The Duchess of Malfi* (1623), is a magnificent example of the violence in the intimate relationship. The Duchess of Malfi is a widow who is murdered by her own brothers for her secret sexual relationship with a man much below her standard. The Duchess of Malfi is a widow and has an affair with her own Steward. She marries him secretly and becomes pregnant. Her brother Ferdinand, Duke of Calabria and a cardinal decide to kill her, her husband and their children, and they do so. While dying she speaks the last words that heaven's gates are not so high. Her husband wishes that his children

would escape the tyranny of murder. The persons of the royal positions are generally infuriated by the marital relationship of their kinsmen to the people who are not of their position and levels. The Duchess of Malfi becomes victims of her position-conscious brothers whatever of one's self-decision and secret of one's happiness may be. High level, high standard, high position, high status and privileges are the concepts which make a man behave and think differently from general human beings, and the persons with such positions and privileges are full of prejudices and inhuman behaviors. *The Duchess of Malfi* is full of horror and violence. The plot is very much directed by suspicion, jealousy, espionage, terror and murder plans.

In Bourgeois society sexuality is repressed. Norman Mailer's *An American Dream* (1965) is a novel that echoes the most representative voice of the capitalist bourgeoisie society of America, where frustration, perversion and violence are in the extreme form. Stephen Richards Rojack is a television personality, a professor of existential psychology, an ex-congressman and holder of various medals and honors who strangles his wife Deborah in a violent struggle. He has extensive sexual relation with Deborah's maid Ruta, and Cherry, a nightclub singer, and finally journeys from New York to Las Vegas and to Yucatan and Guatemala on a pilgrimage.

Similarly in the bourgeois system of society the relationship is just artificial. The husband kills his wife and the wife kills the husband for ordinary causes. The wife has to receive the insurance amount or the husband has to get a more prospective wife or has to receive the money in her name. The present day American society is so perverted that killing of the people of intimate relationship is simple and frequent. Human sexuality has no value at all. A short story of present day bourgeois society can manifest the situation.

"Sorry Wrong Number" is one of the most representative one-act plays written by Lucille Fletcher Wallop that reflects the violence in the intimate relationship in the American urban society. The city life in America is so perverted, disfigured and fragmented that even husband and wife do not trust each other. Mrs. Stevenson is tense because she is sick and alone at home. She telephones Murray Hill 3-0093 at her husband's office, but at first the telephone is very busy and when the line is cleared by the help of the telephone office, somebody picks up the phone and says that is the wrong number that she has dialed. She overhears a murder plan near the railway bridge on the phone, where she herself is living. She telephones the police but the police office shows indifference. Then the police telephone also becomes busy.

Finally it strikes eleven, the train comes and at the roar of the train, the murder plan is acted. Till the last minute Mrs. Stevenson does not sense that the person to be murdered is nobody, other than herself. Helpless and ignored she gets murdered according to her husband's plan. The husband sends a telegram that he cannot come home which is obviously false. He is engaged in the plan of his wife's murder. The number in itself is not wrong but is falsely stated (Wallop 23-36).

Violence and Sexuality

There were campaigns against homosexuality, masturbation and infantile sexuality, but later it was realized that children too have a strong sense of sexuality. Moreover, for Foucault: "Sexuality' is far more of a positive product of power than power ever repression of sexuality" ("Truth and Power" 1140). Power tends to get access to individual bodies, and hence to economic system and population, and then naturally the problem of 'demography, public health, and hygiene, housing conditions, longevity and fertility' arises. Definitely thereafter, the problem of sex too

does have a political significance, because “sex is located at the point of intersection of the discipline of the body and the control of the population” (1142).

In the *History of Sexuality* Foucault justifies the idea of violence in the intimate relationship even better. He presents the whole human history as a panorama of sexuality. It is the question of sexuality that has caused divisions in men. Sexuality of men and women, young girls and boys and even of children has been suppressed in one pretext or another. The religions, castes, creeds and races are sexual matters. From the ancient times these divisions, segregations and differences have been working to create sexual discrimination.

In many communities women cannot easily express their sexual feeling because the religions and social precepts, states laws and moral lessons have said that expression of sexuality in general situation is a sinful, immoral and shameful. The suppression of sexuality in its type is Victorian in nature that is ruled by “our restrained, mute and hypocritical sexuality” (Foucault, *History vol. I* 3). The décor, order, gentleness, decency, social rules and state laws were the obstruction of sexuality, so that “sterile behavior carried the taint of abnormality” (4). Open sexuality, extraordinary frankness and visible practice of it deserved penalty in the 17th and 18th centuries. It was reduced to silence. Moreover, children’s sexuality was badly ignored or suppressed and silence was imposed. In those days, children were totally deprived of sexual discourses.

So, naturally the repression of children’s sexuality would be exposed in different forms either as violence or as truancy or as any secret association with sexual materials and images. Similarly, illegitimate sexual connections were repressed or restricted, so that if some people had any illegitimate sexuality, the best place for them to express was either the brothel or the mental hospital. The discourse too was

based on gestures or codes. Everywhere else, modern Puritanism imposed its triple edict of taboo, nonexistence, and silence.

In Foucault's opinion, the last two centuries were a period of repression, restriction and imposition. Only beds were the whispering places about sexuality. Freud in the recent century brought a revolution and let the people know that the more it is repressed, the higher the tendency of its eruption has. For Foucault repression is linked with knowledge and power.

In his expression about sexuality in relation with power, knowledge and truth, Foucault makes it clear that truth and power are guided by politics. Power guides truth and every age, in accordance with the change of power, has the change of truth. The repression of sexuality in the political and economic protection showed the advent of the capitalist bourgeoisie society. In the historical context freedom and repression of sexuality were maintained according to the characteristics of various types of social development that cannot be separated by political and economic contexts of the time. In Foucault's observation of the historical panorama in different ages it goes like, "By placing the advent of the age of repression in the seventeenth century, after hundreds of years of open spaces and free expression, one adjusts it to coincide with the development of capitalism: it becomes an integral part of the bourgeoisie order" (5).

Nothing is more rigorous than the repression of sex. It cannot be easily deciphered how important is sex and sexual freedom and how important it is in the political questions. A suspicious mind may not understand the whole chunk. For some the discourse on sex might be trivial and base, but sex is something so important that it influences even power. The significance of sex and sexuality and its freedom has now been realized. It will be more important in future because, "... the bitterness of history prevents most of us from putting side by side revolution and happiness; or revolution and a different body, one that is newer and more beautiful; or indeed, revolution and

pleasure:” (Foucault, *History vol. I* 7). The truth, the beauty, the delight and the enlightenment and knowledge have been often suppressed by power. There is always an attempt to repress the talks about sex, and attempts to “eliminate the effects of repression” (7).

It is said that some sort of economic factor is playing a role to decide this truth, but for Foucault it is not only the economic factor but also something more that is connected with the existence of life. “But it appear to me that the essential thing is not this economic factor but rather the existence in our era of a discourse in which sex, the revelation of truth, the overturning of global laws, the proclamation of a new day to come, and the promise of a certain felicity are linked together” (7). He puts his ideas much beyond the scope of economic relations.

These ancient sexual discourses, sermons and preaching have helped us to put aside the hypocrisies of our society and to dream of new life, new city and new havens. All arts, pictures, songs, music and writing are founded on the strength of sex. The repression of sex is the notion of bourgeoisie culture. Foucault further says, “To say that sex is not repressed, or rather that the relationship between sex and power is not characterized by repression is to risk falling into a sterile paradox” (8). The laws, the social systems, norms, and values and the concepts that go counter to the liberation of sex will definitely collapse. The repression of sex is something like repressing our will and ourselves. But sex is often repressed leading to acts of violence.

The suppression, the concealment and the silence of sex are associated with human civilization. To condemn sex or to think sex is sin is a sin in itself. It shows that sex is not used as a matter of delight but as a matter of sinful practice. Foucault questions, “And how have we come to be a civilization so peculiar as to tell itself that,

through an abuse of power which has not ended, it has long “sinned” against sex?” (9). Moreover, it has been used in such a sinful way that nature is blamed disastrous, since its most precious aspect is ignored or undermined.

The repression has long been practiced and now it has deep roots and solid reasons that weigh heavy on sex, and the repressive power has slowly and gradually fallen intrinsically on it that the liberation of sex has been very difficult.

Foucault raises serious doubts on repressive hypothesis. He questions whether this repression is a historical consequence or the prohibition, censorship and denial are the exercise of power or there was a historical rupture between the age of repression and its critical analysis. Sex has been one of the forms of power of which “refusal, blockage, and invalidation, but also incitement and intensification: (are) in short, the polymorphous techniques of power” (11). The power that comes from sex and sexuality is firmly established in our socio-political situations.

The falsehoods that overshadow the truth will be unveiled by the “will to knowledge” and it has been more reduced in the modern epoch. Denials and censorships are used for the repression of sexual discourse. In the survey of history Foucault locates the end of the 16th century as the period of time when sexual discourses were restricted.

The Foucauldian Paradigm

Foucault’s introduction of *The History of Sexuality: Volume I* “We Other Victorians” draws the historical references of different periods and shows that the more civilized we claim to be, the more narrow-minded we have been. The classical age was quite liberal about the sexual discourses whereas the Middle Ages and the Renaissance too were not strict but from the seventeenth century the discourses upheld restriction, prohibition, censorships, denials, refusals, invalidation and definition, and natural sex and sexuality got repressed, perverted and corrupt.

In his repressive hypothesis under “The Incitement to Discourse” Foucault clarifies many confusions and shows how repression of sexuality got gradually overcome. Mostly he focuses on the idea that the ancient society had the freedom of sex and sexual discourses. The periods between the seventeenth century and nineteenth century were tough for the sexual discourses. All the suppressions and oppressions became possible in the name of decorum, system, chastity and civilization. Sexual oppressions and violence were undertaken under the protection of strict laws and social systems.

People did not talk of sex due to prohibitions. Silences and censorships were so heavily imposed that sometimes they tended to explode through rigorous actions and discourses, but many things were either removed or codified. Even if the talks were allusive and metaphorical, it was also said that they could not be strictly used in some certain circumstances. Foucault in his *History of Sexuality Vol. I* refers, “A control over enunciations as well: where and when it was not possible to talk about such things became much more strictly defined; in which circumstances, among which speakers, and within which social relationships” (18).

