

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Jimmy Porter as an Intellectual Character

**A thesis submitted to the Central Department of English
in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the Degree of
Master of Arts in English**

By

Sunil Kumar Dhakal

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

July 2008

Tribhuvan University

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

This thesis entitled "Jimmy Porter as an Intellectual Character" submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University by Mr. Sunil Kumar Dhakal has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head
Central Department of English

Date: _____

Acknowledgement

It is my pleasure to express my heartfelt gratitude to my respected advisor Mr. Harihar Gnawali, Central Department of English T.U. Without his scholarly vision, guidance, invaluable supervision and continuous encouragement this dissertation would never have come in this form. He is my guru, guide and supervisor.

In the same way, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, Head of the Central Department of English, for granting me the opportunity to carry out this research. I am also grateful to all my respected teachers of English Department. I am grateful to Dr. Shiva Risal, Dr. Rewati Sharma, Dr. Arun Gupto, Dr. Birendra Pandey, Mr. Badri Acharya and Mr. Sadan Adhikari for providing me essential texts and dignified suggestions.

The concrete existence of my dissertation has its root in the inspiration and love of my parents Govida Prasad Dhakal and Chhali Devi Dhakal.

My special thanks go to my sister Tara, and to my brothers Shambhu Dhakal, Sushil Dhakal, Balaram Dhakal, Surya Paudel, Ghanshyam Paudel, and Anil Dhakal for their continuous support and encouragement. I would like to thank Keshav Sigdel, Saleem Khan, Ram Padartha and Tulsi Pathak for their kind cooperation.

Lastly, I am also grateful to Mr. Manik Dangol, proprietor of M.M. Communication, Kirtipur for his accurate and high speed that helped me digitize the thesis in time.

Kirtipur, 17, Ktm

July, 2008

Sunil Kumar Dhakal

Abstract

The present research work attempts to analyze the motif behind the anger/resentment of an intellectual basically in the traditional society where prevailing belief and status-quo overshadows the intellectuality. Particularly, this dissertation centers on the activities and attitudes of the protagonist of the play, Jimmy Porter, who rebels against status-quo. Jimmy does not believe in tradition. He wants to bring a change in attitude of people in the society. Therefore, he defies political corruption, war, bishops, superstition, church, upper-class and conventional sexual code and heralds the death of middle class value and morality. Creating such brave and intelligent hero Osborne illustrates the hidden treasure behind marginalized class and makes insightful commentary on England's social and political situation at the same time. He also shows anger as creative force which is not always bad.

Contents

Abstract	
	Page
I. Introduction	1
II. Concept of Intellectual	6
III. Jimmy Porter as an Intellectual Character	18
IV. Conclusion	34
Works Cited	37

I. Introduction

The purpose of the present critical study is to examine and analyze Jimmy Porter as an intellectual character. The research depends on the activities, attitudes, and behaviour of Jimmy. Jimmy rants everything around him. He assails political corruption, condemns war; rejects superstitions; attacks on the church; strikes the upper class; subverts the middle class values; defies the conventional sexual code and heralds the death of middle class morality. To examine Jimmy's intellectuality the dissertation analyzes the motif behind his resentment against the social institutions.

Anyone with the faculty of knowing, reasoning and understanding people, things and situation is the intellectual. In this context *Ajanta's Advanced Learner's Dictionary* defines intellectual as the person who can "show understanding" (398). The intellectuals always defy the corruption. They do not believe in tradition. Gramsci believes that they "step for making a new way of thinking" (qtd. In *Philosophical Dictionary* 172). The traditionalist can not tolerate the new idea of thinking, therefore, they accuse the intellectual of being angry and sadist. The intellectual do not believe in Temple, Church, Gumba, Masjid as home of religion, rather they hate the evils inside in these so-called home of religion. They want change in society. Therefore, they rebel against pre-established rule of family, society and country. So, Said says that "they rebel against status-quo" (9).

Jimmy, the central character of the play, is aware of his slipping youth on meaningless Sunday rituals-ironing clothes, drinking tea, reading papers and so on. But his companions Alison and Cliff do not care anything about their life. Jimmy the young intellectual wants every person around him to awaken. He wants whole England to awaken. Therefore, he criticizes the passivity of English people through Alison and Cliff. Not only Alison and Cliff but also Alison's brother Nigel and her

mother Mrs. Redfern are not far from Jimmy's criticism. He wants revolution in political, social, economic and religious sector of England. But no effort of the people satisfies him. Everything is full of corruption. And all the people are sleeping on that cozy bed of corruption. But Jimmy is the one who wants to wake up every sleeper from the depth of their sleep to the reality of world. For doing this he seems sadist, angry and disgruntled. It is only on the surface. So some superficial readers may accuse him of being psycho-neurotic, angry, sadist, and sexy. But this research work attempts to see Jimmy porter as an intellectual character.

The play has received numerous critical responses after its publication in 1956. Most of critics have seen Jimmy as angry, sadist, psycho-neurotic and sexy character. And some critics observe this play from autobiographical, Marxist or Feministic point of view.

M.D. Faber assesses Jimmy Porter as neurotic and victim of basic insecurity. so he states: "Jimmy is a young neurotic who lives like a pig, and whose bitterness produces a fine flow of savage talk, but is basically a bore because its reasons are never explained" (67).

Similarly, Bamber Gascoigne asserts that Jimmy as angry, intense, feverish, sadist, crazy and undisciplined character. And the reason for his cruelty to his wife is his own excess of energy which he can not use in a sweet-stall. In this context he states:

He is clearly a sadist and masochist, as is shown by his treatment of not only Alison and Helena, but also cliff. His brutal and savage behaviour towards Alison indicates that he obviously enjoys all the pain he inflicts upon her. His assaults on her, which

are essentially verbal, are aimed at not only her detachment and apathy symbolized by the name Lady Pusillanimous and her essentially genteel viewpoint, but also her parents, her brother and her entire way of life. (57)

John Russell Taylor in his introduction to *Look Back in Anger: A Casebook* compares the hero of Osborne's *Look Back in Anger*, Kingsley Amis's *Lucky Jim*, (1954) and John Wayne's *Hurry on Down* (1953). In this context he states:

The heroes of these play are shamelessly self-centered, librated from social responsibility, out for number one. They are sexy, ill-mannered and bent on cocking a shook at social conventions and class limitations. Thus they can, with a bit of forcing, be regarded as rebels, defiers of status quo, irreverent outsiders sniping at the existing structure of British society. (13)

A.E. Dyson in his general editor's comment in *Look Back in Anger: A Casebook* talks about John Osborne's sense of values through Jimmy Porter.; So he states:

Obviously, he is not an ideal character. He suffers, is frustrated, and makes terribly wrong choices – as the last scene makes clear, even for those who imagine that his blasphemy against life when he hopes that Alison 'will have a baby and that it will die' is a mere expression of John Osbarne's sense of values. (25)

According to Mary McCarthy, Jimmy's sadist nature is the result of the trauma brought about by the boyhood experience of watching his father die. In this context he states, "Having been embittered, he has grown up to hate and

mistrust the world. Jimmy's profoundest, quickest most natural instinct is mistrust" (150).