Even the symbolic talks could be based on circumstances, speakers and social relationships, so that the repression of sexuality was much guided by the impositions of certain rules. The “illicit” discourses of sex were widely used and sometimes the indecent speech offended the decorum and had the counter effect. The curtailing of the expression of sexual desire would get the expression in daydreams, imaginations, perceiving of the images, and having the complicity between body and mind for its satisfaction. Sometimes with much restriction the relations between parents and children, masters and servants and teachers and students maintained the areas of silence for such talks.

Sex in the true sense is a rhythm, a self-examination, penance for all sins and more so. Foucault says “the insinuations of the flesh: thought, desires, voluptuous imaginings, delectations combined movement of the body and soul: henceforth all this had to enter, in detail, into the process of confession and guidance” (*History vol. I* 19).

Sexual discourse alone gives vent to the desire, the memory, dreams and emotions. It gives expurgation to all sins, perversions and trivial matters of consciousness. Sex is associated with the interplay of innumerable pleasures, sensations and thoughts through body and soul even in the religious concept of Christianity. The restrictions were absolutely artificial that the seventeenth century society contrived. Its use in literature was termed “scandalous.” Likewise, “Victorian Puritanism” imposed restrictions to sexual discourses, and the silence prevailed, which was an accident in the historical development. Foucault says, “The historical accident would consist rather of the reticences of ‘Victorian Puritanism’: at any rate, they were a digression, a refinement, a tactical diversion is the great process of transforming sex into discourse” (*History, vol. I* 22).

Sexual discourses reduce sexual violence and crimes. The sexuality of children can be well articulated if the interactions with them are held. Expression of sexuality is also is the psychological treatment of many nervous disorders. Since the middle of the nineteenth century discourses of sex were realized to be necessary, and consequently many of such discourses were produced. Foucault often blames the social traditions and values that the 17th and 18th centuries developed against sex and sexuality that was a regression or a halt in the movement of civilization.

Therefore, the realization, the need of the time, the requirement of discourses in all pedagogies and disciplines, the economic and political pressures and discourses

pave way for the favorable situation of sex and sexual discourses.

The words were forbidden, a certain list of vocabulary was censored and the expression of sexuality was considered indecent. But the proliferation of discourses developed quantitatively. Foucault explains the development of the concept of sex, “The nineteenth century and our own (twentieth century) have been rather the age of multiplication: a dispersion of sexualities, a strengthening of their disparate forms, a multiple implantation of ‘perversions’. Our epoch has initiated sexual heterogeneities” (*History vol. I 37*).

In the eighteenth century some explicit codes of sexual practice were determined besides the “Customary regularities and constraints of opinion govern sexual practices, canonical law, the Christian Pastoral and civil law” (Foucault, *History vol. I 37*). They made the clear division between fair and illicit sex centered on matrimonial relations, obligations, violent accompaniment, unwanted relations and so on. “The Sex of husband and wife was beset by rules and recommendations” (37), which was the most respected, most focused and most legitimate relation. “The ‘rest’ remained a good deal more confused; one only has to think of the uncertain status of ‘sodomy’, or the indifference regarding the sexuality of children” (37). The rules of marital relation and deviation from it in search of strange pleasures did not have the clear measures for respect and condemnation however;

On the list of grave sins, and separated only by their relative importance, there appeared debauchery (extramarital relations), adultery, rape, spiritual or carnal incest, but also sodomy, or the mutual “caress”. As to the courts, they could condemn homosexuality as well as infidelity, marriage without parental consent, or bestiality. (38)

The laws of sexuality regarding permissions and possibilities were based on

nature and the actions “contrary to nature” were considered quite “against the law.” Apart from the matter of heterosexual monogamy of legitimate couple, “the sexuality of children, mad men and women, criminals:” (38) and maniacs was under strict scrutiny.

Although some sexuality was considered legitimate, it was not practiced in the discourses. The practice of sexuality in the restricted areas was considered not only illegitimate but also unnatural, and it was socially and lawfully condemned. The forms of sexual activity such as adultery, rape, marriage in a close relation, deduction of a nun and deception of one’s wife belonged to the area of condemnation. Similarly, “stealer of wives, seducer of virgins, the shame of families, and an insult to husbands and fathers” (39) were taken as violators of marriage, which are manifested in the literary works that talk about the situations of those days.

The rules of sexuality were considered either legal or moral. Children, schoolboys, teachers, husbands and other senior relatives may sometimes appear cruel or maniacal, and they seek their asylums through doctors or judges. In such kinds of bizarre impulses many families had to be closely in association with. Foucault writes,

This was the numberless family of perverts who were on friendly terms with delinquents and akin to madmen. In the course of the century they successively bore the stamp of “moral folly, ” “genital neurosis, ” “aberration of the genetic instinct, ” “degenerescence, ” or “physical imbalance” (40).

For over two centuries the church intervened with the conjugal sex over the questions of “frauds,” but when medicine made a forceful entry, it classified and analyzed the psychological and physical complications, disturbances and pleasures of sexual practices. When medicine looked into the whole organic, functional and mental

pathology of sex, it became clear that all repression that gave rise to perversion was due to the exercise of power upon sexuality.

Power and pleasure are closely related to each other. Pleasure comes from the exercise of power. There are *Perpetual Spirals of Power and Pleasure*. Foucault explains the relation of power with pleasure. Power commands, power encroaches, power manipulates, power dominates, and power oppresses. Power decides the sexuality of a person or of the community or of a class or of the whole race. To say that some body's sexuality is repressed, some body's is curtailed or somebody is deprived of sexuality is that an artificial discrimination has been created between the persons in individuals or in the masses.

Violence as Class Struggle

All violent activities have some background. The immediate reason can be anything but in the route violence germinates with some political and economic questions. All human contradictions too have dialectical nature. The haves and have nots, the oppressors and the oppressed, the powerful and the powerless, the masters and the servants, the feudals and the peasants, and the bourgeoisie and the proletariat are in constant fight. The classes may change according to the modes of production. The nature of the fights too is changing, however the contradictions are continuous. The conflict between Rama and Ravana took place when Rama was homeless, powerless and propertyless, whereas Ravana was at the height of his power and prosperity. It was said that he had the houses and the streets of gold and valuable materials. He had collected all those things either by the exploitation of his people or by loots. At the climax of his power he could either abduct other's wife or torture a person. This led to his fall.

Similarly, the contradictions between Vaali and Sugreeva, between Ravana and his brother Bivishana, Rama and his step mother Kaikeyi, and between Rama and his sons Lava and Kush are the contradictions between privileged and non-privileged groups of people in the close family relationship over the possession of power and prosperity. When Kaikeyi is closest to the king among his other wives, she takes the king into confidence and unduly demands for her son to be the crown prince, and the rightful heir of the throne to go to the jungle. The supposed crown prince has to go down to the level of a proletariat, from where he has to even lose not only the privileges of the royalty but his wife too. In order to come up he has to involve himself in many seen and unseen conflicts, which may take the forms of violence too. Within a privileged class or within the family in power, there can be a sharp division between the more privileged and less privileged ones that can result in to a big contradiction towards war and violence.

The most appropriate examples of such contradictions can be taken from the *Mahabharata*. Unlike in the *Ramayana*, in the *Mahabharata* too there is a game of making the powerful ones totally powerless. Sending people to jungle was to deprive them of their power and property, of turning people into proletariats. They suffer and then they realize their class from where they start their real fights. The Pandavas are not only deprived of their power and position, but also are tricked to lose every thing conditionally and are forced to go to the jungle. At this situation the Pandavas cannot even oppose the ravishment of their wife. No body can object to the injustices, because this is a class question and of class interest. After thirteen years when Pandavas come back to claim their rights, a big war takes place. This time also most of the kings and heralds of the time take Kauravas' side. Not only the Gurus and grandfathers, even Pandavas' own maternal

uncle Salya favors the Kauravas. The class interest for the welfare of the class is really important.

The killing of the Duchess of Malfi by her brothers in John Webster's drama and the murder of the wife by the Duke of Ferrera in Browning's poem too are the class questions.

Homicide is a type of violence that takes place among the people of the intimate relationship. Violence between husband and wife, father and son, brother and sister, brother and brother, lover and beloved, between friends, office associates and acquaintances has been largely used in literary writings.

Robert Browning's "My Last Duchess" is an important manifestation of violence in the intimate relationship. It dramatizes violence in the intimate relationship and characterizes the absolute power of feudal aristocracy. Violence between husband and wife, father and son, brother and sister, brother and brother, lover and beloved, and between friends, office associates and acquaintances has been widely presented in the literary works. Plays, novels and short stories and the poems present violence of the intimate relationship almost as their themes or subject matters.

In both works *The Duchess of Malfi* and "My Last Duchess" feudalism has victimized the women because they made contacts with people much below their class, which is absolutely not tolerable from the class concepts of the dukes. The dukes in both works of art are jealous which is the outcome of their class-consciousness.

Even in Maxim Gorky's story "The Mother of a Traitor" there is a kind of class struggle or a fight for nationalism or a struggle for the race and a fight against imperialism. The mother kills her son because he is the traitor of the nation and also the traitor of the class.

Most of these violent actions have economic roots. The economic set-up decides the political and social structure. In this sense all human relations are economic relations. The work structure or the type of the work that people are associated with too decides the class structure. It depends on whether a man himself works or exploits others. The exploitation begins from home and then spreads to the work place and has its hold in political power. The class relations and the class interests divide people into oppressor and oppressed classes. Then naturally the contradictions take place.

The concept of contradictions can have a materialistic interpretation rather than spiritual. In the modern times Hegel started this discourse with more systematic ideas. Hegel's "Absolute idealism" is a view that holds the idea that "all reality is shaped and constituted by the mind" (Cahn 1109), however this mind is not simply an individual mind but "something that is essentially shared and realized in what people do" (1109). Primarily, it is very much closer to spirit than to mind however it is also said that Hegel's idealism does not deny the existence of matter but "holds that mind needs a material world in order to be able to express and fulfill itself in a concrete form" (1109). Hegel's "idealistic dialectics" was deeply criticized by Marx for its being more idealistic than materialistic; however Marx owed much to Hegel in his philosophy of dialectics. Hegel's idea of conflict and resolution between two forces by the methods of thesis, antithesis and synthesis founded a way for the development of the idea of social contradiction.

Taking an extremely wide view of human history, Hegel proposed that all change, all progress, is brought about by the conflict of vast forces. A world-historical figure or nation or event lays down a challenge. This thesis, as he called it, is opposed by an antithesis. The conflict

between them is resolved, inevitably, by a synthesis of the two forces on a higher plane of being. (Durant 258)

Hegel believes that the movement of thought has the "dialectical progression from unity through diversity to diversity-in-unity" (296). Hegel believed that every genius simply places a stone on the pile and the last genius is fortunate enough to have put the stone and kept the arch upright. In his opinion the insight for truth and the Absolute is very important. The philosophy of the dialectics naturally leads one to some revolutionary conclusions. As it is said:

The dialectical process makes change the cardinal principal of life; no condition is permanent; in every stage of things there is a contradiction which only the "Strife of opposites" can resolve. The deepest law of politics, therefore, is freedom -an open avenue to change; history is the growth of freedom, and the state is, or should be, freedom organized. (Durant 297)

Consequently Feuerbach added materialism in dialectics, so that any class contradictions became easy to comprehend from the materialistic point of view. The human classes too contradict like materials do. Marx and Engels explained this concept in the context of social and political contradictions and developed the idea that class struggle can be led to the state of revolution for the total change of the whole social and political structures. For Marx and Engels the struggles are sometimes open and sometimes hidden but always constant and continuous. They write about the whole process of history through the class struggles:

Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now

open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large, or is the common ruin of the contending classes. (36)

Lenin and Mao Tsetung further explained the concept of contradictions in the newer context and proved its practicality by launching revolutions against different forms of the oppressors' classes.

Marxism has been interpreted and developed in accordance with the need of revolution and liberation movements. Some writers and philosophers have explained Marxism for purely intellectual purposes; however such explanations too talk about the contradictions between the privileged and non-privileged classes: between the oppressors and the oppressed people from family to international relations.

Foucault rightly draws the history of civilization in the periphery of madness. In the course of human civilization people have shown madness of different kinds. Some people go mad because they are deprived of privileges; they are the victims of power. Some other people go mad because they use excessive power. Power, arrogance, ambition and selfishness take them to the height of madness. Most of the violent actions caused by the state in the direction of the tyrannical dictators upon the people is the result of power craze. At first they use violence for power possession. Then again they use violence for power continuation and still again they continue violence for suppression, enslavement and enjoyment.

“Truth and Power” are always interrelated, interconnected and interdependent. Truth is determined by power-holders. It is through the inculcation of ideas of the power holders that the commonality is ruled over. So for the circulation of power it is imperative that the people in general believe and follow the ideas of the rulers. The enslavement of the mind by the ideas of the ruling class ensures the privileged

position at the perpetuation of power of the incumbents. So all texts, writings, television serials, newspapers, magazines and all propaganda media desperately attempt to circulate the ideas of the rulers, and force the masses into ignorance for their protection. Literature too can serve power and class interests.

The husband possesses patriarchally imparted political power over the wife. The husband acts and behaves under the influence of the patriarchal powers, so that he undermines the wife's power. Foucault says that commerce serves the interests of the rich people only, which is not natural, and of the people's hearts. As Foucault writes:

Besides, this liberty is far from true natural liberty: on all sides it is constrained and harried by demands opposed to the most legitimate desires of individuals: this is the liberty of interests, of coalitions, of financial combinations, not of man, not of minds and hearts. For financial reasons, families are here more tyrannical than anywhere else: only wealthy girls are able to marry; . . . (*Madness* 203)

Foucault too agrees that there is a struggle for the possession of power. The whole process of class struggle is a power struggle. The domination of a class is the practice of power and the struggle against the domination also is a struggle for power. For Foucault the whole human relations are the power relations and all struggles in the human history are the power struggles.

Violence by Religious, Racial and National Prejudices

All violent activities are inherently political. People of one religion fight with the people of another region, because they want either to resist or to rule, so are the matters about racial and national tensions and encounters. These types of violences are so blind that they try to justify the actions as the fights for their gods or for the

glorification of their races or for their nations. In this connection Dr. Gillian Corble writes:

No morality or ideology is an “Absolute Truth.” . . . Jesus Christ was legally executed according to the law of the day...or was he murdered? It's the adherence to “Truth,” “Morality, ” “Goodness” that cause war. Good American soldiers killing “Bad” German men...and women and children, Hindus killing Muslims, Christians killing Christians, not for the evil reasons but for “good” reasons, killing because one man's morality doesn't agree with another's ideologies and moralities are necessary devices within any group to set a limit to individual autonomy in the interest of the group. But they are not “Truths.” And they must not be hailed as such when dealing with another group which has different ideologies. (qtd. in Pokharel 17-18)

The use of violence in the name of truth, veneration, loyalty and devoutness is commonly frequent. The excuses are innumerable, immoral and irrational too. Violence in the name of god is still more irrational. When violence due to religious prejudices erupts, it is not only difficult to control but it may spread like a wild fire. It will not simply divide the society and the nations but also will divide the family. When Hindu and Muslim communities fight rampantly, the relations between husband and wife, between friends and lovers and between neighbours also will be affected resulting into separations, tortures, arsoning and killing. Killing and torturing the people of the intimate relationship due to religious and racial prejudices have caused dangerous effects. Al Queda’s attacks on America’s twin towers and America’s attacks on Iraq and Afghanistan is said to have resulted into the violence among the international and interracial friends and relatives. At first it was a political

war but later it was reduced into a racial and religious fight, which destroyed many friendly and conjugal relations. The religious, racial and national tensions are more like madness than anything else.

Regarding the religious prejudices and tensions Foucault draws the history of insanity. Foucault talks that the classical Christians believed in madness of unreason. On this concept Jesus was crucified by the madness of the eyes of that time. “When early Christianity speaks of the madness of the cross, it is merely to humiliate false reason and add luster to the eternal light of truth; the madness of God-in-man’s image is simply a wisdom not recognized by the men of unreason who live in this world” (*Madness* 74)

In course of time, the cross was no longer a scandal and it was also believed that Christ himself chose to be surrounded by the men of unreason and madness, and it was also supposed that the holy lord himself had gone somewhat mad to the Gentiles and scandalous to the Jews (75). Comparing the limits of death and madness, Foucault writes, “As death is the limit of human life in the realm of time, madness is its limit in the realm of animality, and just as death has been sanctified by the death of Christ, madness, in its most bestial nature, had also been sanctified” (76).

In Christianity of different ages madness has been glorified in one way or the other thinking that it is “the lowest point of humanity” and that other forms of madness and unreason are concealed whereas madness is scandalized because it is close to animality, from where the divine mercy can begin. Foucault writes:

For Renaissance Christianity, the entire instructive value of unreason and of its scandals lay in the madness of the incarnation of God in man. For classicism, the incarnation is no longer madness; but what is madness is this incarnation of man in the beast, which is, the ultimate

point of Fall, the most manifest sign of his guilt; and, as the ultimate object of divine mercy, the symbol of universal forgiveness and innocence regained. (77)

Man “is hinged to nature, where he is both ultimate downfall and absolute innocence” (77) is the Christian consciousness of madness, animality, nature and innocence.

Sally Ann H. Ferguson in an article “Christian Violence and the Slave Narrative” shows how violence was undertaken upon the slaves even under the Christian veils. During the day of slavery in America the abolitionists wanted to abolish slavery and all sorts of violence upon them; however the monstrosity of power, class and the craze for the accumulation of property caused the Christian slave masters to undertake atrocities upon the slaves in Europe and basically in America, however the slave tradition dates back to time immemorial, and the pains and tortures upon the slaves are countless and unspeakable, even then we can categorize the types and relations as Ferguson throws light briefly on the general American tradition.

The abolitionists said that it was against Christianity to keep the slaves, but the slave owners looked into the myths and history of the Christian and pre-Christian ages and brought the references of slave owning tradition. They said that even gods used slaves and tried to justify the torture and violence upon the slaves. Ferguson writes, “Christianity, a religion having connections to the imperialistic slaveholding European culture from which the American slave owners descended, serves the goal of psychological control especially well” (298).

The slave owners interpreted Christianity in the way that suited them. They connected Christianity with the slaveholding culture with the references of slave culture even by the gods. Ferguson says, “two contradictory interpretations of events

central to beliefs of organized Christianity – the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus Christ – allow Christians to establish a religious duality that liberates humanity from an enslavement to the Creator caused by Original Sin” (298).

In this sense Christianity too has been used as a mask for slavery in the “slavocracy” of Europe and America. The slave owners used all possible violence under the Christian veils. Therefore, religion also has remained a source of exploitation, torture and violence of the rulers and the power mongers.

The Horror of Slavery and Psychic Trauma

Morrison addresses “the horror of slavery” as well as “the power of motherhood.” Carolyn C. Denard writes, “In the context of the horror of slavery revealed in the novel, Sethe did the right thing in saving her daughter from a living death” (332). Similarly the presentation of the ghost of the baby is for the search of “repentance and forgiveness from the ghost of her daughter” (332).

The story of the murder of a child by a mother with deep love and attachment is not natural but it was much better than giving the child to slavery. Negroes were permitted to bear children. More so, they were forced to bear them faster and many more in number so that the white masters would use them as slaves from their early childhood. They slave children become slaves even before the time they learn to know why they have to work for others. In the early stage The Negroes were not permitted to become fathers. The black women were used and enjoyed by the White masters only. But the permission to Negroes to become the fathers was still painful for them. The scanty sexual pleasures were multiplied into large number miseries. Crevecoeur presents this situation:

If Negroes are permitted to become fathers, this fatal indulgence only tends to increase this misery; the poor companions of their scanty

pleasures are likewise the companions of their labours; and when at some critical seasons they could wish to see them relieved, with tears in their eyes they behold them perhaps doubly oppressed, obliged to bear the burden of Nature- as fatal present –as well as that of unabated tasks. (638)

In Morrison's early novels the characters do not find "peace or forgiveness", but in *Beloved* Morrison affirms the opportunity for a kind of reconciliation with the past. The novel creates moral ground for mourning over the past that was full of horror and suffering. Morrison brings back the memory of the days of justice, so that the blacks would not let the bad days repeat; the ghost of slavery would not scare them back, and they would "move forward into the future with hope and wholeness" (Denard 332).