John Mander talks about Osborne's insufficient critical flaws in Jimmy's character. So he aptly remarks, "Jimmy's inadequacy is never exposed to view, and Jimmy is a phoney but we are left with the impression that his creator can not admit the fact" (148).

Prashant K. Sinha in his introduction to *Look Back in Anger* Portrays Jimmy as a contradictory character. He states:

Jimmy embodies many attitudes and traits of his age group and some of his class and many facets of his life and personality parallel Osborne's, but his psychoneurotic problems and idiosyncrasy mark him out as a unique individual who can not be equated with either his creator or his social class. (28)

John Osborne himself at the very beginning of the play describes Jimmy as a bundle of contradictory qualities. He states:

Jimmy is a disconcerting mixture of sincerity and cheerful malice, of tenderness and freebooting cruelty; restless importunate full of pride, 'a combination which alienates the sensitive and insensitive alike. Blistering honesty or apparent honesty, like his, makes few friends. To be as vehement as he is to be almost non-committal. (53-54)

These critics deny to accept Jimmy as an intellectual character. They rather claim him as an angry man but never searched the reason behind his anger. Anger is not always bad. It is bad if it is used for destruction and violence. Jimmy uses anger as a weapon to energize the people who are sleeping on the

cozy bed of inactiveness. And he also makes aware the English people through Alison and Cliff about their slipping youth. Can a merely angry man energize the people and make aware about their slipping youth? Certainly not. It is only the intellectual's task to alarm the people about the economic, political, social and cultural condition of the country.

Jimmy knows very well that the improvement in the nation is possible only through clear political vision. But the politicians are corrupted and visionless. They never understand about the real situation of the country but claim as the specialist of their sector. So Jimmy criticizes the corrupted politicians through Nigel that "nothing is more vague about Nigel than his knowledge" (64).

Jimmy shows his strong dissatisfaction against loss of self-dependency of the country. The reason behind this loss, as he thinks, is the short sightedness on the part of politicians who "get cooking from Paris (that's a laugh) politics from Moscow, and morals from Port Said" (64).

Jimmy hates the man who hates poor people wearing the cover of church. He condemns the bishops who support the H-Bomb project wearing the coat of Church against the desire of peace loving people. Similarly, Jimmy criticizes the so-called posh-newspapers which always publish gossip challenging the intellectual's wit.

Look Back in Anger is a play which presents a young intellectual's rebel against every kind of inactiveness, corruption, destruction and lack. To analyze the character behaviour and mind of Jimmy Porter, this research depends on Saidian theoretical perspective regarding intellectuals.

II. Concept of Intellectual

Anyone who works in any field connected with the production and distribution of knowledge is an intellectual. The intellectual stands on pen. High School teacher, university lecturer/ professor, writer, critic, politician, etc known as intellectuals. The intellectuals are always in spirit of opposition, rather than in accommodation. They break down the stereotypes and reductive categories that are limiting to human thoughts and communication. They are supposed to be in a state of almost permanent opposition to the status quo. But this does not mean opposition for the opposition's sake. They have the power to avert the dominant functional mode by asking questions, making distinctions and restoring to memory. The intellectuals always speak truth to power. They always fight against tyranny, inequality and suffocation of the authority. To achieve the goal, sometime they seem angry, dissatisfied and even sometime sadist. The intellectuals do not have any organization to give them shelter. They are always scattered. They do not have any mechanical network. Therefore they always stand individually and freely, but always raise the common voice of life, liberty, freedom and equality of the people in the nation. They give voice to the voiceless and vision to the visionless. Therefore, they are the prime instigators of the movements. And if the society becomes divided, anarchic and difficult to govern, the implied need for intellectual is to calm people down by showing them the best ideas and the best works of literature and explain them that the group is not a natural or god-given entity but is constructed, manufactured or in some cases invented object with a history of struggle and conquest behind it. So, intellectuals are the people who need to develop a rational functionality positioning themselves in the inbetweenness.

Intellectuals may get their identity even from political thought, social role, geographical region and religious belief too. For example: left- wing intellectuals, right –wing intellectuals, western- intellectuals, non- western intellectuals, Arab intellectuals, Chinese intellectuals, British intellectual, American intellectuals and so on.

A host of critics, institutions and organizations have interpreted and analyzed the concept of intellectual. *The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* defines intellectual as a person with “ability to think in logical way and understanding things” (620). Intellectuality is connected with a person’s power of reasoning with excellent mental abilities. And s/he further develops the mind through their activities.

Aristotle (384-322 BC), the classical philosopher believes that the intellectual observes a form (soul) from nature and reshapes it in different matter (body) and medium. “This medium which the form does not inhabit in nature, is the source of each works inward principle of order and consequently of its dependence from slavish copying” (qtd. In. Adams 49). He states in his important writing *Nicomachean Ethics* (moral theory) book 6 that:

Intellectuals grasp the *Form* through *Nous*. And there are four main intellectual faculties which can be employed more or less well: *Episteme* (Scientific knowledge of what is non contingent acquired by demonstration); *Nous* (intelligence: intuitive reason); *Phronesis* (practical wisdom the ability to deliberate well on matters concerning human welfare); and *Techne* (skill, art) and *Sophia* (wisdom, theoretical excellence) combines *Episteme* and *Nous*. (qtd. in Philosophical Dictionary, 210)

He also distinguishes between the moral excellence and intellectual excellence. The moral excellence is attained by habituation and intellectual excellence by learning.

Antonio Gramsci (1891-1937), Italian Marxist thinker and political philosopher in his *Prison Notebook*, at early phase wrote about political theory rejecting materialist tenets, parliamentary democracy and objectivism proclaimed by Engel and Lenin and condemned bureaucratic centralism because of its brutal exercise of force. And in his later thought Gramsci developed a theory of hegemony and explained the role of intellectual. In this book he discusses that the peasant origin intellectual (priest, lawyer, etc) are originally linked to their class of origin. The proletariats generate its own organic intellectual with in the class and remain intellectual of their class. And they perform an essential mediating function in the struggle of class forces. For Gramsci "there is no existence of non-intellectual" (10). Everyone possesses the intellect of their own kind. Only the immediate social function of the professional category distinguishes between intellectual and non-intellectual. But the relationship between efforts of intellectual – muscular nervous effort is not the same. So, that there are varying degrees of specific intellectual activity. There is no human activity from which every form of intellectual participation can be excluded: *Home Faber* (man the maker) can not be separated from *Homo Sapiens* (man the thinker)" (10). Each man finally, outside his professional activity carries on some form of intellectual activity. Gramsci further states that "all men are intellectuals, but not all men have in society the function of intellectuals" (9). He divides the intellectuals in to two groups: the traditional and the organic intellectuals. The traditional intellectuals–teacher, priest, administrators, etc

continue to do the same thing from generation to generation and organic intellectuals are directly connected to classes or enterprises. They organize interests, gain more power and get more control. Gramsci states:

Organic intellectuals are the capitalist entrepreneurs who create along side himself the industrial technicians, the specialist in political economy, the organizers of new culture, a new legal system. Today's advertising or public relation expert who devises techniques for winning detergent or an airline company, a larger share of the market, would be considered an organic intellectual.

(4)

Gramsci believes the organic intellectuals are actively involved in society. They constantly struggle to change minds and expand markets. Unlike teachers and priests, who seem most or less to remain in place, doing the same kind of work year in, year out, organic intellectuals are always on the move, on the make.

On the contrary to Antonio Gramsci, Julien Benda, the prominent literary theoretician, views intellectual as a small and highly visible group of men. For him intellectual is a rare person, like Jesus, Socrates, Nietzsche, Spinoza, Voltaire and Earnest Renan, etc. Benda's intellectuals always speak truth and justice without concerning for their personal interest or fate. He states in his book *The Treason of the Intellectuals* that "intellectual is a tiny bend of super gifted and morally endowed philosopher – kings who constitute the conscious of mankind" (43). For him the real intellectuals seek their joy in the practice of an art or a science or in metaphysical speculation. And they always possess non-material advantages. The intellectuals constitute a clerisy and counter pose against laity.

They denounce corruption, defend the weak and defy imperfect and oppressive authority. He further states that "real intellectuals are supposed to risk being burned at the stake, ostracized or crucified" (52). The intellectual are always in a state of almost permanent opposition to the status quo. His example of Fenelon and Massillon against Louis XIV, Voltaire against Palatinate and Renan against Napoleon clears that one will be intellectual only through the functions. The intellectual does not surrender before the tyranny. In this context in his *Treason*. Benda states:

How Fenelon and Massillon denounced certain wars of Louis XIV? How Voltaire condemned the destruction of the Palatinate? How Renan denounced the violence of Napoleon? Buckle, the intolerance of England towards the French revolution? And, Nietzsche, the brutalities of Germany towards France? (54)

Benda's real intellectual is courageous and enthusiastic, who speak the truth to power. And they are crusty, eloquent and angry individual for whom no worldly power is too big and imposing to be criticized and pointedly taken to task.

Michael Foucault (1926-84) one of the most influential and probably the most important sociologist of the twentieth century develops a new way of understanding intellectuals in his famous book *Truth and Power*. Foucault's principal interest was in "how power diffuses itself in systems of authority and how effects of truth are produced within discourses which in themselves are neither true nor false" (1134). So, Truth then is itself a product of relations of power and of the systems in which it flows, and it changes as systems change. Foucault analyzes the intellectual in the political sense. For him the intellectual

is the person who utilizes his knowledge, competence and relation to truth in the field of political struggle. So he states that:

To be an intellectual meant something like being the consciousness/conscience of us all. I think we have here an idea transposed from Marxims, from a faded Marxism indeed. Just as the proletariat, by the necessity of its historical situation, is the bearer of the universal (but its immediate, unreflected bearer, barely conscious of itself as such), so the intellectual through his moral, theoretical and political choice, aspires to be the bearer of this universality in its conscious, elaborated form. The intellectual is thus taken as the clear, individual figure of a universality whose obscure, collective form is embodied in the proletariat. (1142)

Foucault discusses that the essential political problem for the intellectual is not to criticize the ideological contents supposedly linked to science, or to ensure that his own scientific practice is accompanied by a current ideology but that of ascertaining the possibility of constituting a politics of truth. The problem is not changing people's consciousness or what's in their heads but the political, economic, institutional regime of the production of truth. Foucault talks two kinds of intellectuals: Universal and specific. He favours universal intellectuals saying "I would call the specific intellectual as opposed to the universal intellectual" (1142). During the twentieth century a new mode of connection between theory and practice has been established. The universal intellectuals were replaced by the specific intellectuals. The universal intellectuals that functioned in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were derived from a quite specific historical figure: the man of justice, the man of law, who counterposes to power

despotism and the abuse and arrogance of wealth, the universality of justice and the equality of an ideal law. For him the specific intellectual has emerged since the Second World War. Here Foucault thinks specifically of American physicist Robert Oppenheimer who moved outside his specialist field when he was an organizer of the Los Alamos Atomic Bomb project in 1942-45. He states:

The universal intellectual derives from the jurist or notable and finds his fullest manifestation in the writer, the bearer of values and significations in which all can recognize themselves. The specific intellectual derives from quite another figure not the jurist or notable but the savant or expert. (1143)

Foucault views that the proliferation of intellectuals have extended into very large number of fields. The universal intellectual finds his fullest manifestation in the writer, but the specific intellectual situate their own condition of life as work (housing, the hospital, the asylum, the laboratory, the university, family and sexual relations). All these experiences give them much more immediate and concrete awareness of struggle. So, they meet with specific problem, non universal and often different from those the proletariat or the classes.

Edward Said, the most distinguished cultural critic and one of the most brilliant, secular, democratic, and public thinker in his *Representations of the Intellectual* (1993) views the intellectual as an exile and amateur whose role is to speak the truth to power even at the risk of ostracism or imprisonment. Drawing on the examples of Jonathan Swift and Theodor Adorno, Robert Oppenheimer and Henry Kissinger, Vietnam and Gulf War, Said explores the implications of this idea and shows what happens when intellectuals succumb to the lures of

money and power. The intellectual should effort to break down the stereotypes and reductive categories that are limiting human thought and communications.

The intellectuals are not guided by any pre-determined rules, nor do they worship any god and fundamental setting. They have neither offices to protect nor territory to consolidate and guard. So he states, "Self irony is therefore more frequent than pomposity, directness more than hemming and hawing in them. But they should question on the patriotic nationalism, corporate thinking, sense of class and social or gender privilege" (10).

Said defines intellectual as "a spirit in opposition rather than in accommodation" (XVII). He believes that the romance, the interest, and the challenge of their life are to stand against status quo. Their task at the time, is to unearth the forgotten, to make connections that were denied, to cite alternative courses of action that could have avoided war and its attendant goal of human destruction.