Morrison has captured the true image of an "unspeakable horror of slavery" and has developed it by the power of her imagination. Foucault is of the opinion that people do not go mad but they are driven mad. Slavery drives people into madness. Confining them into houses is something like making them madder. About confinement Foucault says, "Here is madness elevated to spectacle above the silence of the asylums, and becoming a public scandal for the general delight. Unreason was hidden in the silence of the houses of confinement, but madness continued to be present on the stage of the world – with more commotion than ever" (Foucault, *Madness* 65).

Not only the Blacks who had escaped slavery but also the white brothers and sisters who gave them goods, food and clothes with sympathy "hated slavery worse than death" (Morrison 137).

Jennifer Fitzgerald in her article “Selfhood and Community: Psychoanalysis and Discourse in *Beloved*” presents some important discourses of slavery, mother, masculinity, discourse of black solidarity and pre- Oedipal discourse of psychoanalysis. As in the other novels of Toni Morrison, in *Beloved* too “each protagonist confronts a crisis which evokes psychic trauma, he or she articulates infantile reactions in the practices of this discourse, projecting emotions onto others as external objects and introjecting the resultant imagos as part of themselves” (Fitzgerald 113).

Trauma of Violence

It is said that, “traumatic memory is not the same as everyday memory” (Edkins xiii). The idea of politics, power and nation is so powerfully inculcated in the human mind that it has many times resulted into conflict and violence when the interest and loyalty and attachment contradict in the groups of the people. Within the same political area also when the status quo is challenged, an unexpected change appears to take place, and that will sweep away many traditionally established forms and values. Jenny Edkins in the preface of her book *Trauma and the Memory of Politics* describes the situation of abrupt changes and trauma as it is said:

Quite often, such challenges and the changes they produce are so startling that we don't quite know how to describe them until some time after they have taken place. Occasionally, they appear traumatic. They upset, or escape, the straightforward linear temporality associated with the regularity of so-called “politics” and appear to occupy another form of time: a time that I call form of time: a time that I call in this book “trauma time.” (xiv)

In the linear time the standard political process continues, but in the trauma time there takes place a disruption of linearity, and things take place quite unexpectedly. The traumatic disruptions are not easy to report. Edkins gives the examples of September 11 to show the horror stricken situation of the people. For those who witnessed it with their eyes, it is still very difficult to describe the situation. To remember it, the linearity of time breaks, but the horror remains strongly unforgettable:

The events of September 11 are an example of this traumatic disruption to the linearity of time and expectations. Television viewers around the world heard reporters in New York and Washington struggling to find words to describe what had happened. People on the streets of New York stood frozen, horror-struck, staring up at the twin towers, unable to believe that what they saw in front of their eyes was actually taking place. (xiv)

They could not describe the situation properly. They created stories to talk about the event. It took almost a year to manage the description of the event. Any overlapping or intersection by the expected happening in the natural process of linear time requires “Einstein's re-thinking of natural science.” The linear time produces sovereign power of the nation state, which produces and provokes wars, genocides and famines, and then it will change into trauma. Then the traumatic time begins. Milan Kundera says, “the struggle of man against power is the struggle of memory against forgetting” (qtd. in Edkins, Preface xv) which is very contextual to show the contradiction between linear time and traumatic time; between power and trauma. Anything horrible in life is horrible to remember. Trauma is the thing that we repeatedly mark and remember in the name of forgetting. Jenny Edkins under

“Introduction: trauma, violence and political community” writes to map out the aftermath situation of a war:

In the aftermath of a war or catastrophe comes the reckoning. The dead and the missing are listed, families grieve and comfort each other, and memorials are erected. If it is a war that has been won, commemoration endorses those in power, or so it seems at first glance. Victory parades, remembrance ceremonies and war museums tell of glory, courage and sacrifice. The nation is renewed, the state strengthened. Private grief is overlaid by national mourning and blunted - or eased - by stories of service and duty. The authorities that had the power to conscript citizens and send them to their deaths now write their obituaries. (1)

The persons who return from the war cannot forget the horrible scenes of deaths and losses. They suffer from nightmares and flashbacks of the horror scenes. Instead of forgetting, the memories multiply and become more shocking, the nervous disorders, traumatic stress, shocks and obsessions become just common to the war returnees.

The genocide of the war, the massacre, aerial bombings, deaths and tortures in the concentration camps, open-air shootings become difficult to memorialize. But “after a lapse of time or a change in the political landscape, a narrative takes shape. Events are named, memorials and museums set up, and the identity of at least some of the victims established” (Edkins 2).

Many survivors of Nazi genocide of the 1940s had dreadful witnessing. Many of them suffered from traumatic stress, and their witnessing of the Holocaust was unimaginable and unspeakable. For women survivors, rape and incest was very common.

Like wise, the Vietnam veterans were noted as the sufferers of “post-traumatic stress disorder.”

Childhood abuse, trauma and the symptoms of hysteria have deep effects in women's life. Sigmund Freud analyzed childhood abuse, and later conceived that many women are responsible for their own abuse and accused women of being willing to be raped, “Of course, in the case of childhood abuse and rape as with shell shock and earlier with hysteria, the people concerned were regularly regarded as having either caused their traumatic experiences – by their unconscious wishes – or imagined something that had not actually occurred” (3).

As trauma is a deep shock in the human mind, it is a kind of deadlock of thought. Man is confused not because the events give rise to trauma by the involvement of force and violence, but because there is often a threat in the integrity of life. Rape, torture, sexual abuse and the sight of the deaths of others and the violence and brutality are really traumatic. In some cases not only the victims but the victimizers too can have the traumatic feelings. The Vietnam veterans came back totally powerless. Actually trauma begins when one feels that one's trust has been betrayed. Edkins Writes, “What we call trauma takes place when the very powers that we are convinced will protect us and give us security become our tormentors: when the community of which we considered ourselves members turns against us or when our family is no longer a source of refuge but a site of danger” (4).

Trauma is a constant memory of some painful events. It is a thought process, which is constantly repetitive or constantly static. It shows that violence results into trauma if not into death. Basically, trauma is a psychological situation, which is caused by the loss of a relative or by the painful memory of violence used upon itself by some persons of the intimate relationship. Similarly, the scene of the holocaust or

the genocide, wars, quakes and bombing too can be traumatic. Trauma does not let one to be active or creative. The sufferer undergoes a kind of deadlock of thought.

Chapter VI

FROM CHAOS TO CREATION

Violence in the intimate relationship is most profusely and profoundly used in literature. The presentations of intimate encounters have made the works of art touchy, lofty and deeply impressive. From the ancient mythologies to the present-day writings, violence between friends, kinsmen, lover and beloved, husband and wife, brothers and sisters and between persons of close relationship has probably been the central theme in most of the great works. Intimate relations are most interactive, most sensitive and most delicate so that encounters too are most probable. In the real life situations, they are very frequently practiced or after every action and interaction, contradictions can erupt, and if they are not solved in time, they may take the violent modes leading to more and more violent practices with resulting complications. Violence generally arises out of economic, sexual, racial, national, religious and other psychological reasons. It is a practice of domination-submission politics. In this sense, violence is a matter of power politics. Therefore, whether it is in the real life situation or in the literary presentation, power comes from violence. Every power is a political power and every violence is a power struggle.

The question of power struggle is widely applicable from distant enemies to close rivals, and from opponents and to intimate counter-parts. In the ancient mythologies when the demons used to muster power by blessings, weaponry, majority and external favors, they would attack on heaven and the gods also would search help from the gods and goddesses of super powers, and with united effort, they would

launch the counter-attacks and resume the losses. They took violence as the right answer for violence.

In those days beauty, prosperity and position were the measures of power possession, and so are now. Domination and hegemony are other measures. In a traditional society males have the domination and they bear the authority of privileges. A dominant male has had multiple wives. Even when law prohibits it, he may be using the power privilege in many ways. If his counterpart is simply suspected to have been involved in any illicit relations, he will mostly use violence.

Desdemona's murder by Othello in Shakespeare's play is the most befitting example. There are countless Othellos, Desdemonas and Iagos in the real world, which are represented in literature. In this sense power is tested whether one's sexuality is curtailed or privileged. In all dominations, discriminations and segregations, sexuality is first curtailed; then only other means and measures of power are applied. Slavery, untouchability, caste, class and color discriminations, racial segregations and other forms of dominations are mainly the questions of sexual deprivations.

Power and pleasure are closely related to each other. Pleasure comes from the exercise of power. There are *Perpetual Spirals of Power and Pleasure*. Foucault explains the relation of power with pleasure. Power commands, power encroaches, power manipulates, power dominates, and power oppresses. Power decides the sexuality of a person or of the community or of a class or of the whole race. On the basis of power artificial discriminations have been created between the persons in individuals or in the masses.

Michel Foucault has explained different types of tensions in human history. Foucault in his *Madness and Civilization* (1967) explains the various types of

madness in different ages of history that have determined the courses of human civilization.

Foucault draws the history of civilization in the periphery of madness. In the course of human civilization people have shown madness of different kinds. Some people go mad because they are deprived of privileges; they are the victims of power. Some other people go mad because they use excessive power. Power, arrogance, ambition and selfishness take them to the height of madness. Most of the violent actions caused by the state in the direction of the tyrannical dictators upon the people is the result of the power craze. At first they use violence for power possession. Then again they use violence for power continuation and still again they continue violence for suppression, enslavement and further their pleasures.

State is an armed organization of one class to rule over another class. The proletariat seizes power from the bourgeoisie. When it comes to power, it will be suppressing the previously exploiting classes, but because of the minority of the bourgeoisie, the class will vanish and the course towards the classless and stateless society will be smooth.