Intellectual today speaks specifically of national, religions and even continental variations on the topic, for example: French intellectuals are different in style and history from their Chinese counterparts. Similarly the African or the Arab are set in a very particulars historical context, with its own problems, pathologies, triumphs and peculiarities. Said in his essay *Holding Nation and Tradition at Bay* states:

Every intellectual is born into a language, and for the most part spends the rest of his or her life in that language, which principal medium of intellectual activity. Languages of course are always national – Greek, French, Arabic, English, German and so forth – although one of the main points I am making here is that the

intellectual is obliged to use a national language not only for obvious reasons of convenience and familiarity but also because he or she hopes to impress on the language a particular sound, a special accent and finally a perspective that is his or her own. (27)

Edward Said shows his consent with Matthew Arnold as he says in his *Culture and Anarchy* (1869) that "intellectuals are those individuals whose capacity for thought and judgement made them suitable for representing the best thought culture itself and making it prevail" (qtd. In *Representatives* 33). For Arnold, state is the nation's best self, and a national culture is the expression of the very best that had been said or thought. He is quite explicit about saying that all this is supposed to take place for the benefit not of individual classes or small groups of people but for the whole society. Similarly, for Gramsci the social reality is divided between rulers and those whom they rule. The major choice faced by the intellectual is whether to be allied with stability of the victors and rulers or – the more difficult path – to consider that stability as a state of emergency threatening the less fortunate with the danger of complete extinction, and take into account the experience of subordination itself, as well as the memory of forgotten voices and persons.

Said, in an interview with Abdullah al-Sinnawi to *Al-Arabi* Cairo-January 30, 1995 clearly speaks two models of intellectuals. In this context he states:

I always speak of two models: the first intellectual model is that which Gramsci mentions in his *Prison Notebooks*, wherein he considers anyone with a mind as an intellectual. Gramsci's intellectual is of two kinds: the traditional intellectual, such as the teacher, the priest, and the organic intellectual, such as

media/propaganda person or a party theoretician. My second model is that of Julien Benda in his book *The Treason of the Intellectuals*, in which he states that the intellectual is a rare person like Jesus, Socrates, Nietzsche, Voltaire; he is one who speaks of truth and justice without concern for his personal interests or his fate. (qtd in *Discontents* 195-196)

For Benda, the intellectual exists in language in a sort of universal space and they bound neither by national boundaries nor by ethnic identity. But, for Said the intellectuals' roles exist in language, and the problem of language is the principal problem, that is, which language to use. In his *Peace and its Discontent* he states: "The language that is imposed upon the audience is the language of community and of the homeland which is filled with pressures such as consensus, nationalism, power gibberish and whole host of empty slogans" (196).

The intellectual must be brave and honest. And they must protest against all kind of injustices and misuses of history. In this context Said states that "the role of the intellectual is that of testifying: he/she testifies against all the misuses of history or against the injustice that be fall the oppressed" (196).

For Said another most important quality of intellectual is to rebel against tyranny and to doubt about the illusion of the status quo. In *Discontent* he states:

I should add that he/she must be a rebel against power and prevailing ideas. The intellectual must raise doubts about illusions of the status quo, all that is tyrannical in society, especially for the sake of the deprived and the oppressed. (196)

As Gramsci, Said believes anyone with a mind as an intellectual. But he doubts that the intellectual ceases to be an intellectual if s/he were to join power or participate in it any way. In this context he states:

My view is that the individual ceases to be an intellectual in the ways I've described although anyone can still call themselves an intellectual. Let me give you the example of Andre Malraux, France's great literary figure, who stopped being a true intellectual at the moment he agreed to become the Minister of Culture under Charles de Gaulle. (196)

Intellectual in the professional world desire to get power or participate in it in any way in their area. In this context Said states, "There is of course a trap for the intellectual in the professional world, and that is his/her own propensity to acquire power and to be interested in it within his or her domain" (196).

Regarding the role of intellectual Said further states:

The role of intellectual is to say the truth to power, to address the central authority in every society without hypocrisy, and to choose the method, the style, the critique best suited for those purposes. This is so because the intellectual produces a kind of performance that continues for years whose main goal is (and here it seems to me Benda is crucial) to give utterance not to mere fashion and passing fads but to real ideas and values, which can not be articulated from inside a position of power. (196-197)

Said believes that the integration of Gramsci's view of intellectual "anyone with a mind as an intellectual" and Benda's view "intellectual is a rare person like Jesus, Socrates, Nietzsche, Voltaire" only give the true meaning of

intellectual. In this context he states that "I think that the most important role for the contemporary intellectual is to combine Gramsci and Benda" (196). Thus, he distinguishes himself from all those critics with clear points regarding the view of intellectual. His scientific view departs from all those critics, though he shows his consent with Gramsci and Benda. He is always one step forward than all those critics. Therefore, the present research work attempts to analyze Jimmy Porter as an intellectual character implying Saidian prospective of intellectual.

III. Jimmy Porter as an Intellectual Character

Osborne's *Look Back in Anger* is a play about the rebellion of the educated young man of low social status, against current society. The action of the play takes place in a flat, at the top of a large Victorian house in a town in the English Midland. The play opens with Jimmy's resentful remarks "why do I do this every Sunday? Even the book reviews seem to be the same as last weeks. Different books same reviews" (54). Jimmy, the central character of the play makes his speech with an intellectual content. He is not satisfied with his routinized life. He is aware of his slipping youth. His youth is slipping in meaningless rituals – drinking tea, ironing clothes, reading papers, listening radio and going cinema. His friend Cliff and wife Alison do not care anything about their life. They have neither vision nor tension. Being aware of their slipping youth, Jimmy criticizes their inactiveness and laziness: "Nobody thinks, nobody cares. No beliefs, no convictions and no enthusiasm. Just another Sunday evening" (61).

Jimmy, the working class intellectual boy gets married to a girl named Alison, from upper middle class family, in spite of his resentment against her parents. After marriage he starts a sweet - stall with the help of Mrs. Tanner, mother of his friend Hugh Tanner. Jimmy, the university graduate, earns his livelihood by running a sweet-stall. His business is assisted by his less brightened partner - Cliff. Before establishing this business he had tried a number of jobs at many places but nowhere could stick. Society doesn't allow him to find a suitable career.

Due to the class disparity between wife and husband, the dissatisfaction and misunderstanding reaches to the climax at the fourth year of marriage.

Jimmy criticizes Alison's mother, father and brother, especially for their middle class value and morality. Helena, one of Alison's friends, influences Alison to go to church which Jimmy never liked. Helena also renewed the connection of Alison with her mother secretly. Jimmy goes to meet Mrs. Hugh, bedridden in London. Alison neither goes with him to meet her nor sends a bunch of flower for her funeral but rather calls her father Mr. Colonel Redfern and goes to her mother's home with him, writing a note to Jimmy: "I shall always have a deep loving need of you" (116). Helena takes Alison's place in Jimmy's flat in her absence. They even feel warm in the same bed. Earlier Jimmy considered Helena as his "natural enemy" (79). Now everything changes into positive. But finally, Alison returns to Jimmy realizing her guilt of leaving Jimmy meaningless. Now, she understands the reality of life. She confesses, "don't you see! I'm in the mud at last! I'm grovelling! I'm crawling! Oh, God . . ." (139). Helena also feels that her living with Jimmy is immoral and illegal, therefore, goes from their lives. After Jimmy excuses Alison, they live happily in their "squirrels drey" (140). Jimmy very intellectually keeping his place safe and secure, tackles the situation and moves his life ahead.

The present study attempts to analyze Jimmy porter as an intellectual character with the help of Saidan perspective regarding the intellectual. The social rebellion play, *Look Back in Anger* begins with Jimmy's raging against things (newspapers), institutions (church), persons (Alison cliff, Nigel, Helena etc) and systems (middle-class/political system) on the intellectual content.

A social rebel always keeps on criticizing every kind of inactiveness, slothness, corruption and regression in family, society, and country. Jimmy is dissatisfied with the routined life which he is compelled to lead. He is also not

satisfied with his friend Cliff and wife Alison who lack enthusiasm for anything. And they want to escape from the "pain of being alive" (137). Jimmy's comments on person, things, and institution are witty, sharp and a little bitter. He hates Sundays because it is always the same - reading papers, drinking tea, ironing clothes and so on. He condemns bishops because they support H-Bomb project and rich people against the poor and Sunday papers because they publish nothing more than, gossip challenging intellectual wit or any form of aristocratic gentility or pretense. But his invectiveness is to plea for human honesty and vitality, for people to live emotionally as fully and as deeply as they can. He feels that young generation is aimless. Nobody is ready to die for any good reasons, but they die for the sake of women. Jimmy's response to what is happening around him and embrace of all the major contemporary issues psychologically signify his intellect and awareness of forthcoming danger of war. As Dyson says "the play is subtly aware of the psychological impact of the bomb on men of Jimmy's temperament" (24). Jimmy's attacks on Bishops, church, upper - class, imperial theme, middle class values and conventional sexual code is only for social change. He gets no satisfaction from the society. Rather it tortures him. The people of his generation were not able to die for good causes any longer. In a conversation with Helena, Jimmy says:

I suppose people of our generation aren't able to die for good causes any longer. We had all that done for us, in the thirties and the forties, when we were still kids. (*In his familiar, semi-serious mood.*) There are not any good, brave causes left. If the big bang does come, and we all get killed off, it won't be in aid of the old-fashioned, ground (the traditional social and moral ideal). It'll just

be for the Brave New– nothing very-much-thank you. About as pointless and inglorious as stepping in front of a bus. No, there's nothing left for it, me boy, but to let yourself be butchered by the women. (128-29)

This statement expresses political skepticism and a little personal frustration of Jimmy. He undoubtedly shows his concern for contemporary scene. The big bang is quite important in this context. Jimmy is aware for its effects. He hopes peace and security after the Second World War, but finds insecurity. Anarchy and instability rule over the England. Labor and Conservative Party respectively voted to the power after 1945, but nothing happened except dismantling the British empire. Therefore his comments on society express the mood and temperament of the post –war England. There was hardly any difference between the aims of the two major political parties in Britain. On the international front Soviet Union had manufactured the atom bomb and then the hydrogen bomb ending the Western nuclear monopoly. This led later in 1956 (When *Look Back in Anger* was written) to the Formation of the CND or the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament which in time became a widespread movement. People now found themselves in precisely the situation as Jimmy porter's.

John Osborne, the 27 years old author of *Look Back in Anger* sincerely believes his “hero” to be the representative of the younger generation. In this context Taylor views that "in fact, he is like thousands of young Londoners today" (46). As a representative of the younger generation he feels that he has every right to be angry against *status quo*. Jimmy, the intellectual person thinks that their youth is slipping in meaningless ritual of Sunday. Cliff and Alison both

are unaware of this. Alison stands whole day at the ironing-board, smoothing trousers, shirts, ties, etc. Cliff Lewis only tries ineffectively to defend the girl from Jimmy's criticism. She says nothing, does nothing in reply but goes on ironing. Rather desperately cries "I want a little peace" (103). She gets the peace only at the end of the play. They both ignore Jimmy's advice of being active. But he keeps on fighting to make themselves awaken. He wants to awake up the whole England which is in the grip of deathly coma or narcosis that had been spread all over England by the gases emanating from the press, clergy and political parties. Jimmy intends to provoke her, but there is no response from her side. In a conversation he remarks directing to Alison and Cliff:

Nobody can be bothered. No one can raise themselves out of their delicious sloth. You two will drive me round the bend soon - I know it, as sure as I'm sitting here. I know you're going to drive me mad. Oh heavens, how I long for a little ordinary human enthusiasm. Just enthusiasm - that's all. I want to hear a warm, thrilling voice cry out Hallelujah! (*He bangs his breast theatrically*). Hallelujah! I'm alive! I've an idea. Why don't we have a little game? Let's pretend that we're human beings, and that we're actually alive. Just for a while. (59)

Jimmy is an intelligent, educated young man whose dissatisfaction towards people, things and institutions turned him bitter. His dissatisfaction is not the cause of frustration but the desire for change in society. Changing society means changing attitudes of people. Therefore he attempts to change the attitude of people around him. Jimmy wants Cliff and Alison to respond to his outbursts, to participate in discussion with him, but they keep telling him to

"shut up" (60). His wife only wants peace. Jimmy fights to keep them awake. He desires to hear a warm thrilling voice of Hallelujah! for the enthusiasm which makes him feel that he is alive. Jimmy wants to live a life of a man. He also wants cliff and Alison to live a life. But their passivity makes him sad.

Every intellectual has a crucial role to lead the society ahead. Until and unless people's attitude is not changed, society can not be developed. Jimmy is not passive observer but active participant who always tries to bring a change in attitude and habit of people around him. The following conversation between Jimmy and Cliff makes more clear:

JIMMY. I thought the doctor said no cigarettes?

CLIFF. Oh, why doesn't he shut up?