Truth is determined by power. It is through the inculcation of ideas of the power holders that the commonality is ruled over. So for the circulation of power it is imperative that the people in general believe and follow the ideas of the rulers. The enslavement of the mind by the ideas of the ruling class ensures the privileged position at the perpetuation of power of the incumbents. So all texts, writings, television serials, newspapers and magazines desperately attempt to circulate the ideas of the rulers, and force the masses into ignorance for their protection. Literature too may serve power and class interest.

The husband possesses patriarchally imparted political power over the wife. The husband acts and behaves under the influence of the patriarchal powers, so that he undermines the position of the wife's power.

Foucault too agrees that there is a struggle for the possession of power. The whole process of class struggle is a power struggle. The domination of a class is the practice of power and the struggle against the domination also is a struggle for power. For Foucault the whole human relations are the power relations and all struggles in the human history are power struggles.

In the Marxist point of view all human contradictions are based on dialectics. The haves and have-nots, the oppressors and the oppressed, the powerful and powerless, the masters and the servants, the feudals and the peasants and the bourgeoisie and the proletariat are in constant fight. The classes may be changing according to the modes of production. The nature of fights too is changing, however the contradictions are continuous.

In both works of John Webster *The Duchess of Malfi* and *The White Devil* feudalism has victimized the women because they made contacts with the people much below their class, which is absolutely not tolerable from the class concepts of the dukes. The dukes in both works of art are jealous which is the outcome of their class-consciousness.

Even in Maxim Gorky's story "The Mother of a Traitor" there is a kind of class struggle. Obviously, it seems to be a fight for nationalism or a struggle for the race and a fight against imperialism. But in the real sense the mother kills her son not only because he is the traitor of the nation but also because he is the traitor of the class. {71-79}

Most of these violent actions have economic routes. The economic set-up decides the political and social structure. Man's consciousness is fixed by the material he or she is attached to. In this sense all human relations are economic relations. The work structure or the type of the work that people are associated with is the class structure. It depends on whether a man himself works or exploits. The exploitation begins from home and then spreads to the workplace and has its hold in political power. The class relations and class interests divide people into the oppressor and the oppressed classes. Then naturally contradictions take place.

Violence between husband and wife, father and son, brother and sister, brother and brother, lover and beloved, and between friends has been widely presented in literary works. Plays, novels and short stories and poems present violence of the intimate relationship as their themes or subject matters. The thesis presents a cursory survey from myths to postmodern writings of the representation of violence in the intimate relationships and brings out the conclusion that most of the beautiful writings are based on the intimate encounters basically for power position. In the *Mahabharat*, the whole family divides into two hostile camps and they fight. Duryodhana's intention is to possess power and property whereas Karna and Dushashana are inherently motivated by Draupadi's beauty, and they associate themselves in the violence between the kinsmen.

The killing of Devaki's sons by Kansa in the *Krishnacharitra* and the attempts at the killing of Prahlad by his own father Hiranyakashyapu in *Vishnu Purana* are due to power-jealousy. In the mythology of Greece and Rome, the killings of brothers, sisters, husbands and wives too have taken place on account of jealousies of class, sex and power. Agamemnon was killed by his wife Clytemnestra for the murder of his daughter Iphigenia, but Clytemnestra was herself having an affair with Agamemnon's

cousin Aegisthus. Here, hatred, sense of revenge and sexual jealousy work for the killing of Agamemnon by his own wife.

In Sophocles' work *Oedipus Rex* (c. 425), Oedipus unknowingly killed his father Laios not simply because it was set in his destiny but because he wanted to test his power over a rival while he was trying to get into the border of Thebes, for which he had to suffer tragically. Likewise, most of Shakespearean tragedies are also full of jealousies, hatred and violent actions meted out to the intimate relations by their own kinsmen. *Hamlet* is full of murders. A brother killed his elder brother and married his sister-in-law and the nephew always thought of avenging the killing of his father and finally he succeeded in his mission. In *Othello*, Othello killed his wife Desdemona out of his frustration to see his innocent vision of the world destroyed by his blameless wife's betrayal. In John Webster's *Duchess of Malfi*, and Robert Browning's "My Last Duchess," violence takes place as a punishment for violating the hierarchy of the socio-political order in the aristocratic feudal system. In both of these works, the killers are conscious of their class and position of their power. The Duchess of Malfi becomes victims of her position-conscious brothers whatever of one's self-decision and secret of one's happiness may be. High level, high standard, high position, high status and privileges are the concepts which make a man behave and think differently from general human beings, and the persons with such positions and privileges are full of prejudices and inhuman behaviors. *The Duchess of Malfi* is full of horror and violence. The plot is very much directed by suspicion, jealousy, espionage, terror and murder plans.

Rapes, tortures and killings in Toni Morrison's novels are representative of the postmodernist phase of violence perpetrated among the intimate relations. *Sula*, and *The Bluest Eye* focus on some human weaknesses due to which tortures and sufferings

become indispensable whereas *Beloved* brings back a real story of the killing of a child by a black mother and it has been dramatized as an artistic creation with creativity and imagination. Sethe killed her daughter in order to redeem her from the cruelties of slavery, which became a traumatic experience for her, and she experienced horror and suffering. She tried to gain power of tolerance from the images of the ghost and the company of Paul D. The violent killing of the child shows that slavery was worse than death. In this sense, she tried to revolt against the social and political system established by the white people. The mother used her power upon her powerless daughter as a reaction against the whole political system that would use the black just as an object. The birth of a child would mean the production of a new commodity in the whole spectrum of this system. The mother, by killing her child, did her best to record her rebellion against such a system.

The history of *Beloved* is based on the “real life incident” however Morrison has given an adequate imaginative color so as to make a “political point.” The protagonist escapes from slavery and again is brought back to it. Running away from slavery was also a crime. Slavery, attempts at running away from freedom, murder for final redemption, trial or murder and again slavery and seeking practice for freedom are the general contents of *Beloved*. It is not slavery of total submission but a revolt for freedom.

Morrison addresses “the horror of slavery” as well as “the power of motherhood.” Carolyn C. Denard writes, “In the context of the horror of slavery revealed in the novel, Sethe did the right thing in saving her daughter from a living death” (332). Similarly the presentation of the ghost of the baby is for the search of “repentance and forgiveness” or as a traumatic memory.

The story of the murder of a child by a mother with deep love and attachment is not natural but it was much better than giving the child to slavery. Negroes were permitted to bear children. More so, they were forced to bear them faster and many more in number so that the white masters would use them as slaves from their early childhood. The slave children become slaves even before the time they learn to know why they have to work for others. In the early stage the Negroes were not permitted to become fathers. The black women were used and enjoyed by the white masters only. But the permission to Negroes to become the fathers was still painful for them. The scanty sexual pleasures were multiplied into a large number of miseries.

In *Beloved* Morrison affirms the opportunity for a kind of reconciliation with the past. The novel creates moral ground for mourning over the past that was full of horror and suffering. Morrison brings back the memory of the days of justice, so that the blacks would not let the bad days repeat; the ghost of slavery would not scare them back, and they would “move forward into the future with hope and wholeness” (Denard 332).

Morrison has captured the true image of an “unspeakable horror of slavery” and has developed it by the power of her imagination. Slavery drives people into madness. Confining them into houses is something like making them madder.

Not only the Blacks who had escaped slavery but also the white brothers and sisters who gave them goods, food and clothes with sympathy used to hate slavery worse than death. As in the other novels of Toni Morrison, in *Beloved* too each protagonist evokes psychic trauma.

Most of Norman Mailer’s works of fiction are full of extreme forms of violence. One such work is *An American Dream*, in which Rojack, the principal character is a professor, an ex-congressman and a television personality strangled his

wife Deborah in a violent struggle. He suffered from a lot of psychic ups and downs and lost his self-standing capacity. He was hung onto the dependence of his wife Deborah and had a powerful compulsion of suicidal impulse because of the traumatic experience of the wartime reminiscences. He killed his wife to avoid his own death. He also wanted to revive his power by killing his wife. And finally, after an extensive sexual intercourse with his wife's maid, Ruta, he undertook a pilgrimage to Yucatan and Guatemala for his redemption and purification.

Rojack confronts Deborah, Ruta, Cherry and Kelly. He thinks that he has slain a "Devouring Dragon," that "Great Bitch," "the maimer and castrator" that is nobody other than Deborah herself. He has to come out of confusions, the world of the dragonry, the dark hole and the "mythical Night sea journey" for his rebirth. Rojack, the principal character, had a lot of expectations from the marriage with Deborah, but soon he was frustrated with the relationships. He killed her to free himself from her grip. When Rojack is disillusioned from material power, he seeks spiritual power from his journey to the South. In American life, there is a continuous "domination-submission" struggle. Death, action, rebellion and outlawry are the processes that force him to become a murderer. He relies on his own instinct and tries to gain courage. For him murder is a process of liberation. He tries to solve the confrontation between his exterior and interior realities, and he wants to end his marriage ties with Deborah. He goes through the process of rediscovery and repossession of his violent soul by the murder of his wife. By murdering his wife, he decenters himself. He tries to drift away from the hold of the center and he says that Deborah had occupied his center. Norman Mailer's *An American Dream* (1965) is a novel that echoes the most representative voice of the capitalist bourgeoisie society of America, where frustration, perversion and violence are in the extreme form.

For Mailer, murder is a way of self-knowledge, the search for apocalypse, and a process of spiritual emancipation. From all these examples of violence, it becomes clear that violence is not always destructive; violence is the most effective way to the solution of the most complicated contradictions.

Talking about power and struggle, Gene Sharp puts forward two theories of political power: one is pluralistic and the other is monolithic. Pluralistic political power is fragile because it depends on its power sources for its reinforcement. In the possession of this power the government depends on the people and in the monolithic power people depend on the government and, “that power can really come from a few men, and that it is durable and self-perpetuating – appears to underlie most political violence” (Sharp 8).

Men’s violence to known women is generally ignored, however it can be seen as unfair, inappropriate, painful and even illegal, and also that has been simply taken as a legitimized taboo in spite of its being very shameful. In the recent years it has been lessened to a greater extent because of its being recognized. Violence has a persistent connection with power, control and dominance. The kind of social power that man has acquired over woman is the source of family violence, mainly of men’s violence.