JIMMY. All right. They are your ulcers. Go a head and have a bellyache, if that's what you want. I give up. I gives up. I'm sick of doing thing for people and all for what? (60)

Jimmy porter projects himself as an intellectual representative of the entire generation. As Kenneth Tynan says, "Jimmy stood for all the young people in England between the ages of twenty and thirty" (58). Having spent the years of their childhood in the shadow of Hitler's threat to England, they look forward to the peace after World War II. But the new prosperity that the welfare state introduced, brought its own disillusionment. The Empire gone, England shrunk to relative insignificance, "there really were not any good, brave cause left" (128) for fight. As John Russell Taylor points out "the Labour and Conservative parties were not essentially different and this led to disillusionment with national politics and the possibility of any change" (29).

Jimmy is never guided by any pre-determined rules. He always stands against status quo and efforts to break down the stereotypes. His sexual mores represent the new ethos of a more permissive society. For him virginity is a word of abuse. The traditional society and its representative like Alison's mother, Mrs. Redfern takes sex as a social prestige. But Jimmy, the modern intellectual subverts the traditional thought and establishes new culture of sex which is revealed in the following conversations:

ALISON. Jimmy's got his own private morality, as you know.

What my mother calls "Loose". It is pretty free, of course, but it's very harsh too. You know, it's funny, but we never slept together before we were married.

CLIFF. It certainly is - knowing him!

ALISON. We know each other such a short time, everything moved at such a pace, we didn't have much opportunity. And, afterwards, he actually taunted me with my virginity. He was quite angry about it, as if I had deceived him in some strange way. He seemed to think an untouched woman would defile him. (74)

Jimmy's defiance of the conventional sexual code heralds the death of middle-class morality. He is wide and warm hearted man who permits Cliff and Alison to keep any type of relation. Their mutual affection is often expressed in caresses. When Helana suspects on their affection Alison replies that they "are simply fond of each other" (85) but Helena restorts "darling really! It can't be as simple as that" (85). Cliff and Alison always share affectionate relationship, which Jimmy ignores.

Jimmy always resents dual character of a person. He does not hate the church but the people who suffocate the poor in the name of church and religion. Church is holy and pious by its name but most people play dirty game in it, which Jimmy condemns. As an intellectual, Jimmy couldn't tolerate the corruption in the name of religion. Church should maintain peace and help the poor, but it rather supported the "H-bomb project and the rich against the poor" (57). Therefore Jimmy criticizes the church going. Simple minded people always go to church because they never understand the evils inside the church. Neither they try nor find any fault but always follow the tradition. They never understand that following tradition means encouraging more to the corrupted Bishops. But Jimmy criticizes those who directly or indirectly support the corruption of church. The bishops are involving directly in the church supporting H-bomb project and speaking against poor. But Mrs. Drury, the landlady like women are innocently and ignorantly supporting the church. Jimmy being intellectual never desires for bloodshed. He wants peace and security. So, the hatred against church is revealed in the following conversations:

JIMMY. oh, hell! Now the bloody bells have started! (*He rushes towards the window*) wrap it up, will you? Stop ringing those bells! There is somebody going crazy in here! I don't want to hear them?

ALISON. stop shouting!

(*Recovering immediately*)

You'll have miss drury up here.

JIMMY. I don't give a damn about Miss Drury - that mild old gentlewoman doesn't fool me, even if she takes in you two.

She is an old robber. She gets more than enough out of us for this place every week. Anyway, she's probably in church. (*Points to the Windows*) swing on those bloody bells. (69)

Through this conversation we know easily that what type of person Jimmy is. He wants honesty everywhere. Miss Drury, the landlady taking more than enough from her tenants, hurts the soul of the poor but goes to the church for the sake of religion. Jimmy never likes such dual behaviour. The sound of church stands for peace and pious environment in the world, but if it is swung by such robbers it never consoles the soul but rather it irritates the intellectual.

Bishops, the contractor of the religion dominate the poor people publishing their corrupted ideology on so-called posh, Sunday newspaper. They make a very moving appeal to all Christians to do all "they can assist in the manufacture of the H-bomb" (57). They are preparing the Third World War in the name of religion, which is against the desire of poor and peace loving people. And it is only the whitening place of their black and dark attempts. Therefore Jimmy resents Alison to go to church in the following conversations:

JIMMY. On a Sunday evening in this town? Where on earth are you going?

ALISON. (*Rising*) I'm going out with Helena.

JIMMY. That's not direction - that's an afflictions. I didn't ask you what was the matter with you. I asked you where you are going?

HELENA. (*Steadily*) She's going to church. (95)

Jimmy becomes dissatisfied finding Alison going to church under Helena's influence. Church-going annoys him. He is always in opposition to formal religion and rituals. While Alison was outing with Helena Jimmy asks her where she was going. Alison replies that she was going out with Helena. But that was not the answer Jimmy wanted, he wanted to know where she was going. Helena intervening replies that Alison is going to church. Jimmy is amazed by this information because he does not believe in church. He wants Alison to understand the reality of the church. Therefore he says "I want to stand up in your tears, and splash about in them, and sing. I want to be there when you grove! I want to be there, I want to watch it, I want the front seat" (103). He asks if she has forgotten all that he did for her, and if she no longer remembers how he tried to get her out of the kind of life she was leading before her marriage. But Alison takes Jimmy's views lightly. She never understands the life reality. Therefore, she gets trouble like bitch in her mother's home. She loses her child before birth and returns to Jimmy feeling great loss. But previously she ironically had replied "Oh yes, we all know what you did for me! You rescued me from the wicked clutches of my family and all my friends, I'd still be rotting away at home, if you hadn't ridden up on your charger, and carried me off" (95). Jimmy rescues her from her imprisonment in her parental home. Her mother Mrs. Redfern is never in favour of their marriage. She is full of pride of middle class authority and never liked a man "without money background or even looks as her daughter's suitor" (109). She even doesn't like his long hair too. While Jimmy sees Alison's mother for the first time he develops a keen hatred for her because she wouldn't hesitate to cheat, to lie, to bully, and to blackmail. She also engages detectives to watch Jimmy and spy on his activities. Therefore he carries

off Alison like a knight riding a war horse. Jimmy directing to Alison's mother says "she is as rough as a night in a Bombay brothel" (127). He wants the end of all kinds of superstitions which Mrs. Redfern represents. He wants end of middle-class value and morality. So, he rejects to going to church.

Newspaper functions as the heart of democratic-systems. No intellectual condemns it. But the Saidain intellectual Jimmy porter hates it from the bottom of his soul. Why? There are various reasons behind his hatred. They publish "nothing more than gossip challenging intellectual's wit, and make one feel ignorant" (55). In modern society they are not more than private vehicle of capitalist entrepreneurs to carry their corrupted view to the innocent poor people and it is the platform of such corrupted person who support H-Bomb project and rich people against the poor. So, Jimmy resents the Sunday papers that only publish gossip and conjecture making one feel ignorant which is revealed in the following conversation between Jimmy, Alison and Cliff:

JIMMY. I've just read three whole column on the English novel.