One of the most significant issues of violence is identity. Whether it is the violence of Muslims and Hindus in India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh or even in Indonesia, or the violence of Hutus and Tutsis in Rwanda or the violence between Blacks and Whites in America, South Africa or in Jimbawe or even the recent Madhesi violence of Nepal or the innumerable racial and religious violences of the world, they are instances of identity violence. The Hindu-Muslim riots of 1940s in India were deeply connected with the politics of identity. The Hindu Muslim violence

that was linked with the partition between India and Pakistan turned out to be totally ruthless, and killing of thousands of people in the name of religious difference resulted into geographical separation.

Amartya Sen recollects the fierceness of Hindu-Muslim violence that erupted from January to July during partition. Sen describes that such violence destroys all warmth and attachments between friends, neighbours and communities. Sen presents the horror and terror of Hindu- Muslim violence that has been stamped as an unforgettable picture of terror. Sen recalls, “Hundreds of thousands perished at the hands of people who, led by the commanders of carnage, killed others on behalf of their ‘own people.’ Violence is fermented by the imposition of singular and belligerent identities on gullible people, championed by proficient artisans of terror” (2). Even after partition violence has remained deeply traumatic.

Beyond all conflicts and contradictions the questions of identity remain firm and strong in the human instinct. Divorces in conjugal relations, conflicts between communities and fights among gangs are mostly caused by identity issues. Insults, humiliations, moral pressures, marginalizations and dominations are basically connected with identity. The deprivation of one’s identity may result into violence sooner or later.

Violence is traumatic as well as retaliatory. In the broader panorama, violence generates violence and naturally it will go in the cycles of violence and counter-violence. Some times if the whole community is involved in violence, it will definitely touch the persons in the family relations and create a situation that the innocent people become victimized. If two nations or two races or two religious communities are fighting, naturally it will affect the cross- marriage relations of the hostile groups. The war of America in Afghanistan and in Iraq will have very bad

effects in the family relation between a Muslim wife and Christian husband, basically in the relations of Iraqi and American spouses. Even the friends and allies also may become enemies or remain unsuccessful in protecting the friends or grow suspicious towards each other. In such situation, the allusion of the violence between the hostile groups can be contextual.

Writing an introduction to *Violence and Non-violence: Pathways to Understanding*, Gregg Barak talks about the “Secrets of violence and Nonviolence” that violence and nonviolence go together correspondingly sometimes parallel and sometime intersected. Examples can be cited from the world events from the time after September 11, 2001. The terrorist action generally gives rise to counter terrorist actions, and in the meantime it is very difficult to give protection to the innocent nonviolent people. The repercussions fall heavy on the nonviolent people. After September 11, 2001, many innocent men, women and children became the victims of the so-called counter terrorist repercussions. Barak says, “the murder of a Pakistani Muslim store owner in Dallas, Texas, and a Sikh gas station owner in Mesa, Arizona, most likely an immigrant from India” (Barak 3) were some of the worst examples of such victimization.

The counter terrorist attacks which randomly make targets upon people and buildings as retaliation and as an expression of anguish are very dangerous because in such a situation the trauma of post terrorist action turns into another form of shock which trails long into the break of the possibility of peace establishment.

Reconstruction, rehabilitation and reconciliation go far away. The counter attacks upon the Muslim communities and their business stations in America led naturally to complications, very difficult to settle back. After September 11 Muslim students were beaten in colleges in America, business houses were burned down, Mosques were

firebombed and houses and shopping centers were vandalized. The terrorist attack of September 11 was most horrible, and the retaliatory attacks upon innocent people too were worst.

The then American President Bush visited mosques and consoled people. He tried to bring harmony and understanding between Muslims and Christians. He made statements like: "The face of terror is not the true faith of Islam" and "Islam is peace" (qtd. in Barak 3). Appealing to the American citizens and threatening the actions of those upon the Muslims, Bush asked to make themselves the best of American citizens, however one can see from the perspective of the neutral men that whether it is terrorists, or counter terrorists or the peacemakers, they are trying to justify their missions or deeds from the view point of "moral justice". Whether it is the violence in the name of the "holy war" or counter violence in the name of "operation infinite justice," it shows that both are motivated by the sense of revenge. Whether it is Bin Laden and the members of the al Qaeda gangs or those who undertake violence upon innocent Arabs, it will sooner or later generate counter violence, and there will be no possibility of easy solution. Therefore, understanding the earliest forms of violence and its root causes and its growth in other bigger and more complicated forms is very important. The problem of violence must be solved before it reaches the area of complexity.

In comparison with the personal forms of violence, the "bureaucratic" and "environmental" forms are more systematic, more organized and more widespread, and also they are more invisible and more destructive than the "individualized" forms. Abuses of children and elders, environmental damages, human rights violations, workplace abuses, police and military offences are some of other institutional forms of violence which are more seriously dangerous than the domestic and interpersonal

violence. Likewise, economic and political violences are structural ones. Such structural forms of violence are basically motivated by the enforcement of hierarchy and inequalities.

Galtung depicts the situation of “before violence” and “after violence.” There are the roots of war and violence, which shape up the circumstances for the eruption of violence. The state of “before violence” gives rise to tensions, which in nature is indirect and invisible. In this state the counter forces prepare themselves for a direct clash. When the situation becomes mature, the violent form of conflict will naturally burst out. Then the rival forces meet, contradict, confront, collide, crash and finally they suffer. The state of suffering in “after violence” is still more formidable. There is fear and horror. The deaths, injuries, rapes, displacements and trauma spread all over.

The trauma of war and violence is most unbearable, repenting and even retaliatory. The terrible feelings of shortage, loss, absence and damage are more traumatic. Things become intolerable to remember. Everything rolls up in the mind and becomes almost incredible. It becomes very difficult to believe that it was a reality. But the dreadful scenes appear in front of the naked eye. The moments of occurrence may be quite short; however there will be a long prehistory of violence.

Traumatic memory is different from everyday memory but in the trauma time there takes place a disruption of linearity, and things take place quite unexpectedly. The traumatic disruptions are not easy to report. The description of event of September 11 shows the horror stricken situation of the people as an example of the traumatic disruption to the linearity of time and expectations. For those who witnessed it with their eyes, it is still very difficult to describe the situation. To

remember it, the linearity of time breaks, but the horror remains strongly unforgettable.

The linear time produces sovereign power of the nation state, which produces and provokes wars, genocides and famines, and then it will change into trauma. Then the traumatic time begins. It is very contextual to show the contradiction between linear time and traumatic time; between power and trauma. Anything horrible in life is horrible to remember. Trauma is the thing that we repeatedly mark and remember in the name of forgetting.

The persons who return from the war cannot forget the horrible scenes of deaths and losses. They suffer from nightmares and flashbacks of the horror scenes. Instead of forgetting, the memories multiply and become more shocking. The nervous disorders, traumatic stress, shocks and obsessions become just common to the war returnees.

The genocide of the war, the massacre, aerial bombings, deaths and tortures in the concentration camps, open-air shootings become difficult to memorialize. But “after a lapse of time or a change in the political landscape, a narrative takes shape. Events are named, memorials and museums set up, and the identity of at least some of the victims established” (Edkins 2).

Many survivors of Nazi genocide of the 1940s had dreadful witnessing. Many of them suffered from traumatic stress, and their witnessing of the holocaust was unimaginable and unspeakable. For women survivors, rape and incest was very common. Like wise, the Vietnam veterans were noted as the sufferers of “post-traumatic stress disorder.”

Childhood abuse, trauma and the symptoms of hysteria have deep effects in women's life. Sigmund Freud analyzed childhood abuse, and later conceived that many

women are responsible for their own abuse and accused women of being willing to be raped, but that would turn out to be traumatic experiences. As trauma is a deep shock in the human mind, it is a kind of deadlock of thought. Man is confused not because the events give rise to trauma by the involvement of force and violence, but because there is often a threat in the integrity of life. Rape, torture, sexual abuse and the sight of the deaths of others and the violence and brutality are really traumatic. In some cases not only the victims but the victimizers too can have the traumatic feelings. The Vietnam veterans came back totally powerless. Actually trauma begins when one feels that one's trust has been betrayed.

Trauma is a constant memory of some painful events. It is a thought process, which is constantly repetitive or constantly static. It shows that violence results into trauma if not into death. The scene of holocaust or genocide, quakes and bombing can be traumatic. The sufferer of trauma generally undergoes a kind of deadlock of thought that does not let one to be active or creative.

Similarly, the cultural violence is deeply rooted in the human mind, and it may turn into the structural violence. Consequently, it may come up into the visible and a physical turn. Cultural and structural forms of violence arise from different roots and they are the accumulations of various archetypal and social developments.

Structural and cultural violence generate hatred and revenge between losers and winners. Military solution sometimes becomes inevitable. Leaving the cultural aspects beyond the geographical borders may tend to legitimize direct violence from an "intra-state war" to "inter- state war."

When cultural violence begins, direct and physical violence is not far. The consequence will be heading towards violent solutions. There will be a revolt against the set up structures, and then naturally a situation of warfare persists.

To look into violence right from its root to the post- violence effects, we find that violence grows out of conflict. Many times violence erupts out of nothing or it has its origin at precise space and time, but things will be visible and realized only at the end of violence.

When violence begins, there will be only physical and verbal acts. Tension and emotion go to the height of complication. Then there will be the transaction of violent acts between the opposing parties. Friendship and love are not seen, but everywhere evil for evil becomes apparent. Revenge and retaliation prevail with the exchange of violence. In the post- violence situation both perpetrator and victim feel traumatized and guilty. The feeling of revenge is implicit and can be expressed and exposed in any form.

Many acts of violence are irreversible and irreparable. Murders, injuries, sexualized violence as rapes and abductions and the destruction of cultural monuments as symbolic damages are some examples of irreversible violence in the opinion of Galtung.

Some irreversible violence may sometimes result into mutinies and revolts too.

There are some convictions of “Nation,” “God,” “History,” and “Law” which have generally heightened the sense of emotion to provoke violence, and the violent acts in the name of “Nation,” “God,” “History,” and “Law” have almost always been justified and legitimized.

Talking about the event of September 11 of 2001 in America, Noam Chomsky in his interviews in the book entitled *Power and Terror* says that it was “obviously, a horrible atrocity” (13). In an Interview Chomsky has given cursory glimpses of terror, torture and atrocity in recent history. Japanese atrocities in China, U.S. atrocities in Southern Vietnam and in North Korea by wiping out every thing by massive

bombing, the merciless violence of the U.S. led coalition in Iraq and in Afghanistan, and the suppressions of Russia in Chechnya, China in west China, and Turkey upon Kurds have been legitimized in the name of history and nation, but who cares the millions being driven out of their homes, thousands of villages being destroyed and tens of thousands of people being killed!

In Chomsky's opinion the 9\11 attack was an answer to the long and continued American violence in the most atrocious form. Such violence and counter violence in the international power politics have constantly taken place. In this connection Cregg Barak writes, "when a nation-state feels humiliated by another nation-state or group of nation-state, collective violence of the most atrocious kind may result, including mass murder and genocide" (7).

The domestic violence basically in the intimate relationship is probably the most important one. Violence begins from home and it may contaminate the whole society. Home is the safest place for violence. In domestic life, pushing, slapping and shoving are the general forms of physical aggression. They are the normal forms of violent offences until there is any physical injury. Generally those normal forms of violence too may overpower and terrorize the female counterpart. Some suggest "couple therapy" and some others say that jail is the solution, and in some other's opinion, removing women from their batterer's control is the solution for the control of violence in the conjugal life. At times when the couples lose control, they consequently resort to hitting, pushing or kicking each other. In course of time, such actions may escalate to more injuries resulting into life threatening or life taking situations.

There are some deeply rooted forms of violence. Some of them are like patriarchal traditions as men's rights to control their women. Besides physical abuses,

the patriarchal violence may involve economic subordination, intimidation, isolation, and many other control tactics as “patriarchal terrorism.” Similarly, shame is another source of construction and destruction. Shame can be responsible for a personal as well as collective violence that may result in any form killing like homicide or suicide. The interpersonal, institutional and structural forms of violence overlap into another when complications grow. All the social, political and economic organizations are involved in one-way or the other. The cultural and social experiences of shame, inequality and oppression generate violence. The solution to the complication does not simply refer to love and understanding but to other social and cultural discourses.

Galtung agrees that violence is disruptive, destructive, traumatic and retaliatory. It is visible as well as invisible. It is cultural as well as structural. It is interpersonal and institutional. It is, racial, religious, patriotic, national, and international. It is physical, verbal and psychological. It is individual, collective, traditional, domestic, social, political, economic, sexual, patriarchal and prehistoric. It is oppressive, cruel, terrorizing, horrible and fatal. Tortures, rapes, homicide, genocide, general killing, mass destruction and driving away from homes are some of the forms of violence, which have taken place time and again in the human history. Even then human civilization has come up to this stage through all these violences. The phases of destruction and creation have been developed side by side together. At the most obnoxious, atrocious, dreadful and dangerous violent actions also, there are some positive and creative aspects in violence. Violence is the most essential element for development and for the growth of civilization. On the fall of Troy a new civilization must have emerged. After the destruction of Lanka’s king Ravana, his virtuous brother Vivishana was enthroned, from where the Lankan civilization took a

different dimension. When an old city gets burned down, a new city is built up with newness in form and concept. Every new blossom begins from the withers and falls of the old ones. Violence is a forceful transformation from old to new. In this sense violence begins in chaos but ends in creation.

Implication of this Thesis for Future Research

Violence is profusely used in literature. Violence between husband and wife, father and son, brother and sister, brother and brother, lover and beloved, and between friends has been widely presented in literary works. Plays, novels, short stories and poems have presented violence of intimate relationship as their central themes or subject matters. The thesis presents a cursory survey from myths to postmodern writings of the representation of violence in intimate relationships; however it presents how violence has been undertaken for the possession of power and how power is exercised for violence. From simple domestic violence to severe tortures and killing of the persons of intimate relation, and from interpersonal violence to dreadful genocide, holocaust and mass destruction, violence has been used. In the present thesis I have seen the obnoxiousness and dreadfulness of violence on one dimension where as on another dimension I have found its beauty and creation. The most beautiful writings are based on violence mostly on the violence of intimate relationship. From a limited sphere to a very large horizon and from the ancient mythologies to the present-day writings, violence has been incessantly and perpetually practiced but the human civilization has not stopped or even slightly slowed down. It proves that violence is not only destructive but largely creative. The topic is worth researching, and further researches in it will definitely unfold more and more mysteries about the horizons, layers and dimensions of violence.

Violence between friends, kinsmen, lover and beloved, husband and wife, brothers and sisters and between persons of close relationship has probably been the central theme in most of the great works because intimate relations are most interactive, most sensitive and most delicate so that encounters too are most probable. Whatsoever the obvious reason might be, it is a practice of domination-submission politics or in a sense, a power politics. The thesis tries to justify the point that every power is a political power and every violence is a power struggle. Pleasure comes from the exercise of power. There are *Perpetual Spirals of Power and Pleasure*. Power commands, power encroaches, power manipulates, power dominates, and power oppresses. Power decides the sexuality of a person or of the community or of a class or of the whole race. The whole process of class struggle is a power struggle. The domination of a class is the practice of power and the struggle against the domination also is a struggle for power. The whole human relations are the power relations and all struggles in the human history are power struggles.

Creative possibilities, experiences of trauma, confusions about life, feeling of the absurd, threat in the integrity of life, deadlock of thought, suicidal impulses, inaction and sense of revenge in random are some dangerous effects of violence, but in course of time in the long run they too will add significantly in great creation.

The study on violence is very important. Further researches upon it will explore more important spheres of violence. The studies will bring practical solution to lower the number of events, causes and bad effects of violence in the intimate relationships and in literary writings the researches will help magnify and beautify the works of arts more and more. It is said that Shakespeare at first studied about the stories of violence and then he started writing his great plays so that he could bring out the artistically magnificent creations. Like wise, a deep study about the nature and

dimensions of violence has both practical and creative significances. By the study of violence a doctor will understand the problems of the patients, a social worker will know the real causes of the exacerbated relations, a human right activist will have proper understanding about the real crux of human rights violations, a justice will be able to give verdict to the right sufferer, a peace maker will go deep in the problem to bring the peaceful solution, a security officer will find out the real perpetrator and a literary writer will be able to present the picture more artistically and realistically. The implication of this thesis in the further researches will be most useful for me to go deeper with a profound knowledge and skills to bring solutions, and for others it will be a suggestive study for advanced researches.

Suggestions and Recommendations

The studies of childhood abuse, traumatic experiences and the symptoms of hysteria are significant from the psychological point of view. One should study the causes and effects of these problems for the realistic solutions and presentations. Rape, torture, sexual abuse, the sight of the deaths of others and brutality are mostly traumatic and the study of them will help one to solve the traumatic deadlocks.

A peacemaker must study the cultural violence that is deeply rooted in the human mind, which may turn into the structural violence in the visible and physical form. Cultural and structural forms of violence arise from different roots and they are the accumulations of various archetypal and social impressions. Then only the idea of peace building can be effective. When hatred and revenge overpower the situation, military solution too becomes inevitable. At the beginning of cultural violence, one should easily guess that direct and physical violence might soon begin with the inevitability of violent solutions.

In order to make people aware of the root causes and solutions to violence, the government should design courses about different form of violence for the students above the primary level. There should be courses for the general masses for public awareness and public teachings. The courses should be upgraded and updated to the highest level of education.

There should be precautions, preventions and protections of the spots, sources and conditions from the irreversible and irreparable damages. Strong laws and punishments should be made and imposed on the national and international level to stop and discourage such unpardonable perpetrations. The heinous aspect of violence must be made the subject of abhorrence.

Violence should not be simply taught from its negative perspectives. It should be taught how violence has been undertaken at the change from one age to another. In every juncture of history violence has been used. So the beauty of violence in every shift of civilization must be realized and appreciated. One should understand that violence is the greatest source of creation and development. Philosopher, poets and the literary writers should take the aesthetics violence deeply abreast in their powerful creations.

Works Cited

- Adam, Hazards. "Introduction." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. 1971. Hazard Adams.
Rev. Ed. Fort Worth, Philadelphia, San Diego, New York: Harcourt Brace
Jovanovich College Publishers, 1992. 1-9
- Armstrong, Nancy, and Leonard Tennenhouse, eds. *The Violence of Representation:
Literature and History of violence*. London & New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Arriaga, Ximena B. & Stuart Oskamp. "The Nature, Correlates, and Consequences of
Violence in Intimate Relationships." *Violence in Intimate Rrelationship*. Eds.
Arriaga, Ximena B., & Stuart Oskamp. London; New Delhi: Sage, 1999. 3-
16
- Barak, Gregg. *Violence and Non-Violence: Pathways to Understanding*. London;
New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2003.
- Begiebing, Robert J. *Acts of Regeneration: Allegory and Archetype in the Works of
Norman Mailer*. Columbia & London: University of Missouri Press, 1980.
- Borodulina, T., comp. *Karl Marx, F. Engels, V. Lenin: On Historical Materialism*.
Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1972.
- Cahn, Steven M. ed. *Classics of Western Philosophy*. 1977. Indianapolis-Cambridge:
Hackett, 1995.
- Chomsky, Noam. *American Power and the New Mandarins*. 1967. New Delhi:
Penguin, 2003.
- - -. *For Reasons of State*. 1970. New Delhi: Penguin, 2003.
- - -. *Power and Terror: Post- 9\11 Talks and Interviews*. Eds..John Junkerman and
Takei Masakazu. New York: Seven stories, 2003.
- Chun, Liu. *The National Question and Class Struggle*. Peking: Foreign Language Press,
1966.