Half of its in French. Do the Sunday papers make you feel ignorant?

CLIFF. Not arf.

JIMMY. Well you are ignoran. Your're just a peasant (*To Alison*)

What's about you? You are not a peasant are you?

ALISON. (*absently*) What's that?

JIMMY. I said do the papers make you feel your're not so brilliant after all?

ALISON. Oh - I haven't read them yet. (54-55)

This conversation reveals that the Sunday papers make one feel ignorant by publishing in two or more languages. The half in English and half in French challenges the intellectual's wit. Language must be common/national. Only the national language can erase all the illusion. Vague language can't be intellectual's language. So, Jimmy prefers national language in papers. Another cause which irritates intellectual is publishing baseless things such as the opinion that when "Shakespeare was writing *The Tempest*, he changed his sex" (122). The referring to the far-fetched and sensational research theses of American literary scholars only add vagueness in language. There are numbers of newspapers but so-called posh are few. In a conversation with Cliff, Jimmy says that "there are only two posh papers on Sunday" (87). And they cost more than enough. The price is much higher than content. Therefore Jimmy argues "Why do I spend ninepence on that damned paper every week? Nobody reads it except me" (59).

Another important cause which makes Jimmy criticize the Sunday papers is its misuse. The modern bishops and capitalist entrepreneurs are misusing the papers in various names. They have used it only for information to create worldwide terrorism. They use it only for spreading the war virus in the name of religion.

Various types of symbols and images serve important dramatic purpose in the play. Jimmy is dissatisfied with his routined life, but he is able to search out let too. He gets relief from bear - and - squirrels game. It is a brave attempt by Jimmy and Alison to compensate themselves for the failure of their marriage. Simon Trussler views the game as "a statement of the nature of human love - the willingness to immerse oneself completely in creativeness" (20). The game helps them to escape

from the harsh realities of life, and to maintain harmonious relationship between them which becomes more clear from the following conversations:

JIMMY. (*Staring at her anxious face*). You're very beautiful. A beautiful, great-eyed squirrel.

She nods brightly, relieved.

Hoarding, nut-munching squirrel. (She mmes this delightedly). With highly polished, gleaming fur, and an ostrich feather of a tail.

ALISON. Wheeeeeeeeeee!

JIMMY. How I envy you.

He stands, her arms around his neck.

ALISON. Well, You're a jolly super bear, too, A really sooooooooooooooooooer, morvellous bear.

JIMMY. Bear and Squirrel are marvelous. (78)

Thus, Jimmy reconciles himself to an animal relationship with Alison. Animal stands for innocent and natural relationships. They do not have any disparity, nor are there any class – distinction. This game offers great joy and relieves the tension from which they were suffering. The escape into the fantasy - world of animals makes both of them forget the bitterness of life and makes them very happy.

Similarly, the trumpet offers Jimmy an escape from the irritating world of routine, and is therefore, a source of some comfort to him. The sound of the trumpet has a wholesome quality. But other passive persons around him like Alison, Cliff, and Helena feel very upset. They want to escape from the pain of living. So, Alison comments on Jimmy's trumpet blowing that "God I wish he'd lose that damned trumpet" (69)

Jimmy Porter is always in a spirit of opposition rather than in accommodation. In comparison to him, other characters like Alison, Cliff, Helena, Nigel, Mr and Mrs. Redfern stand for prevailing rule and regulation. Jimmy rejects all the pre-established rules condemning all these characters. He attacks the predominant society through Alison and Cliff, religion through Miss Drury, political system through Nigel, social disparity through Mrs. Redfern and colonialism through Mr. Redfern. Jimmy's intellectuality comes to face, in his comparison with other characters. with this view in mind, brief analysis of other characters has also been presented.

Alison is never aware of her slipping youth. So, Jimmy tries to awake her times and again but she never realizes. He condemns saying "sycophantic, phlegmatic and pusillanimous to bring her into the right track" (65). But she doesn't listen to him. She only wants peace. It is the class disparity which causes dissatisfaction in their conjugal relation. Alison never understands Jimmy's inner-psyche. So, she goes to church under influence of Helena Charles. But, Jimmy, the positive intellectual hopes one day she "may want to come back" (103). She is very cruel woman who does not pay even minimum human sympathy to Mrs. Tanner. She neither goes to meet her with Jimmy nor sends a bunch of flower for her funeral, but calls her father to the apartment and goes with him to her mother's home. Jimmy wants something terrible to happen to his wife: "Oh my dear wife, you've got so much to learn. I only hope you learn. I only hope you learn it one day . . . If you could have a child, and it would die" (81). So, that she becomes wiser about ways of the world. Jimmy is callous as to wish that his wife has a child, and the child dies without knowing that Alison is pregnant. This makes her suffer. She experiences sorrow. Jimmy is right. It is

suffering that ultimately compels Alison to understand Jimmy and return to him. By the end of the play she realizes her guilt: "Don't you see! I'm in the mud at last! I'm groveling! I'm crawling! Oh, God" (139). Jimmy forgets her evils and accepts her: "We'll be together in our bear's cave, and our squirrel's drey, and we'll live on honey and nuts" (140).

Cliff, the less brightened man assists Jimmy as a partner to conduct the sweet-stall. He stands as no-man's-land between Jimmy and Alison. He shows hearty affection towards Alison. He embodies emotion than thought, could not see the future. Jimmy energizes him to awake from that depth of sleep. As a good friend Jimmy suggests him not to smoke in chain "they are your ulcers" (60), but he does not listen him rather says to "shut up" (60). He smokes as if it removes the heartache. Actually cliff has had "no believes, no convictions and no enthusiasm" (61).

Helena Charles, is the natural enemy because she stands for middle class value and morality which Jimmy resents from his early childhood. Church-going is her tradition. She takes Alison under her influence and takes to the church. Further she makes a secret connection of Alison with her parents. While Alison goes to her mother's home she takes her place in Jimmy's apartment. Later she realizes her relation with Jimmy as illegal and immoral, therefore, leaves Jimmy after Alison's return.

Nigel stands for political leader of England in 1930s/40s. Nothing is vague to him than his knowledge but he gets high post in his field. He claims himself to be the true politician but "nothing is more vague than his knowledgeThe only thing he can do –seek sanctuary in his own stupidity." (64).