- Cooper, David. Introduction. *Madness and Civilization*. 1964. By Michel Foucault. Trans. Richard Howard. London; New York: Routledge, 2001.vii- ix
- Crevecoeur. "Letters from American Farmer: Letter ix – Description of Charles Town; Thoughts on Slavery; on Physical Evil: A Melancholy Scene." J. A. Leo Lemay. Ed. *An Early American Reader*. Washington, D.C: USIA, 1988. 638–644
- Denard, Carolyn C. "Toni Morrison." Elaine Showalter. Ed. *Modern American Women Writers*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1991. 317-338
- Derrida, Jacques. *Writing and Difference*. 1967. Trans. Alan Bass. London and New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Durant, Will. *The Story of Philosophy: The Lives and Opinions of the Greater Philosophers*. New York: The Pocket Library, 1954.
- Dutton, Donald G. "Limitations of Social Learning Models in Explaining Intimate Aggression." *Violence in Intimate Relationship*. Eds. Arriaga, Ximena B., & Stuart Oskamp. London; New Delhi: Sage, 1999. 73-87
- Edkins, Jenny. *Trauma and the Memory of Politics*. UK: Cambridge UP, 2003.
- Ferguson, Sally Ann H. "Christian Violence and the Slave Narrative" *American Literature* 68. 2 (July 1996): 297- 320
- Fitzgerald, Jennifer. "Selfhood community: Psychoanalysis and Discourse in *Beloved*" Linden Peach. ed. *Toni Morrison: Contemporary Critical Essays*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1998. 110-127
- Foster, Richard. *Norman Mailer*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1968.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. 1975. Trans. Alan Sheridan. London: Penguin, 1991.

- - -. *Madness and Civilization*. 1964. Trans. Richard Howard. London; New York: Routledge, 2001.
- - -. *The History of Sexuality*. 1978. Trans. Robert Hurley. Vol.1. New York: Vintage Books, 1990.
- - -. "Truth and Power." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. 1971. Hazard Adams. Edi. Rev. Ed. Fort Worth, Philadelphia, San Diego, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers, 1992. 1134-1145
- Freud, Sigmund. "Letter to Einstein." *Essays on the Creation of Knowledge*. 1996. Comp & eds. Sheedhar P. Lohani, Rameshwar P. Adhikari, and Abhi N. Subedi. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak, 1997.
- - -. *The Interpretation of Dreams*. 1958. Trans. & Ed. James Strachey. Vol 8. Ed..Angela Richards. London: Penguin, 1971.
- Galtung, Johan. *Coping with Visible and invisible Effects of War and Violence*: NP: ND
- - -. *Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means: the transcend method*. United Nations, 2000.
- Giap, Vo Nguyen. *National liberation war in Viet Nam*. Hanoi: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1971.
- Glenday, Michael.K. *Modern Novelists: Norman Mailer*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.
- Green, Martin. *The Origins of Nonviolence*. New Delhi: Harper Collins Publishers, 1986.
- Gutman, Stanley T. *Mankind in Barbary: The Individual and Society in the Novels of Norman Mailer*. New Hampshire: The University Press of New England, 1975.

- Han, Dongping. *The Unknown Cultural Revolution: Educational Reforms And Their Impact On China's Rural Development*. 2000. New York: Garland; Kolkata: Cornerstone, 2007.
- Hardwick, Elizabeth. *Seduction and Betrayal: Women and Literature*. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Hearn, Jeff. *The Violences of Men*. London; Thousand Oaks; New Delhi: Sage, 1998.
- Holtzworth -Munroe, Amy et al. "A typology of Male Batterers: An Initial Examination." *Violence in Intimate Relationship*. Arriaga, Ximena B., & Stuart Oskamp. eds. London & New Delhi: Sage, 1999. 45-72
- Hawthorn, Jeremy. *A Glossary of Contemporary Literary Theory*. London: Arnold, 2000.
- Jed, Stephanie. "The scene of tyranny: Violence and the humanistic tradition." *The Violence of Representation: Literature and History of violence*. Armstrong, Eds. Nancy and Leonard Tennchonse. London; New York: Routledge, 1989. 29-43
- Kaufmann, Donald L. *Norman Mailer: The Countdown (The First Twenty Years)*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press; London and Amsterdam: Fiffer and Simons 1969.
- Konstantinov, F. V, et al. *The Fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1982.
- Lauretis, Teresa de. "The violence of rhetoric: consideration on representation and gender." *The Violence of Representation: Literature and History of violence*. Eds. Armstrong, Nancy and Leonard Tennenhouse. London; New York: Routledge, 1989. 239- 256
- Leeds, Barry H. *The Structured Vision of Norman Mailer*. New York & London:

University Press, 1969.

Lennon, Michael, ed. *Pontifications*. Boston & Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1982.

Leonard, Kenneth E. "Alcohol Use and Husband Marital Aggression Among Newlywed Couples" *Violence in Intimate Relationship*. Eds. Arriaga, Ximena B., & Stuart Oskamp. London; New Delhi: Sage, 1999. 113-135

Leventhal, Beth, & Sandra E. Lundy, eds. *Same-sex Domestic Violence: Strategies for Change*. London New Delhi: Sage, 1999.

Lloyd, Sally A. "The Interpersonal and Communication Dynamics of Wife Battering." *Violence in Intimate Relationship*. Eds. Arriaga, Ximena B., & Stuart Oskamp. London; New Delhi: Sage, 1999. 91-111.

Long, William J. *English Literature: Its History and Its Significance*. New Delhi - Ludhhiana: Kalyani Publishers, 1977.

Mailer, Norman. *An American Dream*. 1965. London: Flamingo, 1994.

- - -. *Pontifications*. Ed. Michael. Lennon. Boston & Toronto: Little, Brown & Company, 1982.

Mariscal, George. "The other Quixote." *The Violence of Representation: Literature and History of violence*. Eds. Armstrong, Nancy and Leonard Tennenhouse. London; New York: Routledge, 1989.98-115

Marx & Engels. *Manifesto of the Communist Party* 1848. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1971.

Marx, Karl and F. Engels. *The German Ideology. On Historical Materialism: A Collection*. Comp. T. Borodulina. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1976. 14-76.

- Mc Gowen, Randal. "Punishing violence, sentencing crime." *The Violence of Representation: Literature and History of violence*. Eds. Armstrong, Nancy and Leonard Tennenhouse. London; New York: Routledge, 1989.140-156.
- McAlindon, Tom. "What is a Shakespearean Tragedy?" *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespearean Tragedy*. Ed. Claire McEachern. Cambridge: Cambridge Up, 2002.1-22
- McEachern, Claire, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespearean Tragedy*. Cambridge: UP, 2002.
- Mitchell, W. J.T. "Representation." *Critical Terms for Literary Study*. Eds. Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1990. 11-22
- Morrison, Toni. *Beloved*. 1987. London: Vintage, 1997.
- Paglia, Camille. *Sex and Violence or Nature and Art*. London: Penguin Books, 1992.
- Pasang, Nanda Kishor Pun. *Red Strides of the History: Significant Military Raids of the People's War*. Eds. Kumar Shah, Chetan Kunwar & Binod Sen. Trans. Sushil Bhattarai. Kathmandu: Agnipariksha Janaprasakashan Griha, 2008.
- Poirier, Richard. *norman mailer*. Ed. Frank Kermode. New York: The Viking Press, 1972.
- Pokharel, Rajan Prasad. *Life and Literature*. Kathmandu: Rita, 2003.
- Powell, Barry B. *Classical Myth*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1995.
- Progress Publishers. *The Fundamentals of Marxist Leninist Philosophy*. Moscow: USSR, 1979.
- Rajagopalachari, C. *Mahabharata*. 1st ed. 1951. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 2001.
- - -. *Ramayana*. 1st ed. 1951. Mumbai: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 2000.

- Ruland, Richard and Malcolm Bradbury. *From Puritanism to Postmodernism: A History of American Literature*. New York: the Penguin Group, 1991.
- Said, Edward W. "The World, The Text, and the Critic." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. 1971. Ed. Hazard Adams. Fort Worth; Philadelphia; San Diego; New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers, 1992. 1210-1222
- Selden, Raman. *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*. New York; London; Toronto; Sydney; Tokyo: Harvester Wheatsheaf, ND.
- Sen, Amartya. *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny*. Great Britain: Allen Lane, 2006.
- Sharp, Gene. *The Politics of Nonviolent Action: Part One: Power and Struggle*. 1973. Boston: Porter Sargents. 1984.
- Smith Valorie. "Toni Morrison." *American Writers: A Collection of Literary Biographies*. Supp 1, Part 2. Ed. Leonard Unger. New York: Charles Scribner's sons, 1979. 361-381
- Spirkin, Alexander. *Dialectical Materialism*. Trans. Robert Daglish. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1983.
- Stallybrass, Peter. "Drunk with the cup of Liberty" "Robin Hood, the carnivalesque, and the rhetoric of violence in the early modern England." *The Violence of Representation: Literature and History of violence*. Eds. Armstrong, Nancy and Leonard Tennenhouse. London; New York: Routledge, 1989. 45-75
- Straus, Murray A. "The Controversy over Domestic Violence by Women: A Methodological, Theoretical, and Sociology of Science Analysis" *Violence in Intimate Relationship*. Eds. Arriaga, Ximena B., & Stuart Oskamp. London; New Delhi: Sage, 1999. 17-44

Swami Prabhupada, A.C. Bhaktivedanta. *Bhagavad – Gita As It Is*. Mumbai: The Bhativedanta Book Trust, 1998.

Tennenhouse, Leonard. "Violence done to women on the renaissance stage." *The Violence of Representation: Literature and History of violence*. Eds. Armstrong, Nancy and Leonard Tennenhouse. London; New York: Routledge, 1989. 77-97

Tsetung, Mao. *Selected Reading from the Works of Mao Tsetung*. China: Committee for the Publication of the Selected Works of Mao Tsetung, 1965.

Wallop, Lucille Fletcher, "Sorry Wrong Number." *Joys of Reading: A Collection of Essays, Short Stories, Poems, and Plays*. Eds. Shreedhar Lohani and Rameshwar Adhikary. Kathmandu: M.Kpublishers and Distributors, reprint 2007.

Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: OUP, 1977.

Yeats, W.B. "Purgatory." 1938. *The Heritage of Words*. Eds..Shreedhar Lohani, Rameshwar Adhikari and Abhi Subedi. Kathmandu: Ekta Books, 1998.116-124

- - - "Leda and the Swan." *Elements of Literature*. 4rth ed. Eds. Robert Scholes, et al. Oxford and New York: Oxford UP, 1991.