Miss drury regularly rings the bell for the sake of religion, but takes more than enough from the tenants. “She is an old robber” (69). Jimmy never likes such behaviour. He doesn’t believe church as a home of religion. Humanity is true religion to him. Similarly he attacks the bishops, who spread the war virus in the name of religion, and “support the rich against the poor” (57).

Mrs, Redfern stands for class disparity. She does not like Jimmy as her daughter’s husband because he was “without money background, or even looks”(96).. Similarly, Mr. Redfern stands for colonialism, whom Jimmy attacks very strongly. In a conversation with Mr. Redfern Alison says “you’re hurt because everything is changed. Jimmy is hurt because everything is the same. And neither at you can face it” (112). At last Alison returns to Jimmy and Helena leaves Jimmy confessing their guilt. Anyway, they realize the life reality. Cliff also decides to establish his own business. In this way Jimmy's resentment brings all the character in the right track, but his place remains safe and secure from very beginning to the very end of the play. Thus, all his activities prove him a brilliant young intellectual rebel.

IV. Conclusion

Osborne's social play *Look Back in Anger* talks about the rebel of the young intellectual from low class status. He rants against existing social institution. His violence against all kind of tradition is natural. He seems angry, and his anger is associated with creative force. His attitudes and activities are linked in intellectual content. Therefore, the present research study examines the intellectuality behind the resentment of Jimmy Porter.

Jimmy wants revolution in the society. He wants a positive change in attitude of all the people. He wants to awaken the people from the cozy bed of passivity. He attacks the English people through Alison and Cliff saying that " they can come out of their slothfulness" (73). He doesn't believe in pre-established rules and rituals. The middle class people go to the church. But Jimmy has no belief in religion. Church gives no comfort to him. He hates the people who suffocate the poor supporting the H-Bomb project and the rich in the name of religion. Humanism is his true religion. The church -bells rather irritate him because he is aware of every evils inside the church. Bishops do nothing more than supporting the war. And the newspapers are not more than private vehicle of bishops and capitalistic entrepreneurs to spread the war virus all over the world in the name of religion. It is only the instrument to spread information terrorism. The newspapers also challenges the intellectual's wit publishing in two or more languages. Vague language could not be intellectual's language. So, Jimmy resents the newspapers too. Jimmy ironically comments that "I ought to send the Bishop a subscription"(57). Jimmy fights for good purposes, and his struggle is proved significant to the society in the end. Jimmy suffers severely. All the spectacles and readers respect him and they identify themselves with his suffering. It

creates the situation of catharsis. Audience finds assimilation with him. His constant rebel against passivity brings all the characters into the right track.

Jimmy is linked to low social status. Social passivity and disparity is the villain. So, he doesn't get the chances to enjoy his life, rather suffers for the right purposes. Therefore, he becomes able to produce a feeling of pity and fear. Jimmy never goes with the values and principles of the traditional world. His choice disturbs his whole life. He gets nothing more than trouble and dissatisfaction in his private life. He always keeps national interest above than the self-interest. Jimmy is always concerned about human life and its purpose. He feels that the young generation is aimless and old as traditional. So he challenges human activities and behaviours. He is the individual but his opponent is the society, especially its disparity. In such battle the hero is all the time defeated and the antagonistic forces remain victorious. But in contrast he asserts his dignity, and gets victory.

Jimmy is a man of great strength and courage. He is a graduate. He earns his living by running a sweet-stall representing a common approach to life. His wife Alison and friend Cliff also involve in the business. But they are victim of passivity. They do not care about their slipping youth in the meaningless Sunday rituals. Jimmy makes aware them about their duty and responsibility towards nation and towards themselves. He struggles against social evils. His family experiences and struggles have made him know the worldly reality. He spends his whole life to change the world. He never runs for personal interests. He declares war in the rotten society which has just emerged from the influence of the second World War. Jimmy is the intellectual who never practices the traditional rituals but rather creates his own "Private morality"(74).

Jimmy takes life differently than others. His anger functions as a weapon of protest against traditional belief. His feelings represent the youths of the 1950s. He challenges the upper-middle class marrying above him. He is dissatisfied with status-quo. So, he rebels against it. He hates bourgeois because “they do not hesitate to cheat, to lie, and to blackmail” (71). Jimmy, intellectually and systematically attacks the outer world and then gradually enters into the state of mind of his companions so that he becomes able to bring them in the right track. Thus, his protest is proved fruitful at the end. And he is rewarded. His ability to bring all the entire person in the right track keeping his place safe and secure proves him an intellectual character but not an angry husband or a man.

Works Cited

- Aristotle. "Poetics." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace and Co, 1992. 49-66.
- Dyson, A.E. "General Editor's Comments." *Look Back in Anger: A Casebook*. Ed. John Russell Taylor. London: Macmillan, 1968. 22-31.
- Faber, M.D. "The Character of Jimmy Porter: An Approach to Look E Anger." *Modern Drama* 13.1 (1970): 67-75.
- Foucault, Michael. "Truth and Power." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace and Co, 1992. 1134-45.
- Gascoigne, Bamber. *Twentieth Century Drama*. London: Hutchinson University Library, 1962.
- Karmacharya, K.L. and P.R. Vaidya, eds. and comps. *Ajanta's Advanced Learners Dictionary*. Delhi (India): Hindustan Offset Printers. n.d.
- Mander, John. "The Writer and Commitment." *Look Back in Anger: A Casebook*. Ed. John Russell Taylor. London: Macmillan, 1968. 143-149.
- Mautner, Thomas. *A Dictionary of Philosophy*. Main Street Cambridge, USA: Blackwell Publishers Inc, 2004.
- McCartey, Mary. "A New World." *Look Back in Anger: A Casebook*. Ed. John Russell Taylor. London: Macmillan, 1968. 150-60.
- Osborne, John. *Look Back in Anger*. London: Oxford University Press, Oxford House, 1995.
- Said, Edward. *Representative of the Intellectuals*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.
- Said, Edward. *Peace and Its Discontents*. New York: Vitage, 1995.

Said, Edward. "Holding Nation and Tradition at Bay". *Representative*

Intellectuals. New York: Vintage, 1994. 27-35.

Sinha, Prashant K. "Introduction." *Look Back in Anger: With an Introduction and*

Notes. Bombay: Oxford University Press, 1995. 1-45.

Taylor, John Russell. "Introduction". *Look Back in Anger: A Casebook*. London:

Macmillan, 1968. 11-21.

Trussler, Simon. *The Plays of John Osborne: An Assessment*. London: Victor

Gollanez, 1969.

Tynan, Kenneth. *Curtain*. London: Longman, 1961.

Wehmeier, Sally. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. 6th ed. Great Clarendon

Street: Oxford University Press, 2000.